



## Programme Review Report

### Bachelor of Architecture (Honours)

<i>Version of Report</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Date</i>
1	Jan Cairns	31/03/2025
2		07/04/2025

<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 Architecture (Honours)
NFQ Level	8
ECTS Credits	300
Mode of delivery	Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Duration	Part-time: Full-time: 5 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; Second Class Honours, First Division; Second Class Honours, Second Division; Pass
Discipline Programmes Board	NA
Faculty Board	Faculty of Engineering & Built Environment
Schools involved in delivery	School of Architecture, Building and Environment
Delivery location	Bolton Street, Linenhall

Collaborative Partner (where applicable)	NA
Date of Commencement of revised programme	September 2025

## Section B Awards

Award Title	Bachelor of Architecture (Honours)
NFQ Level	8
Award Class	Major
ECTS Credits	300
Classification of award	First Class Honours; Second Class Honours, First Division; Second Class Honours, Second Division; Pass.
Award (2) Title	Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Architecture
Exit/Embedded	Exit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Embedded <input type="checkbox"/>
NFQ Level	8
Award Class	Major
ECTS Credits	240 ECTS
Classification of award	First Class Honours; Second Class Honours, First Division; Second Class Honours, Second Division; Pass.
Award (3)	Bachelor of Science (Honours) in Architectural Studies
Exit/Embedded	Exit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Embedded <input type="checkbox"/>
NFQ Level	8
Award Class	Major
ECTS Credits	180 ECTS
Classification of award	Award is unclassified.

## Section C - Programme Derogations (if required)

*Derogations from Assessment Regulations/Marks and Standards, requiring approval by University Programmes Board (where applicable)*

As the BArch (Hons) is a Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland (RIAI) Regulated programme, the following applies:  
There shall be no compensation between modules to allow failed modules (35-39%, D grade) to be passed.

University Programmes Board Approval

Date

<b>Section D</b>	<b>Review Process</b>
------------------	-----------------------

<b>Date of Programme Review</b>	Monday 31 March 2025
---------------------------------	----------------------

<b>Context for Programme Review</b>
-------------------------------------

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

The review was requested by the School of Architecture, Building and Environment in order to review and revise the programme, taking on board initiatives and developments from the School's involvement in the HCI Pillar III funded <i>Building Change</i> project, proposed changes to the QQI Standard for Architecture and the RIAI Standard for Knowledge Skill and Competence for Practising as an Architect, and TU Dublin developments including the University Education Model, Graduate Attributes, policies and regulations.
--

Please tick the type of programme review undertaken:

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

<b>Transitional arrangements</b>
----------------------------------

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 considered and approved by the Review Panel are to be implemented with immediate effect in September 2025.
--

**Panel Members**

Name	Role	Affiliation
Dr Jan Guerin (Chair)	Panel Chair	Head of Discipline, Medical Sciences, School of Biological Sciences, Sports, TU Dublin
Louise Reddy	Internal Panel Member	School of Art and Design, TU Dublin
Professor Lorraine Farrelly	External Panel Member	Head of Architecture, University of York, UK
Dr John McLaughlin	External Panel Member	Cork Centre of Architectural Education, University College Cork
David Petherbridge	External Panel Member	Managing Director, RKD Architects, Dublin
Jan Cairns	Academic Quality Advisor	Academic Affairs, TU Dublin

**Schedule of Meetings**

Venue	Room 207, TU Dublin Linenhall
09.15 hrs	Introduction of Panel to senior staff of School of Architecture, Building and Environment, including Head of School, Head of Discipline, Programme Co-ordinator and other key staff. Presentation from School on key aspects of the programme and its review.
09.45 hrs	Private meeting of Panel to identify matters to be raised at subsequent meetings with School senior and teaching staff.
10.45 hrs	Meeting of Panel with the Head of Discipline, Programme Co-ordinator and other key staff to discuss issues including programme rationale, aims, objectives and learning outcomes, resources, recruitment and ongoing market demand, graduate employment and employability, overall learning, teaching and assessment strategy and other programme-related issues identified by the Panel.
12.00 hrs	Panel Break
12.15 hrs	Meeting of Panel with staff teaching on the programme to discuss module syllabuses and teaching, learning and assessment methods
13.15 hrs	Meeting of Panel with a group of current students and graduates of the programme.
14.15 hrs	Lunch for Panel
15.15 hrs	Private Meeting of the Panel to discuss its findings and commence drafting the report.
16.15 hrs	Verbal Presentation of draft summary findings to Head of Discipline, Programme Co-ordinator and members of the Programme Team.

<b>Section E</b>	<b>Programme Evaluation</b>
------------------	-----------------------------

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 ✓	No □
Comment: The input of external stakeholders and students to the review of the programme was noted.		

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"/>
<p>Comment:</p> <p>This alignment was addressed within the Programme Self Evaluation Report and within the programme documentation. The Architecture Discipline Action Plan 2025-28 states that it will "ensure that the UN SDGs, climate action and environmental stewardship are foregrounded in our curriculum at all stages". The Panel considers that this programme is at the forefront of sustainability and climate action, both within TU Dublin and other Architecture programmes nationally.</p>		
<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"/>
<p>Comment:</p> <p>The Panel received annual monitoring reports and external examiner reports for the programme.</p>		
<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"/>
<p>Comment:</p> <p>These reports were provided. The Panel notes that issues relating to physical resources were raised within these reports but not yet actioned by the University.</p>		

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"/>
<p>Comment:</p> <p>This programme recruits very strongly and has scope to increase its intake, but only when the serious resourcing concerns are fully addressed. Please see the Condition of the Panel in respect of the need to restrict student intake to a maximum of 70, due to concerns regarding the physical learning environment.</p>		
<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"/>
<p>Comment:</p> <p>Student performance and progression rates are strong. Students engage very strongly, particularly through the Studio component of the programme.</p>		
<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:</p> <p>Graduates of the programme are successful in finding work as architects. A high proportion of graduates return within two to three years to complete the required Professional Practice Examination on the Professional Diploma in Architectural Practice. It is noted also</p>		

that over time graduates are choosing to take up more diverse roles in industry, choosing to work for developers, contractors, multidisciplinary design consultancies, public agencies as well as traditional practices of all scales.

Awards Standards		
<i>Are the programme aims and learning outcomes clearly written using appropriate terminology?</i>	Yes ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment:		
<i>Are the programme aims and learning outcomes aligned to the proposed level of the award on the NQF in accordance with applicable Award Standards?</i>	Yes ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment:		
<i>Will the curricula, teaching, learning and assessment methods enable students to reach the appropriate standard to qualify for the award?</i>	Yes ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment:		
<i>Is ongoing programme development appropriately informed by internal and external stakeholder input (including industry/practice, professional/regulatory bodies, and community organisations)?</i>	Yes ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: There is strong engagement with the student body through the standard University channels and also through the <i>Building Change</i> project where a team of Student Curators was created leading to a proposal for the establishment of a Student Council, which is to be formalised in 2025-26. Engagement with industry/practice and with the RIAI is strong, with members of staff also being active in the RIAI and other architecture bodies.		
<i>Does ongoing programme development take account of relevant external discipline benchmarks and Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements?</i>	Yes ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The programme is aligned to RIAI requirements.		

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:</p> <p>There is strong evidence of this within the programme and modules. The Panel particularly notes the impact of the <i>Building Change</i> project, led by TU Dublin.</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:</p> <p>There is regular engagement with industry and the RIAI. The programme's External Examiners have an ongoing input into programme development as evidenced through their reports.</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"/>
<p>Comment:</p> <p>See Commendations of the Panel in respect of first year studio and the Vertical Studios of years two and three.</p>		
<i>Are there appropriate opportunities for students to undertake work-based learning, through work placements or work-based projects or assignments?</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment:</p> <p>It has not been possible to achieve curricular compliance with the RIAI Education Policy and the Standard for Education as an Architect and also include a work placement semester. However, the Programme Team strongly recommends to students to take time out between years three and four in order to gain relevant work experience and the majority of students do so. Please see the Recommendation of the Panel in this regard.</p>		
<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 type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>		
<i>If applicable, have the relevant Blended Learning Checklists (i.e. Learning Experience Context &amp; Programme Context) been fully completed and submitted to the Panel?</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comment:</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>		
<i>Is the required programme and module information provided in the correct format?</i>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

## Comment:

The Programme Self Evaluation Report was completed and programme and module information was downloaded from the Programme and Module Catalogue. A Student Handbook was provided.

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 ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: This was evident in the documentation and through Panel discussions with the Programme Team.		
<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 ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Most modules in the programme are continuously assessed. Studio-based modules incorporate staged project presentations called reviews or crits (individual and group) as well as final portfolio submission. Evaluation strategies in all studio modules are founded on principles of authentic assessment and they aim to encourage critical self-reflection. Lectures based modules incorporate a range of assessment approaches but are also typically continuous, with reports, assignments and in class MCQs or quizzes.		
<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 ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The focus on studio work and the emphasis on authentic assessments, along with the variety of other assessment methods, minimise the risk of breaches of academic integrity.		
<i>Is there a comprehensive mapping of assessment methods and module learning outcomes and between module learning outcomes and programme learning outcomes?</i>	Yes ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: This mapping was provided to the Panel.		
<i>Are there opportunities in all modules to provide students with timely and constructive feedback on their learning and development?</i>	Yes ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Please see Recommendation of the Panel in respect of transparency in assessment and feedback.		
<i>Do the teaching and assessment methods consider the diversity of the student cohort?</i>	Yes ✓	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The variety of learning and teaching methods employed include individual desk tutorials, seminar teaching, directed and self-directed group projects, presentations, site and building visits, walking tours and guest lectures. The Vertical Structure employed in years		

two and three, is premised on vertical peer learning between students at different stages and each of the modules within the structure prioritises different forms of teaching.

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 type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comment: The Panel has significant concerns in this regard. See below 'Other matters to be brought to the attention of Faculty Board and/or Academic Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee'.		
<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: The Panel notes that current staffing arrangements are just adequate for the delivery of the programme. The use of HPALs who are practitioners is seen as a valuable aspect of programme delivery. Please see Recommendation of the Panel in respect of approved Assistant Lecturer appointments.		
<i>Are there appropriate arrangements in place to support the student experience and to monitor student performance?</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Please see Recommendations of the Panel in respect of transparency of assessment and feedback and on the support of students in their transition to third-level education.		
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment:		
<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: Equitable, inclusive access to architectural education is a key value underpinning the recruitment process of the programme, and the Programme Team's strategies to foster and support equality and diversity are described within the documentation. It is a stated aim to create an environment in which potential students from all cultural and socio-economic backgrounds can see a future for themselves in the broad profession and discipline of architecture.		
<i>Is the relevant programme information clearly communicated to the students to ensure they are informed, guided and cared for?</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comment: Please see Recommendation of the Panel in respect of guidance to students on pastoral case matters.		

<b>Section F</b>	<b>Overall Recommendation of the Panel</b>
------------------	--

1.	<b>Recommend continuing approval of programme as submitted, without amendment</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	<b>Recommend continuing approval of programme, subject to minor amendments/editorial changes to be completed as soon as possible and with recommendations for consideration.</b>  <b>Note:</b> recommendations are attached where it is considered that the programme would benefit from particular changes, or from a review of certain aspects of the 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	<b>Recommend continuing approval of programme subject to the fulfilment of conditions. Recommendations for consideration may also be attached.</b>  <b>Note:</b> 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.  A new programme cannot go forward to Faculty Board for consideration unless a response to the Review Report is submitted with revised programme documentation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.	<b>Do not recommend continuing approval of programme.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Areas for commendation	
1.	The Panel recognises that the BArch (Hons) is flagship programme for TU Dublin with a strong reputation, producing graduates of choice within industry.
2.	The Panel acknowledges the committed and dedicated academic staff who constitute the Programme Team, whose passion for architectural education was evident during discussions with the Panel.
3.	The Panel commends the Programme Team's leadership of the <i>Building Change</i> project, the curriculum partnership with academy and profession (HCI Pillar III-funded project), and it welcomes plans to continue the excellent initiatives emerging from this work.
4.	The introduction of the Vertical Studio structure in years two and three of the programme has offered great potential to students to explore particular themes in some depth, enabling them to develop particular interests in their Studio work in years four and five.
5.	The First Year Studio work establishes a strong foundation in year one that supports students' development and progression in later years of the programme.

6.	The alignment with TU Dublin's strategic pillars, the University Education Model and Graduate Attributes is evident within the programme.
----	---

### Conditions of Approval

1.	<p>The Panel supports the outcome of the RIAI 2023 accreditation that the first-year intake to the programme should be restricted to a maximum of 70 and agrees that this needs to be enforced, given the Panel's and the RIAI's stated concerns relating to the physical learning environment for the programme.</p> <p>The limit of 70 students is for the present circumstances in the School with regard to staffing and available space. There is considerable demand for places on this programme and if space and staffing resources are increased then the limit can be increased accordingly.</p> <p>Response: We appreciate the panel's recognition of the challenges of sustaining our teaching standards in our current location with a continued high number of incoming students. We sought assurance from the TU Dublin Admissions Office that the intake of September 2025 would not exceed this number and their response is below.</p> <p>"The Admissions Office notes the panel's condition of approval regarding first year intake. The demand for, and application numbers to, TU832 have increased year-on-year each year since 2020. The application numbers in 2024 were 449 with 159 First Preferences, as compared to 320/114 in 2020. This demonstrates significant growth over a short period of time. The Admissions office is currently reviewing and redeveloping its offer/acceptance predictive modeler, with a view to increasing the accuracy of projected acceptance rates. This review/redevelopment is scheduled to be completed and implemented in time for the 2025 CAO offers season, and the Admissions Office is confident that the stated limit of 70 is an achievable target."</p>
2.	<p>Programme Learning Outcomes should be provided in the documentation for the awards available to those students who exit the programme at the end of years three or four.</p> <p>Response: See attached document with proposed Learning Outcomes for Year 3 and Year 4 Exit Awards. On approval these will be incorporated into the TU832 Programme Document. Please note that the programme learning outcomes are informed by the current QQI Standard for Architecture and the RIAI Standard of Knowledge Skill and Competence for practice as an architect. The new combined Education Standard for Architecture will be published by the RIAI in September and will combine both of the existing documents. The HoD and members of the programme team have been involved in the development of this new standard and will review our programme learning outcomes in 2025/26 to ensure continued consistency and alignment.</p>

### Recommendations

1.	The Panel strongly recommends that the programme is relocated to appropriate accommodation at the first opportunity. This accommodation should have adequate space, facilities and suitable IT infrastructure and equipment, in line with other similar professional programmes nationally.
	Response: The Discipline and School welcome the recommendation of the panel in this regard and agrees that the provision of appropriate accommodation should be a high priority. There is proposal in place to relocate the studio based disciplines in SABE to alternative accommodation for September 2026. However final decisions on space allocation are made by the University Executive and Campus Planning teams.
2.	The Panel recommends that consideration be given to increasing staff resources in light of the end of the <i>Building Change</i> project and associated funding. The Panel strongly supports the recruitment of the two Assistant Lecturers positions that have been approved, as part of the University process for the prioritisation of posts.
	Response: The Discipline and School welcome the recommendation of the panel in this regard and agrees that the provision of appropriate resources to a programme and discipline with high and growing student numbers should be prioritised. Since the Review process, one of the approved posts has moved to interview stage and we are hopeful that the other post will shortly be re-approved. This is however subject to University resource allocation decisions in the context of Financial Recovery process.
3.	The Panel welcomes the establishment of the small model-making workshop for the programme in Linenhall. It strongly recommends that this workshop should be supported by appropriate technical support.
	Response: The Discipline and School welcome the recommendation of the panel in this regard and will endeavour to ensure the continued development of the workshop as a resource for architecture students. Since the Review process, a technical post to support the studios and workshop in SABE has been approved and will be progressing to recruitment in June 2025.
4.	The Panel is of the view that work experience is vital for architecture students, however, it understands the restrictions on the introduction of a structured work placement within the programme. The Programme Team should consider how it might support students to undertake work experience following either third or fourth year of the programme. For example, it would recommend that the School facilitate introductions between students and employers to assist students in securing placements
	Response: The discussions around this issue during the Panel visit were valuable to the programme team and we welcome this recommendation. We commit to formalising and strengthening our processes for preparing our Year 3 and 4 students for a year out. This will involve the creation of a working group tasked with establishing an event or process by which students might be introduced to

	practice networks as well as providing them with the practical advice necessary . We already have a strong connection with the TU Dublin Career Planning service and will continue to develop that.
5.	<p>The Panel recommends that the Programme Team address the issue of student assessment workload through the use of a live assessment calendar that is actively managed by the Team.</p> <p>Response: This is a welcome suggestions and the Programme Chair and team commit to ensuring that a live online assessment schedule will be in place for September 2025. Currently a coordinated assignment schedule is prepared at the start of each academic semester but this is not agile or responsive enough to deal with changes that may occur during the teaching period.</p>
6.	<p>The Panel recommends that the Programme Team enhance the transparency of the assessment process through the use of rubrics. Such rubrics would support the delivery of timely and constructive feedback to students on their performance effectively, by indicating how and where their performance can be enhanced.</p> <p>Response: The new Programme Document and Programme Assessment Regulations set the foundation for the continued implementation of assessment rubrics across the programme. This will require the engagement and commitment of the programme team to the implementation of consistent rubrics across the stages and in particular the design studio modules but we agree with the Review Panel that this will support constructive performance based feedback to the students.</p>
7.	<p>The Panel welcomes the Programme Team's intention to continue to develop and implement some of the initiatives from the <i>Building Change</i> HCI funded project. In particular, the Panel considers that the digital literacy of students should continue to be enhanced, while noting that the IT infrastructure needs to be addressed to support this. The development of a digital pathway for students through the programme would support the delivery of TU Dublin Graduate Attributes.</p> <p>Response: There are two aspects to this challenge, one is the physical digital infrastructure available to the school and discipline – this needs to be enhanced and will require investment by the university. We have managed to procure through Building Change new equipment and tools to address an immediate deficit but this will need to be built upon. The second is a digital curriculum, which is under way and will be embedded in the programme over the next 2 to 3 years. We have already made changes to our programme structure as part of this review process to embed a digital pathway in existing and new modules, and will continue to monitor and develop this.</p>
8.	In relation to the recommendation above, the Panel recommends that the School explore opportunities for industry sponsorship for the provision of high-spec

	computers and other digital resources to support the development of Graduate Attributes.
	Response: As noted above we have, through Building Change been able to procure a small number of high spec PCs, 3d printers, AR/VR equipment and other digital resources to develop a Digital Laboratory, but this will need to be added to over the coming years in order to build our digital capacity. We welcome the suggestion by the panel to engage with industry for sponsorship and will develop a Business Case with the School Executive and TU832 programme team members for the implementation of this.
9.	The Programme Team should consider how to continue to harness the goodwill of industry and alumni, through the provision of guest lectures, workshops and other learning opportunities for students, as well as the creation of a network of potential providers of work experience.
	Response: We are grateful for the strong support and goodwill that we already have from our practice and industry networks and will continue to nurture these relationships. The school and discipline have benefited strongly from the contribution of members of this network, including alumni, in delivering lectures, facilitating site visits and offering work experience placements. It may however be beneficial now to put more formal structures in place to allow for these relationships to be cultivated and developed further for the benefit of our students. We will seek to develop a strategy for this in line with Recommendation 4 above, over the coming academic year.
10.	The Panel notes and commends the buddy system that is in place for first year students. It recommends that the Programme Team give further consideration as to how to assist first year students in their transition from secondary education to becoming independent learners and thinkers.
	Response: The programme team and in particular the first year teaching team are developing a new Induction and Orientation programme for our incoming students in September 2025 to introduce them to the university, the school and programme as well as establishing from the outset the diversity of pathways through their education in architecture. This will build on the TU Dublin Framework for first year success, the Building Change curriculum change work and our commitment to strengthening student agency and voice in the school.
11.	The Year Head role in relation to Year Tutor responsibilities around pastoral care should be clarified and students should be reminded regularly throughout the programme where they should go for such pastoral care and advice.
	Response: The Year Tutor roles and responsibilities are clearly outlined in the university Quality Framework. It has been practice in the architecture discipline for Year Tutor roles to be assigned to the studio module coordinators and over time, this has led to an imbalance of attention to other aspects of the role including pastoral duties. The role and associated responsibilities will be clearly

	communicated to students and staff at the outset of the next semester. The new Student Handbook clearly describes the school and university support structures that students can avail of. This will be presented to all students in September 2025.
--	--

12.	The Programme Team should review modules to ensure that the ECTS, student learning hours expected and assessment workload are aligned, specifically in relation to 5 ECTS modules.
	Response: The programme team reviews all modules through our annual quality enhancement process to ensure that assessments and workloads are commensurate with the ECTS assigned. However it has been noted by the HoD, Programme Chair, students and some staff that the on the ground delivery (including changes to assessment) and expectations communicated in certain modules leads to disproportionate workload. The introduction of a live and regularly updated assessment schedule as noted in Point 5 above will assist with managing this more locally for the benefit of the students.

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

The Panel has significant concerns regarding the poor quality and standard of physical teaching and learning environment for the programme, in terms of the adequacy of studio space including health and safety compliance, access to workshops, the IT infrastructure including high-spec PCs, wifi issues, software licences, as well as issues around the basic upkeep of the Linenhall building and health and safety concerns such as access to drinking water. The Panel's concerns reflect those of other external stakeholders including the RIAI. It considers that the space and facilities available to the programme compare unfavourably with other Architecture schools, both nationally and internationally.

The Panel's Condition of continuing approval regarding a restriction to the student intake relates to this concern, while at the same time the Panel notes that high demand for the programme and uptake of offers demonstrates that there is potential to increase student numbers significantly. The Panel is aware that these matters have been raised within the University but it asks that AQAEC also forward these concerns through the appropriate routes within the University, so that these matters are addressed and the programme is supported in maintaining its strong national profile and reputation.


#### 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.

Signed: 	Date:  14/04/2025
---	-------------------------

##### School Response

The response to the conditions and recommendations has been agreed by the School and is signed by the Head of School.	
Signed: 	Date: 30/05/2005

<b>Faculty Board</b>	
The report and response have been approved by Faculty Board	
Head of Teaching and Learning:	
Signed:	Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

<b>Academic Quality Assurance &amp; Enhancement Committee</b>	
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.