



Programme Review Report

Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Quantity Surveying and Construction Economics

<i>Version of Report</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Date</i>
1	Jan Cairns	28/02/2024
2	Jan Cairns	09/04/2024

<i>Approval</i>	<i>Date</i>
Documentation for Review approved by Faculty Board	12/02/2024
Report of Programme Review Panel approved by AQAEC	Click or tap to enter a date.
New Programme Title approved by University Programmes Board (if applicable)	NA

Section A Programme Details

Title	Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Quantity Surveying and Construction Economics
NFQ Level	8
ECTS Credits	240
Mode of delivery	Part-time <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Duration	Part-time: 5 years Full-time: 4 years
Modality/ies of delivery	In-person, On-campus <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Blended <input type="checkbox"/>
	Online <input type="checkbox"/> Hyflex <input type="checkbox"/>
Classification of award	First Class Honours;
Discipline Programmes Board	NA
Faculty Board	Faculty of Engineering & Built Environment
Schools involved in delivery	School of Surveying & Construction Innovation
Delivery location	Bolton Street
Collaborative Partner (where applicable)	NA
Date of Commencement of revised programme	September 2024

Section B	Awards
------------------	---------------

Award Title	Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Quantity Surveying and Construction Economics
NFQ Level	8
Award Class	Major
ECTS Credits	240
Classification of award	First Class Honours; Second Class Honours, First Division; Second Class Honours, Second Division; Pass.

Section C - Programme Derogations (if required)
--

<i>Derogations from Assessment Regulations/Marks and Standards, requiring approval by University Programmes Board</i>

Not Applicable

University Programmes Board Approval	Date
--------------------------------------	------

Section D	Review Process
------------------	-----------------------

Date of Programme Review	Wednesday 28 February 2024
---------------------------------	----------------------------

Context for Programme Review

How was the programme review process instigated, by whom/via which process?

Review requested by the School of Surveying & Construction Innovation in order to undertake a full review of the programme and update as appropriate.

Please tick the type of programme review undertaken:

Full Programme Review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Focused Programme Review <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---

Transitional arrangements

How will changes to revised programme be implemented, i.e. to be implemented with immediate effect in the next academic year of delivery, or phased in on a year-by-year basis.

Changes to be phased in on a year-by-year basis, from September 2024.

Panel Members

Name	Role	Affiliation
Dr Geraldine Gray	Chair	School of Informatics & Cybersecurity, TU Dublin
Denise Connaughton	Internal Assessor	School of Culinary Arts & Food Technology, TU Dublin
Gervase Cunningham	External Assessor	Belfast School of Architecture & the Built Environment, Ulster University
Finbarr Dunwoody	External Assessor	Atlantic Technological University
Alan Garvin	External Assessor	John Sisk & Son, Dublin
James Lonergan	Representative of Society of Chartered Surveyors Ireland (SCSI)	Society of Chartered Surveyors Ireland
Jan Cairns	Academic Quality Advisor	Academic Affairs, TU Dublin

Schedule of Meetings

Venue	Boardroom, TU Dublin Bolton Street
09.30 hrs	Introduction of Panel to senior staff of School of Surveying and Construction Innovation, Chairperson of the Programme Committee/Programme Co-ordinator and other key staff. Presentation from School on key aspects of the programme and its review.
10.00 hrs	Private meeting of Panel to identify matters to be raised at subsequent meetings with School senior and teaching staff.
11.00 hrs	Meeting of Panel with Head of School, Head of Discipline, Programme Co-ordinator and other key staff to discuss issues including programme rationale, aims, objectives and learning outcomes, recruitment and ongoing market demand, graduate employment and employability, overall learning, teaching and assessment strategy and other programme-related issues identified by the Panel.
11.45 hrs	Panel Break
12.00 hrs	Meeting of Panel with staff teaching on the programme to discuss module syllabuses and teaching, learning and assessment methods
13.00 hrs	Meeting of the Panel with a group of current students and graduates.

13.30 hrs	Lunch
14.30 hrs	Private Meeting of the Panel to discuss its findings and commence drafting the report.

Section E Programme Evaluation

Programme Review Process		
<i>Was the programme review conducted in accordance with the Programme Review Process, i.e. were current students, graduates, employers, other appropriate stakeholders involved in the review process?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Students and graduates met the Review Panel. Documentation made available to the Panel provided evidence of external stakeholder participation.		

Governance & Management		
<i>Does the programme align with the University's Strategic Plan and the principles of the University Education Model, and relevant policies?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The Programme Proposal Form and the PSER describe this alignment.		
<i>Do the Programme Management and Quality Assurance arrangements align to TU Dublin Quality Framework processes?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment:		
<i>Has the Annual Monitoring/Academic Quality Enhancement process been used to identify issues and actions that continually enhance the programme and student learning experience?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Annual Monitoring Reports and action plans were provided.		

Student Data		
<i>On consideration of student recruitment data, is there evidence that there continues to be a market demand for the programme and that the programme remains viable?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Both the full-time and part-time programmes continue to recruit strongly.		
<i>On consideration of student engagement, performance and progression data, are students engaging with their programme and performing as expected? If not, has this been acknowledged and addressed through the programme review process?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Student engagement, performance and progression have been consistently strong.		

<i>On consideration of graduate destination data, is there evidence that students are securing employment in the field or progressing to further study in the discipline?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment: Graduates of the full-time programme are very successful in securing employment in the field and many are employed by their work placement providers. Part-time students are already in employment when taking the programme.</p>		

Awards Standards		
<i>Are the programme aims and learning outcomes clearly written using appropriate terminology?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment:</p>		
<i>Are the programme aims and learning outcomes aligned to the proposed level of the award on the NFQ in accordance with applicable Award Standards?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment:</p>		
<i>Will the curricula, teaching, learning and assessment methods enable students to reach the appropriate standard to qualify for the award(s)?</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment: See Recommendation of the Panel in relation to the balance of theory and practice within lectures/contact hours.</p>		
<i>Is ongoing programme development appropriately informed by internal and external stakeholder input (including industry/practice, professional/regulatory bodies, and community organisations)?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment: Evidence on strong engagement with SCSI and with industry.</p>		
<i>Does ongoing programme development take account of relevant external discipline benchmarks and Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment: Programme is closely aligned to SCSI requirements.</p>		

Programme Design		
<i>Is the programme design informed by current development in the discipline and associated subject areas, having taken into consideration current trends, stakeholder feedback and market analysis?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment: PSER is clear how the above has informed changes to the programme.</p>		
<i>Is there a mechanism to ensure the input of external stakeholders in the ongoing development of the programme?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment: Close relationships with industry, guest lecturers and with the SCSI ensure ongoing input into the development of the programme.</p>		

<i>Is the programme curriculum well-structured with a logical progression of learning and development across the modules and stages?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: See Panel's recommendation in relation to the scheduling of related modules.		
<i>Are there appropriate opportunities for students to undertake work-based learning, through work placements or work-based projects or assignments?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Work Placement is included in the full-time programme. In the part-time programme, students are employed in the industry and undertake 10 ECTS of work-based learning in each year.		
<i>Are work/practice placements appropriate and fit for purpose, having regard to the requirements of professional, regulatory, and associative bodies where applicable, in the context of student achievement of learning outcomes and in the overall student experience?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment:		
<i>If applicable, have the relevant Blended Learning Checklists (i.e. Learning Experience Context & Programme Context) been fully completed and submitted to the Panel?</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: NA		
<i>Is the required programme and module information provided in the correct format?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment:		

Learning, Teaching & Assessment		
<i>Is there an effective student-centred learning and teaching strategy that aligns with the University's strategies and guidelines in this regard?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: See Panel's recommendation regarding the scheduling of related modules.		
<i>Does the assessment strategy provide an appropriate mix of assessment types that will enable students to demonstrate that they have met the module and programme learning outcomes?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: See Panel's recommendation regarding a small number of modules where the assessment is 100% Examination.		
<i>Do the learning outcomes and assessment strategy ensure that academic integrity can be maintained and attempted breaches of academic integrity are minimised/easily detected?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: This matter was discussed with the Panel as to how this is addressed in the assessment strategy.		
<i>Is there a comprehensive mapping of assessment methods and module learning outcomes and between module learning outcomes and programme learning outcomes?</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: See Condition of Panel regarding the mapping of Programme Learning Outcomes and Module Learning Outcomes.		

<i>Are there opportunities in all modules to provide students with timely and constructive feedback on their learning and development?</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: See Condition of Panel regarding the provision of an assessment schedule.		
<i>Do the teaching and assessment methods consider the diversity of the student cohort?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: See Recommendation regarding the assessment workload for part-time students.		

Student Supports & Learning Environment		
<i>Are there sufficient and appropriate resources (e.g. human, financial and physical) to support the proposed programme aims and objectives, to deliver the programme as specified?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: See Recommendation of Panel regarding the need for more teaching staff and physical space to facilitate an increase in student numbers.		
<i>Are there sufficient staff that are appropriately qualified and capable to support the programme delivery?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: See Recommendation of Panel as referred to above.		
<i>Are there appropriate arrangements in place to support the student experience and to monitor student performance?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment:		
<i>Are the access, transfer and progression arrangements including RPL clearly defined and appropriate, and aligned to TU Dublin policy/strategy in this regard?</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: See Recommendation of the Panel regarding consideration of Exit awards.		
<i>Do the student supports and learning environment cater for equality, diversity and inclusivity of students?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: This was addressed in the PSER.		
<i>Is the relevant programme information clearly communicated to the students to ensure they are informed, guided and cared for?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment:		

Section F	Overall Recommendation of the Panel
-----------	-------------------------------------

1.	Recommend continuing approval of programme as submitted, without amendment	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Recommend continuing approval of programme, subject to minor amendments/editorial changes to be completed as soon as possible and with recommendations for consideration. Note: recommendations are attached where it is considered that the programme would benefit from particular changes, or from a review of certain aspects of the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	programme over a period of time, with changes made if required. While recommendations are advisory in nature, there is an expectation that all recommendations are responded to appropriately and acted upon as appropriate.	
3.	<p>Recommend continuing approval of programme subject to the fulfilment of conditions. Recommendations for consideration may also be attached.</p> <p>Note: conditions are attached where it is agreed that changes must be made to the programme / programme documentation prior to the commencement of the programme. Conditions must be set where issues are identified that relate directly to academic standards or to University regulations or procedures. It should be clear what is required in order to meet the conditions.</p> <p>A new programme cannot go forward to Faculty Board for consideration unless a response to the Review Report is submitted with revised programme documentation.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.	Do not recommend continuing approval of programme.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Areas for commendation	
	Strong relationships with industry including guest lecturer input to the programme.
	Close alignment of the programme with Society of Chartered Surveyors Ireland (SCSI) requirements.
	Strong reputation of the programme within industry and highly regarded and sought after graduates.
	High student progression and performance rates.
	Good relationship and communication between students and staff.

Conditions of Approval	
1.	<p>It is noted that a mapping of Programme Learning Outcomes to Modules had not been submitted. While the Panel has no concerns in relation to this alignment, it considers that this mapping should be completed within the Programme & Module Catalogue (PMC) when the Akari system can accommodate this.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> <i>The Programme Team undertake to complete this mapping exercise within the Programme & Module Catalogue once the functionality exists within AKARI.</i></p>
2.	<p>An Assessment Schedule should be provided to the Panel. This schedule should also indicate when feedback is made available to students, so that it might inform future assessments.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> <i>The 2023/24 Coursework Schedule can be accessed within the shared folder. In line with TU Dublin's General Assessment Regulations, timely feedback is provided on all assessments in order that students can identify sections that have been completed satisfactorily and clearly know which sections require further study.</i></p>

Recommendations	
1.	<p>The Panel acknowledges that there is a significant demand for places on both full-time and part-time programmes, but it notes that an increase in recruitment is restricted by current staffing levels and the physical space available to the programme. Both of these issues would need to be addressed prior to any growth in student numbers.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> <i>Noted.</i></p>
2.	<p>The Law content within the programme should be reviewed to ensure that it relates specifically to Quantity Surveying, focusing on contract administration and application.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> <i>The Programme Team considered the programme review panel event and subsequent report. Law content within the programme was reviewed and evaluated, as was the Panel's considered opinion in respect to information technology. Following discussion, it was agreed to remove Construction Law 2 from the programme and replace it with an Information Technology module (attached). This module currently exists within the School of Business Technology, Retail & Supply Chain and, as such, afford us the opportunity to introduce an existing TU Dublin module in line with the UEM.</i></p>
3.	<p>The Panel commends the progression of module content throughout the programme. It recommends that, where possible, modules that are related to each other be scheduled within the same year to reduce a time gap between these modules.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> <i>This has been considered and actioned by the Programme Team. As recommended and where possible, modules that are related to each other have been scheduled within the same year to reduce the time gap between same. The Updated programme overview documents can be accessed within the shared folder.</i></p>
4.	<p>It emerged during discussions with staff that topics such as Project Controls, Life Cycle Costing and Analysis, sustainability, measurement of embedded carbon, ethics and soft skills, run through relevant modules within the programme, informed by staff research in these areas. The Panel recommends that this should be made more explicit within the module descriptors to demonstrate the integration of these topics.</p> <p><i>Response:</i> <i>This has been considered and actioned by the Programme Team.</i></p>
5.	<p>It should be evident within the module descriptors that Excel is used throughout the programme, and not just in the Information Technology module.</p>

	<p><i>Response:</i> Where appropriate, this has been actioned by the Programme Team.</p>
6.	<p>Two-hour lecture sessions should be reviewed to include practical applications to optimise a balance of theory and practice.</p>
	<p><i>Response:</i> Noted.</p>
7.	<p>The Panel recommends that a component of continuous assessment be introduced to modules where there is currently only a final examination, so that feedback to students on their performance may inform future assessments.</p>
	<p><i>Response:</i> This has been addressed for Construction Studies 3 (amended to 40% CA 60% Exam). It occurs for 2 other modules (Economics 1A and 1B) which are shared with the School of Real Estate. Whilst a split assessment model is preferable, the Programme Team notes that the utilisation of an existing module in line with the UEM is also a satisfactory approach.</p>
8.	<p>The Panel notes that issues have been encountered over the use of CostX and Cubit software (iTwo CostX and Buildsoft Cubit). The Panel recommends that students be given some experience of these softwares to comply with industry requirements. It suggests that the submission of student assignment / project reports are converted to PDF with the digital file attached as a supplement submission, which may resolve any issues.</p>
	<p><i>Response:</i> Noted. The students will be introduced to multiple software programmes throughout their programme of study.</p>
9.	<p>The scheduling of assessments for students on the part-time programme should be considered to ensure that these students have sufficient time for the completion of assessment and preparation for examinations.</p>
	<p><i>Response:</i> Noted. See coursework schedule within the shared folder.</p>
10.	<p>The Panel notes that it is not intended to make exit awards available to students who do not complete the programme. It recommends that it revisit this matter in the future.</p>
	<p><i>Response:</i> Noted.</p>

Other matters to be brought to the attention of Faculty Board and/or Academic Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee
--

The Panel is pleased to note that the SCSi Director of Education James Lonergan has reported his intention to recommend continuing SCSi accreditation of the programme, with the submission of the Panel's report through the SCSi committee structure.

Section G Approvals

Review Report

This Review Report has been agreed by the Review Panel and is signed on its behalf by the Panel Chair.

Signature:

Geraldine Gray

Date: 11th March 2024

School Response

The response to the conditions and recommendations has been agreed by the School and is signed by the Head of School.

Head of School: Dr Mark Mulville

Signed: *Mark Mulville*

Date: 29/04/2024

Academic Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee

The report and response have been approved by the Academic Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee

Head of Academic Affairs:

Signed:

Date: Click or tap to enter a date.