

Report on the September 2008 pathway 1 and 2 registration intake.

Thirty eight applications were received for the September intake; this is 21 up on the May 2008 intake and is nearly back to typical application numbers.

Auckland = 21 applicants. Interviewed 20 – 23 October.

Wellington = 11 applicants. 10 interviewed 29 and 30 October and one on 25 August.

Christchurch = 6 applicants. Interviewed 3 and 4 November.

The NZRAB meeting was held on 25 November 2008.

Statistics

NZRAB Sept 2008		Auckland	Wellington	Christchurch
	38 Applicants	21	11	6
		14 successful 7 unsuccessful	9 successful 2 unsuccessful	6 successful

76% achieved registration.

Pathway	Gender	Age	New or reapplication	No weeks experience	(NZ or other degree)	GDP attendance Y/N	Size of practice were applicant employed
P1 36	Male 23	25-34 22	New 32 Reappl 6	140-200 8	NZ 29 Other 9	Yes 34	1 = 11 2 = 5 3 = 4 4 = 3 5 = 2 6 = 3 7 8 = 2 9 10 11 = 1 12 = 3 13 14 15 = 3 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31+ = 1
P2 2	Female 15	35-44 12		201 – 250 10	U of A Pass 9 Fail 4	No 4	
via P4 6		45 PLUS 4		251 – 300 6	UNITEC Pass 3 Fail 1		
via P5 0				300plus 14	VUW Pass 11 Fail 1		
via P6 0					Other 9		

Areas of weakness

- Inadequate experience in contract documentation, conditions of contract, procurement, administration and observation.
- Lack of understanding of risk in relation to sub and separate consultants.
- Lack of complexity of building projects submitted in some case studies.
- Lack of knowledge of resource consent process.
- Age of some projects in case studies.
- Design input not evidenced or inadequate.
- No involvement in the engagement of the consultants.
- No idea of professionalism.
- No understanding of context.
- Lack of rigor in the application of process.
- Insufficient broad practice experience.
- Inadequate understanding of the role of the architect in cost monitoring.

Helpful pointers for future applicants

Written commentary provided by some applicants in their case studies explaining their role was very helpful.

During professional conversations some applicants were saying "we did" rather than saying "I did".

Applicants can bring full size drawings and contract set with them to the interview. Some Assessors find reading heavily reduced copies of design drawings difficult. It will be up to Assessors whether they view this additional material.

Copies of the case studies must fit into the hard file boxes specified, but provide enough information to be adequately assessed. The maxim "brevity in the case study= a confident applicant" should be considered.

Case studies should be composed of recent projects, not ones more than a couple of years old.

Repeat applicants need to consider the advisability of resubmitting projects used previously and consider whether this will assist their current application.