

PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF BUILDING & CIVIL ENGINEERING 2018/19

Phase 2: Programme Review

PROGRAMME PANEL REPORT

DEPARTMENT: Architecture
DATE: 9 – 10 May 2019

PROGRAMMES SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW

Major Awards

Bachelor of Science in Architectural Technology (NFQ L7, 180 ECTS credits)
Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Architectural Technology (NFQ L8, 240 ECTS credits)
Master of Science in Architectural Technical Design (NFQ L9, 90 ECTS credits) *[NB: subject to a separate revalidation decision by Academic Council pending completion of requirement 1.3/5.3]*

Bachelor of Science in Interior Architecture (NFQ L7, 180 ECTS credits)
Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Interior Architecture (NFQ L8, 240 ECTS credits)
Master of Science in Interior Architecture (NFQ L9, 90 ECTS credits) *[NB: subject to a separate revalidation decision by Academic Council pending completion of requirement 1.3/5.3]*

Non-Major Awards

n/a

PROGRAMME REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP

Mr Joseph Little
Assistant Head of School, Dublin School of Architecture (Construction), TU Dublin (*Chair*)

Ms Emer Maughan
Lecturer, Department of Building & Civil Engineering, Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology

Mr Peter Scanlon
Lecturer, Yeats Academy of Arts, Design & Architecture, IT Sligo

Mr Patrick Wilding
Senior Interior Architect, CBRE Building Consultancy, Dublin

Ms Eva Juhl
Institutional Review Facilitator, Office of the Registrar & VP for Academic Affairs, CIT

PROGRAMME REPRESENTATION

Programme Staff

Dr Joe Harrington, Head of School of Building & Civil Engineering
Mr Martin Boylan, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (IA)
Mr Kevin Busby, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (IA / Arch)
Mr Jim Cahill, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (AT)
Mr Evan Finegan, Assistant Lecturer, Department of Architecture (AT)
Dr Jim Harrison, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (IA / Arch)
Dr Sarah Mulroony, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (IA / Arch)
Ms Deborah Ní Riain, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (AT / IA)
Mr James O'Callaghan, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (AT)
Mr Derek O'Leary, Assistant Lecturer, Department of Architecture (AT)
Dr Marc Ó'Riain, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (IA)
Mr Jason O'Shaughnessy, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (IA / Arch)
Mr Donal O'Shea, Lecturer, Department of Mathematics
Dr Garrett O'Sullivan, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (AT / IA)
Ms Anne Rogers, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (IA)
Ms Deirdre Ryan, Lecturer, Department of Architecture (AT)

Learner Representatives

Ms Weronika Chwastek, BSc (Honours) in Architectural Technology, Stage 1
Mr Ross Duggan, BSc in Architectural Technology, Stage 1
Mr Kieran Devaney, BSc (Honours) in Architectural Technology, Stage 2
Ms Aisling O'Leary, BSc (Honours) in Architectural Technology, Stage 2
Mr Jack Crotty, BSc in Architectural Technology, Stage 3
Mr Eugene O'Brien, BSc (Hons) in Architectural Technology, Stage 3
Ms Lauren Elsey, BSc (Honours) in Architectural Technology, Stage 4
Mr Zhao Qing Tia, BSc (Honours) in Architectural Technology, Stage 4

Ms Orla McCarthy, BSc (Honours) in Interior Architecture, Stage 1
Mr Dean McCarthy, BSc (Honours) in Interior Architecture, Stage 1
Mr Stephen Lehane, BSc (Honours) in Interior Architecture, Stage 2
Ms Laura Cooke, BSc (Honours) in Interior Architecture, Stage 2
Ms Ciara Mooney, BSc (Honours) in Interior Architecture, Stage 3
Ms Weronika Kraska, BSc (Honours) in Interior Architecture, Stage 3
Ms Léa Laurent, BSc (Honours) in Interior Architecture, Stage 4
Ms Kate Byrne, BSc (Honours) in Interior Architecture, Stage 4

Graduates and External Stakeholders

Mr John McCarthy, Director, Wilson Architecture, Cork
Ms Emily Jane Keady, Graduate of BSc (Hons) in Architectural Technology / Wilson Architecture
Mr Turlough Clancy, Associate Director, Henry J Lyons Architects, Cork

A. PROGRAMME SUMMARY AND MAJOR CHANGES PROPOSED

1. BSc IN ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGY / BSc (HONOURS) IN ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGY / MSc IN ARCHITECTURAL TECHNICAL DESIGN

1.1. Programme Summary

The Bachelor of Science in Architectural Technology (NFQ Level 7, 180 ECTS Credits) and the Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Architectural Technology (NFQ Level 8, 240 ECTS Credits) are three- and four-year degree programmes offered by the Department of Architecture with parallel entries through the Level 7 and Level 8 CAO lists respectively.

The Bachelor of Science (formally Diploma) in Architectural Technology has been offered by CIT since 1984, initially as a one-year add-on Diploma in Construction Studies, with a one-year add-on BSc (Honours) introduced in 2005 and the 4-year ab-initio programme launched in September 2008 following a 'ladder conversion' process.

Following conversion, the School decided to retain the parallel Ordinary Bachelor degree, rather than abolish it as happened in other areas. This was based on the observation, repeatedly confirmed in the intervening years, that many entrants who would have qualified for the Honours programme chose to apply for entry into the Ordinary degree instead. While first-time enrolment in the Level 8 degree has always exceeded L7 enrolment, in recent years by a ratio of ca. 2:1, the School feels that retention of parallel Level 7 and Level 8 CAO offerings has supported it in sustaining programme viability in a field where enrolments are particularly vulnerable to economic fluctuation.

Where Level 7 and 8 programmes run in parallel, CIT curriculum policy requires that Stages 1 – 3 must include differentiated modules of at least 15 ECTS credits (i.e. normally, at least three standard 5-credit modules). The differences must be non-trivial and feed into the distinct knowledge, skills and competence profiles of Ordinary and Honours levels graduates respectively. In the Architectural Technology programmes, the differentiation is built into the two 10-credit Studio modules in Sem. 1 and 2 of Stage 3, resulting in 20 differentiated ECTS credits overall. While Level 7 and Level 8 learners are not separated for delivery of Studio, the Stage 3 Studio modules in the Honours degree (ARCH7033, ARCH7035) include one differentiated, higher-level learning outcome (LO1) as against the respective L7 Studio modules (ARCH7032 and ARCH7034) and require students to apply the Studio brief to a different, more complex building, with extra requirements in the brief. L7 graduates who achieve a final result of 50% or higher are eligible to progress to the award stage of the Honours degree.

In addition to the undergraduate programmes, a Master of Science in Architectural Technical Design (NFQ Level 9, 90 ECTS Credits) was launched in 2014 after consultation with stakeholders and professional feedback. The MSc had one initial intake of two students, but has not run since due to insufficient demand to deliver it in a financially feasible manner.

The BSc in Architectural Technology achieved accreditation through the RIAI in 2014; RIAI accreditation visits for the BSc (Hons) in Architectural Technology were unsuccessful. An application for re-accreditation of the BSc programme and for accreditation of the BSc (Hons) programme was submitted to the RIAI in 2018/19, with panel visits in April and June 2019.

Historically the Architectural Technician was viewed as a drafter of details. Today's Architectural Technologist is recognised as a Technical Designer who is part of a team with the Architect and provides technical expertise and support to the Architect. As such, the Architectural Technologist is skilled in the application and integration of construction technologies in the building design process. The typical Architectural Technologist is a team player with creative mechanical aptitude, the ability to think in three dimensions, developed time management skills, with a passion for buildings, how they are built, how they work and how they are used. S/he has particular responsibility for the preparation of production information such as working drawings, schedules and specifications and integration of expertise from other related disciplines. The Architectural Technologist also works on site surveys, administrative procedures to do with building regulations, fire safety certificates, planning applications, the building contract, etc.

Most Architectural Technologists work for private architectural practices or in Government Departments, Local Authorities or Semi-State Agencies, with job opportunities in related industries also. As in all areas related to the building industry, career possibilities are very much dependent on the state of the economy. In a booming economy there is a shortage of Architectural Technologists; when the economy is depressed the industry is soon affected. Since 2016, graduate employment for Architectural Technology graduates has improved considerably, with practically all 2018 Level 8 graduates (albeit of a small graduating cohort) now in relevant employment. And while in general Level 7 graduates tend to continue onto the Level 8, in the most recent two years over 60% of the graduates of the Level 7 programme have entered the employment market rather than directly progressing to the Honours degree.

1.2. Major Changes Now Proposed

In the period since the last programmatic review, a range of changes have been implemented in the undergraduate Architectural Technology programmes to address comments made by visiting RIAI Panels and external examiners. While module weighting has remained unchanged, iterative changes were made to some module content and titles, amongst others to better differentiate the Level 7 and 8 offerings. Some changes were also made to assessment types and breakdown. These include a reduction in the overall number of assessments and introduction of 'staff peer' assessment of all studio work. A 5-credit *Work Placement* elective was introduced into the L8 degree in 2016, to run in the summer between Stages 3 and 4 (with marks included on the broadsheet for Sem. 1, Stage 4). Lastly, to address recurrent challenges related to the transition of new entrants to third level, an Induction Week for First Years was introduced in 2017/18. Replacing the 'Vertical Project' which previously occurred in Week 1 of Sem. 1, the First Year Induction Week has been positively received by students.

The major changes now proposed encompass introduction of a new mandatory 10-credit *Work Placement in AEC* module in Semester 1 of Stage 3 of both the Ordinary and Honours programme, and of a 5-credit mandatory *Interdisciplinary Project* module in Sem. 1, Stage 4 of the Honours degree. The *Interdisciplinary Project* will be shared between Final Year students in the disciplines of Structural Engineering, Architectural Technology, Interior Architecture, Construction Management and Quantity Surveying.

To enable inclusion of the additional 10 or 15 mandatory ECTS credits (in the Ordinary and Honours degrees respectively), it is proposed to deliver the CTMS (Construction Technology, Materials & Services), Environment and Architectural Representation streams in six rather than

seven modules. At the same time, it is envisaged to reduce the amount of module sharing between the Architectural Technology and Interior Architecture programmes in these streams. None of the Technology modules are now to be shared, and sharing in the Environment stream is to be halved from four to two shared modules. The decreased sharing in these programme strands is intended to allow the relevant modules to be better adapted to the requirements of each specialism, thus strengthening the distinct profiles of the Architectural Technology and Interior Architecture programmes. It was also pointed out that this facilitates the 'compressed' delivery of the streams in which the number of modules has been reduced, as it makes it possible to remove material not relevant to the respective specialism.

In addition, the Department of Architecture has obtained derogation – in line with other programmes in Engineering – to remove elective choice from Semester 1 of Stage 4 of the Honours degree in Architectural Technology, which allows the *Interdisciplinary Project* to be included without displacing other mandatory content. Four semesters offering elective / Free Choice remain on the proposed L8 Architectural Technology programme.

To ensure efficiency of delivery, it is proposed to share several other modules between AT and IA. The following modules are newly proposed for sharing: *Architectural History*, which has been split out from Architectural Representation to become a single, shared 5-credit module (elective in AT, mandatory in IA); ARCH8001 *Professional Practice – Management* (mandatory in AT, elective in IA); ARCH8017 *Architectural Portfolio*; the new 10-credit *Work Placement in AEC* (albeit this is offered in different semesters in AT and IA); and the *Interdisciplinary Project*.

The MSc in Architectural Technical Design is proposed for revalidation with minor module changes only.

2. BSC IN INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE / BSC (HONOURS) IN INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE / MSc IN INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE

2.1. Programme Summary

The Department of Architecture also offers a three-year Bachelor of Science in Interior Architecture (NFQ Level 7, 180 ECTS Credits) and a four-year Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Interior Architecture (NFQ Level 8, 240 ECTS Credits) with parallel entries through the Level 7 and Level 8 CAO lists.

A two-year Higher Certificate in Science in Interior Architectural Technology was launched in 1999. The three-year BSc in Interior Architecture was initiated in 2004, followed by the introduction of a one-year add-on Honours degree in Interior Architecture in 2008. The ab-initio BSc Honours in Interior Architecture, another 'ladder conversion', started in 2009. On conversion, the parallel Level 7 was retained on the same basis as in Architectural Technology. The necessary differentiation is again to be achieved through the two differentiated Stage 3 Studio modules (ARCHXXXX *Design Studio Environment* / ARCHXXXX *Design Studio Workplaces* in the Level 7; ARCHXXXX *Design Studio Adv Environments* / ARCHXXXX *Design Studio Adv Workplaces* in the Level 8). In this case, the additional learning outcome in each Studio module of the Level 8 programme is to be achieved through an extended brief and application of more

demanding criteria. Graduates of the BSc in Interior Architecture with a final result of 50% or higher are eligible to progress to the award stage of the Honours IA degree.

An MSc in Interior Architecture was introduced on foot of consultation and professional feedback in 2013. As for the MSc in AT, this programme had one modest initial intake but could not be delivered since due to insufficient subsequent demand.

The CIT BSc and BSc (Honours) in Interior Architecture programmes are recognised by the European Council of Interior Architects (ECIA).

Interior Architecture is described as a field at the intersection of Architecture, conservation and design of the built environment, centred on rethinking the life of existing buildings through innovative design alterations, renovations and adaptive reuse and transformation. Unlike Interior Design, it is Architecture within the confines of an existing building. Thus, the Interior Architect is now recognised as a valuable member of the design team with a level of technical expertise comparable to that of the Architect. Interior Architects are typically involved in the remodelling and repurposing of existing buildings, therefore playing an important role in the sustainable reuse of the built environment. Their work more specifically involves the design of interiors, their layouts, fittings, furnishings and decoration, and the preparation of the necessary design/technical drawings and written documentation to carry out the works.

Most Interior Architects work for private architectural practices as part of an Interiors Team, while some are also employed by kitchen, furniture, lighting, set design or manufacturing companies. As for Architectural Technologists, employment and career possibilities in Interior Architecture are closely linked to the state of the economy, with a marked improvement in employment levels noticeable from 2016 onwards. Practically all 2018 graduates of the L8 were in relevant employment in November 2018. Level 7 Interior Architecture graduates for the most part continue to progress to the Honours IA degree.

2.2. Major Changes Now Proposed

Modifications to the Interior Architecture programmes since the last Programmatic Review correspond to those made in Architectural Technology and include changes to some module content and titles; some changes to assessment types and breakdown; a reduction in the overall number of assessments; introduction of 'staff peer' assessment of studio work; introduction of a 5-credit *Work Placement* elective into the Honours degree; and replacement of the 'Vertical Project' by an Induction Week for First Years, which appears to work well. As for Architectural Technology, these changes were made in the main to address comments received from the European Council for Interior Architects (ECIA) and from external examiners. The overall structure of the Interior Architecture programmes has remained largely unchanged however and incorporates a number of themes or streams, namely Studio, Graphics, History/Theory, Environment and Technology.

As for AT, introduction of a new mandatory 10-credit *Work Placement in AEC* and a 5-credit mandatory *Interdisciplinary Project* module are now proposed for the Interior Architecture programmes. Delivery of *Work Placement in AEC* will be staggered between AT and IA however, and for Interior Architecture will take place in Semester 2, Stage 3. The *Interdisciplinary Project*, delivered in Sem. 1, Stage 4 of the Honours degree, is shared across a number of L8 programmes in cognate disciplines within the School of Building & Civil Engineering.

Additional proposed changes concern the reduction in module sharing with the Architectural Technology programmes in the Technology & Materials and Environment strands, accompanied by the 'compression' of the material into fewer modules as appropriate, as outlined in Section 1.2. This is to enable the Department to better tailor the material delivered in those streams to each specialism, while also creating some space for the introduction of the new mandatory work placement and interdisciplinary modules. The existing, shared module ENVI6006 *Environmental Design 3* (in Semester 1, Stage 3) is thus to be replaced by a new, more focused 5-credit *Building Regulations* module specific to Interior Architecture, while the currently shared module ENVI7003 *Environmental Design 4* will no longer be delivered in the IA programmes. It is furthermore envisaged to remove ARCH8019 *Design Detailing 2* from Stage 4 and integrate the relevant material into the ARCH 8012 *Design Studio Distillation* (in Semester 2 of Stage 4). Design Studio in Semester 2 of Stage 3 (currently ARCH7019 *Design Studio 6*) has been reduced from a 15- to a 10-credit module (ARCHXXXX *Design Studio Adv Workplaces*).

B. PANEL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION TO ACADEMIC COUNCIL ON REVALIDATION

Contingent upon confirmation of the fulfilment of any Panel requirements and the successful completion of the internal programme and module moderation process, the Panel **recommends to Academic Council that the listed programmes be revalidated** for five years or until the next Programmatic Review, whichever is sooner, with effect from September 2019.

The following conditions are attached to this recommendation:

- 1.1. **REQUIREMENT** (*Architectural Technology*): In view of the imminent introduction of professional registration requirements for Architectural Technologists, the Panel requires that the AT Programme Team map the proposed programmes (NFQ Level 7, 8 and 9) to the *2016 QQI Awards Standards for Architectural Technology*. This internal process should be rigorous, should be conducted on a whole-team basis, and should clearly identify which modules address which indicators of the QQI Awards Standards.
- 1.2. **REQUIREMENT** (*BSc / BSc (Honours) in Architectural Technology / Interior Architecture*): To ensure a positive transition to the proposed new programme structure and to ensure that no students miss crucial content, the Panel requires that (a) a gap analysis be carried out to identify in concrete terms the movement of teaching material, and (b) that a Transition Schedule or Schedules be created as required.
- 1.3. **REQUIREMENT** (*MSc in Architectural Technical Design / Interior Architecture*): The Panel requires that the Masters programmes in IA and AT be comprehensively updated to reflect relevant changes impacting upon practice and research in each field since 2014. In the case of AT radical changes include, but are not limited to, the 2016 QQI Award Standards, the nZEB Standard, changes to ventilation commissioning, SDGs, the Paris Agreement, BIM standards, developments in digital technologies, etc.

The updated MSc programme and module descriptors should be re-submitted to the Panel prior to submission to Academic Council for revalidation.

2. GENERAL

2.1 Commendation: The Panel was very appreciative of the efforts taken to prepare the review material and the commitment of time and energy by management, programme teams and quality assurance office within this review process. In the context of the continued absence of the Head of Department Katherine Keane, the Panel specially commends the leadership of Head of School Joe Harrington and Programme Coordinators Deirdre Ryan and Anne Rogers, and offers its best wishes for a speedy recovery to Katherine Keane.

The overall impression is of a suite of high-quality programmes safeguarded by a dedicated, experienced and collegial multi-disciplinary team through difficult times, continuously adapted to changing standards, technology and examiner feedback, and for which the recovering construction sector now offers an opportunity for consolidation and growth.

The Panel commends the dedication and collegiality of the programme teams of the IA and AT suites of programmes, and would furthermore like to thank and commend the learners,

graduates and industry representatives who generously shared their time and valuable insights during the site visit.

2.2 Finding: The Panel acknowledges that recent circumstances have made collation of the programmatic review documentation particularly challenging for the programme teams. It notes however that it would have been desirable if the programme submission, in particular, could have included more comprehensive detail on significant developments in the external environment, as well as on the exact changes now proposed to the programmes, including the movement of existing material in response to the introduction of mandatory work placement. This would have aided the Panel in obtaining a more complete picture of what is now proposed, and of how the teams have responded to professional and scientific developments which will necessarily affect the programme content, and may also affect their structure and delivery and assessment modalities. Relevant external developments include, in particular, the imminent statutory protection of the professional title of Architectural Technologist, with a consequent need to align the AT programmes to the 2016 QQI Award Standards in the immediate future.

Additional supplementary documents furnished and/or orally presented by the programme teams over the two days in response to Panel requests were:

- Mapping of the existing AT undergraduate programmes to the *2016 QQI Award Standards for Architectural Technology*;
- Programme Strategy (AT) and Programme Vision Statement (IA);
- Department of Architecture brochure (with excerpts from the CIT F-T prospectus).

2.3 Finding: Lastly, the Architecture Panel would like to record its agreement with all findings, requirements and recommendations of the Phase 1 Panel Review Report.

3. ENTRANT AND GRADUATE PROFILE, AWARD AND PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

3.1 REQUIREMENT: The departmental presentation emphasised that achievement of professional accreditation for its programmes was of utmost importance to the Department, due to its immense value for the employability and career prospects of graduates.

In this context, the Panel found it remarkable that the programme documentation for Architectural Technology did not reference the current national move to introduce statutory registration requirements for Architectural Technologists. While the exact registration criteria and procedure have yet to be agreed nationally, it is a given that the ability of graduates to be individually registered and bear the protected title of Architectural Technologist will be predicated on the demonstrable and detailed alignment of the learning outcomes of her or his programme with the QQI Award Standards for Architectural Technology (2016). The Panel heard that all members of AT programme staff were involved in mapping their own relevant modules and that two staff were responsible for collation of the overall mapping and the ‘heat mapping’ for the existing Level 8 programme; the output was provided to the Panel during the meetings. However, the staff noted that no guidance had been received from QQI or any other body on the mapping methodology, so that there was uncertainty when a particular standard could be deemed to be met to a sufficient degree. Given this, and in the absence of the Head of Department, no mapping had been carried out for the proposed AT programme suite.

In view of the imminent introduction of professional registration requirements for Architectural Technologists, the Panel **requires** that the AT programme team map the proposed programmes (at NFQ Levels 7, 8 and 9) to the *2016 QQI Awards Standards for Architectural Technology*. This internal process should be rigorous, should be conducted on a whole-team basis, and should clearly identify which modules address which indicators of the QQI Awards Standards.

The Panel suggests that, in lieu of a ‘heat map’ approach, the programme team consider identifying which modules address which indicators of the QQI Awards Standards in a binary way; this can be done quite straightforwardly at the level of the individual module learning outcomes. This approach may make it easier to justify the extent to which indicators are addressed, as well as highlighting some areas that can be improved.

3.2 Recommendation: The documents furnished to the Panel present well-managed, broad programmes, but did not include a vision statement, nor a sense of the particular strengths or differentiating features of the programmes, in what is a crowded marketplace in a recovering economy.

Whilst accepting that the language of social media marketing and programme documents is different, the Panel strongly recommends that the Department addresses this issue and creates a unique, attractive vision statement for each programme. Such a vision might also prompt beneficial adjustments to the Educational Aims and Programme Outcomes for each of the programmes.

3.3 Recommendation: Section 3.3 on Industry Engagement, Sponsorship and Support in the Phase 1 School Submission, which formed part of the background materials supplied to the Panel, contains an impressive range of recent School-wide activities, most of which relate to construction or engineering. Section 6.1 of the Phase 2 Submission for the Department of Architecture refers to the Department’s research contributions to SIRIG, although it is unclear what IA and AT-related industry engagements are taking place. The School’s connection to Lean Construction Ireland, South-West Regional Skills and the Regional Climate Change Office, amongst others, could provide many opportunities to develop industry engagement, sponsorship and research that would enrich the IA and AT programme suites.

The Panel recommends that the Department strategically pursue industry engagement, sponsorship and research opportunities that support development of the unique vision, particular strengths and differentiating features of these programme suites.

4. PROGRAMME OPERATION AND PERFORMANCE

4.1 Commendation: It is clear that student engagement, retention and progression rates remain a concern. The School intends to grow its whole-time equivalent figures by 30% in the next five years (back to pre-recession days) by better retention rather than increased admissions.

The Phase 2 Panel commends the efforts made and diversity of approaches to improving student retention. The teams have twin foci: (a) to ensure the decision applicants make to study IA and AT are sufficiently informed, so that they are more likely to commit, once registered; and (b) to improve the student experience in Stages 1 and 2 to improve pass rates

and retention. Measures in category (a) include: CIT Open Day, CIT Engineering Roadshow, contact with career guidance teachers and a rolling engagement with Transition Year. Measures in category (b) include: first year mentoring, 'academic success coaching', shared folders, creating a more supportive context for studio crits (by hanging up work some days before presentations and unpacking the learning after crits), and an engaging atmosphere in studio (e.g. encouraging use of music, etc.).

The Panel also commends the efforts of the Programme Teams to remain in touch with recent graduates and to record their employment status post-graduation.

4.2 Recommendation: There are many benefits from programmes being able to run repeatedly: content can be regularly updated; industry feedback and the size and makeup of each cohort can both justify a programme and ensure its relevance; programme delivery can be assessed and revised over time. As the two taught Masters of Science have each run only once following validation, neither has had these benefits. At the same time Masters by Research have continued within a broader, commendable, research engagement.

The Panel accepts the Department's contention that both taught Masters have value and that the programme teams can deliver them. The Panel recommends that (a) the School establish the level of interest for the two Masters in the current market; and (b) the mode of delivery be considered to see which approaches have the greatest chance of repeat delivery. For example, blended online delivery has worked very well for other cognate professional postgraduate programmes in Ireland.

5. PROPOSED PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION (INCL. DELIVERY AND ASSESSMENT)

5.1 Commendation: The Panel commends the introduction of mandatory work placement at Stage 3 in the IA and AT suite of programmes, where it can benefit all students of the Department.

5.2 Commendation: The Panel also applauds the introduction of the Interdisciplinary Project module in Stage 4 of the AT and IA Honours degrees. Given cross-silo collaboration is as important at Level 7 as at Level 8, down the line the team may wish to consider a delivery earlier in the programme.

5.3 REQUIREMENT: It was confirmed to the Panel that the Masters in AT and IA have essentially remained as initially approved. While the programme teams do not expect renewed demand in the near future, and have clearly had to prioritise their work in preparation for the programmatic review under the given circumstances, the Panel considers that the L9 programme specifications as submitted do not reflect the significant changes in key concerns, technologies and the regulatory framework in the fields of Architectural Technology and Interior Architecture which have occurred since the programmes were first approved.

The Panel therefore **requires** that the Level 9 IA and AT programmes be comprehensively updated to reflect relevant changes impacting upon practice and research in each field since 2014. In the case of AT radical changes include, but are not limited to, the 2016 QQI Award Standards, the nZEB Standard, changes to ventilation commissioning, SDGs, the Paris Agreement, BIM standards, developments in digital technologies, etc. The updated MSc

programme and module descriptors should then be re-submitted to the Panel prior to submission to Academic Council for revalidation.

5.4 REQUIREMENT: While the Panel greets the introduction of mandatory placement (and the Stage 4 Interdisciplinary Project), the introduction of a large placement element always gives rise to questions about the core material it has replaced (i.e. has it been retained and moved, diminished or removed) and the way it is introduced. The Panel gained little clarity about the exact movement and possible 'compression' of core content in the programmes now proposed from the programme documents and the discussion.

To ensure a positive transition to the proposed new programme structure and to ensure that no students miss crucial content, the Panel **requires** that (a) a gap analysis be carried out to identify in concrete terms the movement of teaching material, and (b) that a Transition Schedule or Schedules be created as required.

5.5 Recommendation: It is clear that running Level 7 and 8 programmes in Interior Architecture and Architectural Technology in parallel affords the School flexibility and contributes to programme sustainability in a varying economic climate. While this parallel delivery model is not uncommon within the sector, other Irish HEs provide flexibility through 3+1 and 4-1 arrangements, which has the advantage of ensuring that there is only one identifiable student cohort in each stage of each programme.

It is important to the Panel to ascertain that the current parallel structure, with its particular delivery model of teaching Level 7 and Level 8 students together in all modules while creating the requisite level differentiation through the Stage 3 studio briefs, does not in any way contribute to low self-esteem amongst students enrolled in the Level 7 programmes. In this context, the Panel acknowledges that the LC points differential does not appear to be the sole, or even dominant, factor in the decision of CAO applicants to seek entry into the Ordinary or the Honours degree (inter alia as per the programme performance data supplied).

However, the Panel recommends that the Level 7 student cohorts of the IA and AT programme be (anonymously) surveyed to establish their perception once on the programme.

Furthermore, in view also of the continuously more modest demand for the Level 7 degrees, the Panel recommends that the appropriateness of the current parallel structure in the AT and IA programmes be reviewed before the next programmatic review to see if its continuation can be fully justified.

5.6 Recommendation: The proposed new mandatory 10-credit Stage 3 Work Placement in AT and IA will be four weeks long. For Interior Architecture students, this four-week period is proposed to take place at the beginning of Semester 2.

For Architectural Technology students, placement is to take place at end of Semester 1 (from mid-November), with a possible extension of ca. 3 weeks up to the start of Semester 2. The Panel is concerned that AT students will join design practices at the most stressful period of the year in what is a short formal placement period with little time for adjustment.

The Panel recommends that the Department review the timing and duration of the mandatory 10-credit placements in AT and IA annually, with a view to establishing whether changes to the timing and/or extension of the placement period might benefit student learning.

5.7 Recommendation: Conservation and building re-use are themes of growing importance. The increasing importance of the Sustainable Development Goals is strengthening these themes further, with significant emphasis on 'circularity' in building design and re-use. The generally shorter time span of interior fitouts would surely inform the emphasis on life-cycle assessment (LCA).

The Panel strongly recommends that these themes be considered core in both programme suites, and that associated policy (such as the Venice Charter, National Monuments Acts 1930 – 2004 and RIAI policy in respect of Conservation) not be delivered through Studio alone.

5.8 Recommendation: Building information modelling and management (BIM) is at the forefront of a wider shift toward digital technologies in design, construction, certification and maintenance processes. Increasingly BIM models are created for design purposes but are then used by builders and later facility managers. The rigour and quality of BIM models is being interrogated in a way that CAD models never were. The industry is shifting quickly to BIM since the economic recovery commenced, albeit slower in Interior Architecture than architectural practice. There was also strong interest in BIM amongst the student representatives of both programme suites, extending beyond the use of the REVIT application to include information management, Navisworks and other digital tools. Students have a range of concerns: they believe that (a) the level of BIM skills across the programme team is not as high as could be; (b) that BIM should be introduced before Stage 3 so that Level 7 students can properly benefit from it; and (c) that BIM may be removed from IA instead of being increased.

In these dual industry and academic contexts the Panel strongly recommends that the Department creates a digital technologies / BIM strategy for the next five years. This should assess the shift taking place in industry, the varying needs of IA and AT graduates, the upskilling and resources needed to support the shift. The strategy should also explore the research potential of BIM and digital technologies.

5.9 Recommendation: Given their importance in policy, business and research, the Panel recommends that statistics and probability be introduced in Stages 3 or 4 of IA and AT.

5.10 Recommendation: The Panel recommends that the programme teams encourage student use of, and reference back to, the module descriptors in Akari, since these represent the formal 'contract' of the Institute with the learner and the information formally published by the Institute about each module. The alignment of codes used by the Department on programme tables in student handbooks and programme marketing literature with the formal Akari module codes would be beneficial.

5.11 Recommendation: In the meeting with students the Panel heard that none of the 16 student representatives (from both suites of programmes) had taken out books listed in module descriptors. Only one had read a pdf version, though several said they had read other books related to particular modules. The Panel recommends that certain assignments be created that encourage an active engagement with the proscribed reading lists.

6. MODULES

This section presents the findings and recommendations from an indicative review of modules carried out by the members of the Peer Review Panel. The Panel notes that a comprehensive survey of module specifications could not be carried out in the context of this review.

Therefore, a recommendation of the Panel to revalidate the programme(s) under review is contingent on the successful completion of the subsequent internal programme and module moderation process carried out by, or on behalf of, the CIT Registrar's Office.

6.1 Recommendation (All Modules): There was a noticeable disparity between elective modules listed in the programme documents and the actual module choices being offered to the students over the years. Furthermore, within the latter group, it appears that some modules were genuinely elective, some were offered on an alternating basis, and some were in fact quasi-mandatory core modules.

The status of modules should be unambiguous. Furthermore, programme teams should avoid overstating the number of elective choices in the programme schedules if it is clear that most of these cannot viably delivered with given student numbers. Elective modules have clear value for student learning, yet essential content should not be in electives – for instance, no student, whether in IA or AT, should be able to complete their degree without having taken Architectural History.

The Panel recommends that these issues be addressed and clarity provided in the programme schedules.

6.2 Recommendation (All Modules): The Panel asks that the reading lists for all modules be reviewed and updated where necessary prior to final module approval, with a view also to introduction of online resources where available.

6.3 Recommendation (Environmental Design stream): The Panel suggests that delivery of the theory content in the modules within the Environmental Design stream might be streamlined to allow for inclusion of a higher proportion of practical elements.

6.4 Commendation (Building Regulations): The Panel commends inclusion of a dedicated *Building Regulations* (No Code Yet) module in Stage 3, Semester 1 of the Interior Architecture programmes.

7. OTHER FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Recommendation: The Panel recommends that industry and graduate surveys be created to support the next school and programme reviews.

7.2 Recommendation: The Review process was well managed and the Panel felt well supported. Nonetheless the time allowed for the review was very short given the number of programmes being examined, particularly as there were significant issues to be considered such as the status of the MSc programmes, the parallel delivery of the NFQ Level 7 and 8 programmes and the QQI mapping of AT.

The Panel recommends therefore that (a) the programme documentation be provided in good time to the next Panel, and (b) also suggest that future reviews could be conducted over two full days. It could also be considered whether some sessions specific to each programme suite could be run in parallel to ensure greater time efficiency and a more even allocation of time to, in this case, Interior Architecture and Architectural Technology.

8. DEROGATIONS SOUGHT

8.1 The Panel notes that renewal of existing derogation had been sought by the School of Building & Civil Engineering and granted by Academic Council prior to the panel visit for:

- (a) Large-credit Studio modules (10 – 15 ECTS credits in the undergraduate programmes; 10 – 20 ECTS credits in the Masters degrees);
- (b) Large-credit Research Project modules (10 ECTS credits in Stage 4 of the Honours degrees; 20 ECTS credits in the Masters degrees);
- (b) Omission of Free Choice / elective choice in Semester 2 of Stages 1 and 3.

C. PROGRAMME FINALISATION

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF PANEL REQUIREMENTS

Requirement(s) <i>[Please copy & paste from the report, adding rows as necessary. Completed recomm. can also be indicated.]</i>	Department Response	Registrar's Office Comment
<p>1.1. REQUIREMENT (Architectural Technology): In view of the imminent introduction of professional registration requirements for Architectural Technologists, the Panel requires that the AT Programme Team map the proposed programmes (NFQ Level 7, 8 and 9) to the 2016 QQI Awards Standards for Architectural Technology. This internal process should be rigorous, should be conducted on a whole-team basis, and should clearly identify which modules address which indicators of the QQI Awards Standards.</p>	<p>The relevant mapping has been completed for the proposed Level 7 and Level 8 Architectural Technology Programmes to the 2016 QQI Awards Standards for Architectural Technology. The process has been undertaken in a rigorous, whole team based manner. The mapping process maps each individual module which includes for the suite of module learning outcomes but also the important module indicative content.</p> <p>The mapping has been based on a considered approach by the Architectural Technology team, some of whom are also involved in the IATEF (Irish Architectural Technology Educators Forum).</p>	<p>COMPLETE <i>(14 June 2019)</i></p>
<p>1.2. REQUIREMENT (<i>BSc / BSc (Honours) in Architectural Technology / Interior Architecture</i>): To ensure a positive transition to the proposed new programme structure and to ensure that no students miss crucial content, the Panel requires that (a) a gap analysis be carried out to identify in concrete terms the movement of teaching material, and (b) that a Transition Schedule or Schedules be created as required.</p>	<p>A gap analysis has been completed for each of the two suites of programmes – Interior Architecture and Architectural Technology. This gap analysis is now being reviewed to determine if transition schedules are required.</p>	<p><i>19 June 2019:</i></p> <p>The gap analysis has been completed for both undergrad. programme suites (AT and IA).</p> <p>- Interior Architecture: Confirmation received from HoS that based on the gap analysis no Transition Schedules will be required for IA, and that current legacy students will be able to repeat using legacy papers or specific briefs/ assignments across the different modules.</p> <p>- Architectural Tech: Due to the move of some material Transition Schedules are required and are being produced but not yet completed.</p>

<p>1.3. REQUIREMENT (<i>MSc in Architectural Technical Design / Interior Architecture</i>): The Panel requires that the Masters programmes in IA and AT be comprehensively updated to reflect relevant changes impacting upon practice and research in each field since 2014. In the case of AT radical changes include, but are not limited to, the 2016 QQI Award Standards, the nZEB Standard, changes to ventilation commissioning, SDGs, the Paris Agreement, BIM standards, developments in digital technologies, etc.</p> <p>The updated MSc programme and module descriptors should be re-submitted to the Panel prior to submission to Academic Council for revalidation.</p>	<p>The Taught MSc Programmes in Architectural Technical Design and Interior Architecture will not be delivered in the next academic year of 2019/2020. These programme will be fully updated in advance of future delivery.</p>	<p>NOT COMPLETED (18 June 2019)</p> <p>MSc's not proposed for revalidation for Sep.19, with no new intakes admissible at this point. To be proposed to AC for revalidation on completion of Requ. 1.3 at a later point in time.</p>
<p>3.2. RECOMMENDATION The documents furnished to the Panel present well-managed, broad programmes, but did not include a vision statement, nor a sense of the particular strengths or differentiating features of the programmes, in what is a crowded marketplace in a recovering economy.</p> <p>Whilst accepting that the language of social media marketing and programme documents is different, the Panel strongly recommends that the Department addresses this issue and creates a unique, attractive vision statement for each programme. Such a vision might also prompt beneficial adjustments to the Educational Aims and Programme Outcomes for each of the programmes.</p>	<p>The Department will develop a vision statement for each programme and its unique selling points.</p>	
<p>3.3. RECOMMENDATION Section 3.3 on Industry Engagement, Sponsorship and Support in the Phase 1 School Submission, which formed part of the background materials supplied to the Panel, contains an impressive range of recent School-wide activities, most of which relate to construction or engineering. Section 6.1 of the Phase 2 Submission for the Department of</p>	<p>The Department (supported by the School and its extensive external engagement and research activity) will pursue relevant industry engagement, sponsorship and research opportunities to support development of the Architectural Technology and Interior Architecture Programmes.</p>	<p>...</p>

<p>Architecture refers to the Department's research contributions to SIRIG, although it is unclear what IA and AT-related industry engagements are taking place. The School's connection to Lean Construction Ireland, South-West Regional Skills and the Regional Climate Change Office, amongst others, could provide many opportunities to develop industry engagement, sponsorship and research that would enrich the IA and AT programme suites.</p> <p>The Panel recommends that the Department strategically pursue industry engagement, sponsorship and research opportunities that support development of the unique vision, particular strengths and differentiating features of these programme suites.</p>		
<p>4.2. RECOMMENDATION There are many benefits from programmes being able to run repeatedly: content can be regularly updated; industry feedback and the size and makeup of each cohort can both justify a programme and ensure its relevance; programme delivery can be assessed and revised over time. As the two taught Masters of Science have each run only once following validation, neither has had these benefits. At the same time Masters by Research have continued within a broader, commendable, research engagement.</p> <p>The Panel accepts the Department's contention that both taught Masters have value and that the programme teams can deliver them. The Panel recommends that (a) the School establish the level of interest for the two Masters in the current market; and (b) the mode of delivery be considered to see which approaches have the greatest chance of repeat delivery. For example, blended online delivery has worked very well for other cognate professional postgraduate programmes in Ireland.</p>	<p>The School will establish the level of interest for the two MSc Programmes in advance of the potential delivery of the programmes. The mode of delivery will also be reviewed in the context of the market and demand and this review will lever-off existing experience and expertise within the School and across the Institute where full online and blended online delivery is an integral feature of some programmes</p>	

<p>5.5. RECOMMENDATION It is clear that running Level 7 and 8 programmes in Interior Architecture and Architectural Technology in parallel affords the School flexibility and contributes to programme sustainability in a varying economic climate. While this parallel delivery model is not uncommon within the sector, other Irish HEs provide flexibility through 3+1 and 4-1 arrangements, which has the advantage of ensuring that there is only one identifiable student cohort in each stage of each programme.</p> <p>It is important to the Panel to ascertain that the current parallel structure, with its particular delivery model of teaching Level 7 and Level 8 students together in all modules while creating the requisite level differentiation through the Stage 3 studio briefs, does not in any way contribute to low self-esteem amongst students enrolled in the Level 7 programmes. In this context, the Panel acknowledges that the LC points differential does not appear to be the sole, or even dominant, factor in the decision of CAO applicants to seek entry into the Ordinary or the Honours degree (inter alia as per the programme performance data supplied).</p> <p>However, the Panel recommends that the Level 7 student cohorts of the IA and AT programme be (anonymously) surveyed to establish their perception once on the programme.</p> <p>Furthermore, in view also of the continuously more modest demand for the Level 7 degrees, the Panel recommends that the appropriateness of the current parallel structure in the AT and IA programmes be reviewed before the next programmatic review to see if its continuation can be fully justified.</p>	<p>The Level 7 students across both Architectural Technology and Interior Architecture cohorts will be surveyed in the next Academic Year to establish their perception of their programme. In addition the current parallel Level 7 and Level 8 delivery will be reviewed in advance of the next Programmatic Review Process.</p>	
<p>5.6. RECOMMENDATION The proposed new mandatory 10-credit Stage 3 Work Placement in AT and IA</p>	<p>The Department will review on an annual basis (starting in the next Academic Year) the timing, duration</p>	

<p>will be four weeks long. For Interior Architecture students, this four-week period is proposed to take place at the beginning of Semester 2.</p> <p>For Architectural Technology students, placement is to take place at end of Semester 1 (from mid-November), with a possible extension of ca. 3 weeks up to the start of Semester 2. The Panel is concerned that AT students will join design practices at the most stressful period of the year in what is a short formal placement period with little time for adjustment.</p> <p>The Panel recommends that the Department review the timing and duration of the mandatory 10-credit placements in AT and IA annually, with a view to establishing whether changes to the timing and/or extension of the placement period might benefit student learning.</p>	<p>and operation the Work Placement module; changes will then be made as appropriate and necessary. The Department accepts that the view of the Panel on this Work Placement matter.</p>	
<p>5.7. RECOMMENDATION Conservation and building re-use are themes of growing importance. The increasing importance of the Sustainable Development Goals is strengthening these themes further, with significant emphasis on ‘circularity’ in building design and re-use. The generally shorter time span of interior fitouts would surely inform the emphasis on life-cycle assessment (LCA).</p> <p>The Panel strongly recommends that these themes be considered core in both programme suites, and that associated policy (such as the Venice Charter, National Monuments Acts 1930 – 2004 and RIAI policy in respect of Conservation) not be delivered through Studio alone.</p>	<p>The Department will ensure that the SDG and ‘circularity’ in building design and re-use will be central themes in programme delivery and a review will be undertaken in the next Academic Year to ensure integration into programme delivery.</p>	
<p>5.8. RECOMMENDATION Building information modelling and management (BIM) is at the forefront of a wider shift toward digital technologies in design, construction, certification and maintenance processes. Increasingly BIM models are created for design purposes but are</p>	<p>The Department will develop a digital technologies/BIM strategy and will lever-off existing expertise and knowledge within the School including the newly validated Level 8 BSc (Hons) in Building Information Modelling & Management which is at</p>	

<p>then used by builders and later facility managers. The rigour and quality of BIM models is being interrogated in a way that CAD models never were. The industry is shifting quickly to BIM since the economic recovery commenced, albeit slower in Interior Architecture than architectural practice. There was also strong interest in BIM amongst the student representatives of both programme suites, extending beyond the use of the REVIT application to include information management, Navisworks and other digital tools. Students have a range of concerns: they believe that (a) the level of BIM skills across the programme team is not as high as could be; (b) that BIM should be introduced before Stage 3 so that Level 7 students can properly benefit from it; and (c) that BIM may be removed from IA instead of being increased.</p> <p>In these dual industry and academic contexts the Panel strongly recommends that the Department creates a digital technologies / BIM strategy for the next five years. This should assess the shift taking place in industry, the varying needs of IA and AT graduates, the upskilling and resources needed to support the shift. The strategy should also explore the research potential of BIM and digital technologies.</p>	<p>the forefront of BIM Programmes in Ireland.</p>	
<p>5.9. RECOMMENDATION Given their importance in policy, business and research, the Panel recommends that statistics and probability be introduced in Stages 3 or 4 of IA and AT.</p>	<p>Statistics and Probability are covered in Year 4 of the Research Module under sample selection. However the Department will review the recommendation across Stage 3 and 4 of the Architectural Technology and Interior Architecture Programmes.</p>	
<p>5.10. RECOMMENDATION The Panel recommends that the programme teams encourage student use of, and reference back to, the module descriptors in Akari, since these represent the formal 'contract' of the Institute with the learner and the information formally published by the</p>	<p>The Department will encourage student use of the module descriptors and will include relevant information in student handbooks and other documentation as appropriate. The matter will also be highlighted with all students at the</p>	

<p>Institute about each module. The alignment of codes used by the Department on programme tables in student handbooks and programme marketing literature with the formal Akari module codes would be beneficial.</p>	<p>beginning of the next Academic Year.</p>	
<p>5.11. RECOMMENDATION In the meeting with students the Panel heard that none of the 16 student representatives (from both suites of programmes) had taken out books listed in module descriptors. Only one had read a pdf version, though several said they had read other books related to particular modules. The Panel recommends that certain assignments be created that encourage an active engagement with the proscribed reading lists.</p>	<p>The Department will review student assessments to encourage active engagement with proscribed reading lists in module descriptors.</p>	
<p>6.1. RECOMMENDATION (All Modules): There was a noticeable disparity between elective modules listed in the programme documents and the actual module choices being offered to the students over the years. Furthermore, within the latter group, it appears that some modules were genuinely elective, some were offered on an alternating basis, and some were in fact quasi-mandatory core modules.</p> <p>The status of modules should be unambiguous. Furthermore, programme teams should avoid overstating the number of elective choices in the programme schedules if it is clear that most of these cannot viably delivered with given student numbers. Elective modules have clear value for student learning, yet essential content should not be in electives – for instance, no student, whether in IA or AT, should be able to complete their degree without having taken Architectural History.</p> <p>The Panel recommends that these issues be addressed and clarity provided in the programme schedules.</p>	<p>The Department will review its suite of modules in the context of mandatory and elective modules and module choice.</p>	
<p>6.2. RECOMMENDATION (All Modules): The Panel asks that the</p>	<p>The Department will review module reading lists and update as</p>	

<p>reading lists for all modules be reviewed and updated where necessary prior to final module approval, with a view also to introduction of online resources where available.</p>	<p>appropriate including the addition of online resources where available (some of which has also been undertaken as part of the module audit process).</p>	
<p>6.3. RECOMMENDATION (Environmental Design stream): The Panel suggests that delivery of the theory content in the modules within the Environmental Design stream might be streamlined to allow for inclusion of a higher proportion of practical elements.</p>	<p>The Department will continue to review the split of theory to practical element in the module.</p>	
<p>7.1. RECOMMENDATION The Panel recommends that industry and graduate surveys be created to support the next school and programme reviews.</p>	<p>The Department will undertake the relevant surveys to support future School and Programmatic Reviews.</p>	
<p>7.2. RECOMMENDATION The Review process was well managed and the Panel felt well supported. Nonetheless the time allowed for the review was very short given the number of programmes being examined, particularly as there were significant issues to be considered such as the status of the MSc programmes, the parallel delivery of the NFQ Level 7 and 8 programmes and the QQI mapping of AT.</p> <p>The Panel recommends therefore that (a) the programme documentation be provided in good time to the next Panel, and (b) also suggest that future reviews could be conducted over two full days. It could also be considered whether some sessions specific to each programme suite could be run in parallel to ensure greater time efficiency and a more even allocation of time to, in this case, Interior Architecture and Architectural Technology.</p>	<p>The Department and School will ensure that documentation will be provided to the next Panel in good time; the duration of the Programmatic Review Panel visit is a matter for Academic Council and the Institute.</p>	

2. MODULE AND PROGRAMME MODERATION

C.2.1 Completion of Programme and Module Moderation

Module moderation has been completed for all new modules in the undergraduate programme suites in Architectural Technology and Interior Architecture.

C.2.2 Additional Registrar's Office Commentary

N/a

D. APPENDIX – TIMETABLE OF PHASE 2 MEETINGS

School of Building & Civil Engineering Programmatic Review - Phase 2 Panel Visit				
Thursday, May 9th, 2019		Panel 1	Panel 2	Panel 3
		Architecture	Civil & Structural Engineering	Construction
10.00 am - 10.30	Private Panel Meeting including Presentation by the Office of the Registrar & Vice President for Academic Affairs, CIT	Council Room, 2nd Floor, Administration Building, CIT		
10.30 am - 11.00 am	School Overview & Phase 1 Requirements			
11.00 am - 11.15 am	Coffee			
11.20 am - 12.30 pm	Department Overview Presentation / Discussion	Seminar Room 1 Melbourn Building	Council Room, 2nd Floor, Administration Building	Seminar Room 2 Melbourn Building
12.30 pm - 1.00pm	Meet with Students	CIT Bistro		
1.00 pm - 2.00 pm	Private Panel Lunch			
2.00 pm - 3.30 pm	Meeting with Department Teams re Programme Operation and Performance	Seminar Room 1 Melbourn Building	Council Room, 2nd Floor, Administration Building	Seminar Room 2 Melbourn Building
3.30 pm - 3.45 pm	Private Panel Meeting (Tea/Coffee)			
3.45 pm - 5.30 pm	Meet with Department Teams re Proposed Changes to Programme Structures			
5.30 pm - 6.00 pm	Meet with Recent Graduates / Employers	Kingsley Hotel, Victoria Cross, Cork		
8pm	Panel Dinner - attendance not compulsory			
Friday, May 10th, 2019				
9.00 am - 9.15 am	Private Panel Meeting - Emerging Themes	Seminar Room 1 Melbourn Building	Seminar Room (CAMMS Seminar Room B287)	Seminar Room 2 Melbourn Building
9.15am - 11.15 am	Meet with Department Teams re General Review of Modules			
11.15 am - 11.45 am	Private Panel Meeting (Tea/Coffee)			
11.45 pm - 12.45 pm	Sub-panel meetings to draft outline Reports			
12.45 pm - 1.15 pm	Private Panel Lunch	Council Room, Admin Building		
1.15 pm - 1.45 pm	Feedback to overall Panel - Themes			
1.45pm - 2.00 pm	Feedback to School and Department Management			