

Master of Engineering in Mechanical Engineering and in Chemical & Biopharmaceutical Engineering

A Review Panel was convened in respect of three related M Eng proposals on May 31st 2010. The outcome of that panel was a recommendation that the M Eng in Structural Engineering was recommended for validation.

Two further proposals were referred back for further work by the proposers. In these cases the finding of the panel was that the core specialisms, Mechanical Engineering and Chemical Engineering respectively needed to be strengthened and given more prominence.

Since then, the proposing teams have worked to meet the recommendations set out by the panel, and have now presented their revised programmes. They state:

“Both programmes have been redesigned from a “zero-base” to reflect both panel comments and graduate inputs. Concerns about the technical level of both programmes have been addressed. The panel expressed concern about the technical level and content of some modules which had been included in the previous proposal. The complete redesign of the two programmes ensures that these concerns have been addressed in full. The panel also recommended that that the relevance and attractiveness of both programmes be assured, and that an appropriate level of discipline-specific material be included in both cases. We feel that that this recommendation has been addressed by the rigorous redesign of both proposals and through consultation with graduates”.

The Registrar’s Office conducted a basic quality review of the revised proposals and is satisfied that considerable progress has indeed been made towards addressing the core requirement of the panel for more discipline-specific masters-level material. Industry surveys have been undertaken to guide this process. It is also evident to us that there are still important QA issues to be finalised, for example,

- assessment spread and load
- verifying that there is no repetition of material from the level 8 underpinning degrees in terms of content and level
- whether the ‘Research Project Preparation’ module is correctly labelled at 10 credits.

The members of the Panel were invited to give feedback on the revised documentation. They were also asked to indicate which one of the following three options should be favoured

A – The programme is **still** in need of major further work, and may need to be re-presented to a reconvened Panel in the autumn. [This is a decision not to validate for an intake in Autumn 2011]

Or

B – The programme meets the primary requirements set by the review panel; the further QA work can be entrusted to the CIT Registrar’s Office for completion before commencement. [This is a conditional decision to validate. It would allow an intake in Autumn 2011 subject to CIT Registrar’s Office verifying that the Panel’s remaining recommendations are addressed].

Or

C – The programme is very substantially complete and satisfactory.

All the Panel members who replied (four from five, including the Chairperson and all the academic members) have favoured option B.

Accordingly, Academic Council Executive on June 20th 2011 approved validation of the programme, with further QA work to be completed before commencement.

Ed Riordan
Deputy Registrar & Head of Academic Quality