

STAGE 2 PROGRAMME APPROVAL REPORT

Programmes:

MSc Temporary Works and Construction Engineering

Programme Approval and Review Committee:

School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering

Presented by:

Dr Sarah Stallebrass

Committee:

Professor Abdalnaser Sayma (Chair, School of Mathematics,
Computer Science and Engineering)

Martin Rich (Cass Business School)

Professor Andy Boon (City Law School)

Dr Rachael-Anne Knight (School of Health Sciences)

Neal Sumner (LEaD)

Umar Chaudhery (Vice-President (Education), Students' Union)

Laura Tull (Secretary, Student and Academic Services)

Decision:

Approved with
conditions

Date: 13th April 2016

Stage 2 documents and authorisations:

Stage 2 Approval Form

Programme and module specifications

Draft programme handbook

Report from External Advisor

Proposed implementation date: September 2016

External Contributions to the Programme Approval Process

External contribution to the process had been provided by Dr Kevin Stone, Principal Lecturer in Geotechnics, University of Brighton. This expertise, combined with that of the University members, provided a full and robust Committee to consider the range of matters to be addressed through the Programme Approval process.

Student contribution to the Programme Approval Process

The Students' Union Vice-President (Education) is a standing member of the University Programme Approval Committee in order to ensure that student views are considered appropriately and was in attendance to review the proposal.

Conflict of interest

No conflicts of interest were declared.

Outcome of Committee discussion:

The Committee agreed the following commendation and conditions:

Commendation:

1. The Committee commended the programme team on the standard of the programme specification, in particular the learning outcomes.

Conditions:

1. To review all module specifications in liaison with the School LEaD representative to:
 - Ensure that that learning outcomes are measurable;
 - Clarify the assessment methods for each module to ensure transparency for students.
2. To provide further clarity on the Dissertation module, in particular:
 - Employer involvement in providing a project, and the implications if this does not happen;
 - Revise the number of contact hours and ensure that this is accurately reflected in student facing documentation.
3. To articulate within the programme specification that there are no formal progression points for this award.

**Deadline for the programme response to the conditions, with full supporting documentation:
Friday 27th May 2016.**

In addition to the above, some areas for enhancement within specification documents and some errors and inconsistencies within the Stage 2 submission were identified. Details would be shared with the Programme team to enable them to be addressed within the final version of the documentation.

Summary of discussion:**1. The Programme**

The MSc Temporary Works and Construction Engineering would be run by the School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering. Existing training in this area had previously been in the form of short courses with no dedicated higher education programmes within this area.

The Temporary Works forum had recently established the Temporary Works Forum Centre of

Excellence in Temporary Works and Construction Method Engineering at City University London. The Centre of Excellence proposed to establish formal education in this specialist area that can be delivered by experts in the field.

The Committee was positive about the proposal, but remained unclear as to why modules were not being offered as CPD. The programme team responded that the MSc was a desirable qualification in a specialist area that industry professionals felt had not been properly addressed. It was noted by the programme team that a market for taking individual modules may develop in the future, but currently the programme would primarily be aimed at people in industry who have experience but would like a qualification to formalise career progression.

2. Programme Content

The Committee noted from the proposal that the content and structure of the programme had been revised since Stage 1. The balance of the programme had been changed as a result of feedback from the Temporary Works forum to reflect a greater emphasis on structural and geotechnical engineering for temporary works. Consequently, two modules had been added (Temporary Works Structures 2 and Groundwater Control). In addition to this, the shift to 15 credit modules meant that the proposed programme would be consistent with the University Credit Framework and would facilitate the potential sharing of modules with other courses in the future.

3. Learning, Teaching and Assessment

The Committee agreed that there was some ambiguity in relation to assessments within the module specifications. For example, some inconsistencies with modules specifying a word count for the report. The programme team responded that the 'report' would vary between modules and would not necessarily be a written report. Whilst it was acknowledged that not all assessments would require a specific word count, the Committee agreed that further detail on the nature of each assessment should be provided to ensure clarity for students.

The programme team further articulated the nature of some of the assessments, and how they measured Learning Outcomes which referred to showing an 'understanding' of a topic. For example, it was noted that for the *Introduction to Temporary Works* module (*EPM612*) examinations would be scenario based. The Committee agreed that the Learning Outcomes should be revised in liaison with LEaD to ensure that they are measurable and representative of the interesting assessment strategy on the programme.

The Committee requested some further information on the Dissertation module, and how this would work in practice. The Committee noted that having a project provided by an industry specialist sounded like an exciting opportunity, but agreed that the employer's involvement should be articulated as well as the implications if this does not happen. The Committee also queried the number of contact hours for the Dissertation module, and how the 50 hours would be broken down. The programme team agreed that this would be revised for accuracy and reflected in the student facing documentation

The Committee discussed compensation and queried it's appropriateness for this programme. The Programme team responded that this was in line with other postgraduate programmes within the School, and emphasized that the accrediting body was not concerned about the compensatory element. The Committee was in agreement that there could be a more consistent approach across the University in relation to how compensation is applied for postgraduate programmes.

4. Student experience

The Committee requested some clarity on the number of progression points, as the programme specification indicated that there were three throughout the programme. The programme team clarified that although three assessment boards would be held, they would not be formal progression points. The Committee agreed that this should be clearly articulated within the programme specification to ensure clarity for students.

The Committee was interested to know how students would be supported for the Dissertation module. The programme team responded that students would have a supervisor from industry as well as an academic support. The project itself would be provided from an industry specialist. The Committee agreed that this sounded like an exciting opportunity for students.

5. Quality assurance, standards and regulations

The Committee commended the programme team on the standard of the programme specification, in particular the learning outcomes.

Some areas for enhancement within specification documents and some errors and inconsistencies within the Stage 2 submission were identified. Full details would be shared with the Programme team to enable them to be addressed within the final version of the documentation, in particular a new space request form to take into account the increase in the number of modules and the full PARC minutes.

6. Resources

As noted above, due to the change in module diet since Stage 1 a new space request form should be provided as well as full costings from the library.

Laura Tull
Academic Development Officer
April 2016