University College Dublin

REVIEW GROUP REPORT

Periodic Quality Review

UCD School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy

April 2016

Accepted by the UCD Governing Authority at its meeting on 7 February 2017

Table of Contents

Key Findings of the Review Group

The Review Group has identified a number of key findings in relation to areas of good practice operating within the School and key areas which the Review Group would highlight as requiring future improvement. The main section of this Report sets out all observations, commendations and recommendations of the Review Group in more detail. A composite list of all commendations and recommendations is set out in Appendix 1.

<u>Examples of Good Practice</u>

The Review Group identified a number of commendations, in particular:

- It was clear that a significant amount of work went into preparations for the review and the Self-assessment Report prepared by the School was deemed excellent – it was robust, honest and clearly articulated the challenges faced by the School. The Review Group strongly support the School's decision to engage with the review process and seek external input at such an early stage in its lifecycle.

- The Richview Library provides an exceptional learning environment with a very pro-active librarian and unique resources, for example, the map collections are also available to the public. The national value of this collection should not be underestimated, particularly given its significant use by practitioners, which also provides a conduit for the profession to work with the School. As such, the Library is also part of the Schools out-reach in a very positive manner.

- The School has a broad range of learning and teaching modules, with talented faculty and staff, who are very flexible and generous in their approach to delivering these on a collaborative basis.

- There is an exceptionally strong studio culture in the School due to highly dedicated faculty and staff.

- Generally, there is a very healthy and broad mix of modules in the School, which provide a strong platform for the various programmes offered. The curricula of the various programmes appear coherent, well rounded and are informed by relevant professional accreditation standards.

- The development of various new Masters programmes in the School that enhance students ability to work within an interdisciplinary environment is welcome, given the increasing need for diverse professional collaboration in practice.

- A number of research-active faculty, including part-time faculty, are producing excellent and impactful work. The volume of research activity, including and especially externally funded research, has been on the rise.

Prioritised Recommendations for Future Improvement

The full list of recommendations is set out in Appendix 1, however, the Review Group would suggest that the following be prioritised:

- The Review Group recommend that the School should consider appointing an Advisory Board to help drive change in the newly formed School. The Board could initially be convened for 2 years with the option to make it permanent following a review of its effectiveness. The Board should comprise members from outside the School, including from other UCD Schools and stakeholders.

- The School should establish a Teaching and Learning Committee as a matter of urgency.

- The Review Group strongly recommends that the School review the number of hourly-paid faculty and non-permanent fractional lecturers. The balance between permanent and non-permanent faculty needs to be changed in order to enhance research capacity, to strengthen strategic, long-term planning of teaching, and to make it possible for faculty to take part in studio teaching.

- The School also needs to develop a policy regarding hourly paid posts. There should be an appropriate balance between short-term and transitory appointments (lasting no longer than a few years) with a view to continually refreshing teaching from best practice, and those developed into proper (possibly larger fractional) posts where faculty and staff have the benefits of career development and promotion. The present imbalance with too few larger fractional and full-time posts needs to be addressed to help improve the balance of management loads for these posts.

- The University should urgently review the maintenance and upgrading requirements for the buildings at Richview, in particular, ensuring compliance with legislative requirements regarding access for people with disabilities.

- The School should consider reorganising the use of Newstead/Richview to enhance the utilisation of the space and integrate students and teachers more. Whilst Richview is cramped, Newstead has ample space. The Review Group proposes that some architecture and landscape architecture studios should be co-located in Newstead, to integrate the students better and to create mutual learning and friendly competition among the students.

- Clear investment needs to be made to create time for faculty and part-time practitioners to be in dialogue with each other at key points in the year, to aid strategic programme development. This could take the form of annual programme reviews and planning meetings, attended by all learning and teaching faculty and staff.

- The School should consider the introduction of credit-bearing internships across all its Undergraduate and Masters programmes. There is a good precedent in the M.Eng programme Year 4, which is supported by College level internship co-ordinators, and of which the School could take advantage.

- Faculty and staff should be encouraged to adopt different methods of assessment e.g. peer assessment and group-work assessment at all stages, including final submissions.

- Develop *with the full participation of key stakeholders,* a Communications and Marketing Strategy, that communicates the School's joint narrative and vision, and includes a clear, step-by-step plan for the School's external activities. The School should seek support from both University Relations and the College when developing their plan.

1. Introduction and Overview of UCD School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy

Introduction

1.1   This report presents the findings of a quality review of the School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy, University College Dublin, which was undertaken on 18-21 April 2016. The School response to the Review Group Report is attached as Appendix 2.

The Review Framework

1.2   Irish Universities have collectively agreed a framework for their quality review and quality improvement systems, which is consistent with both the legislative requirements of the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012, and international good practice (e.g. Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, 2015). Quality reviews are carried out in academic, administrative and support service units.

1.3   The purpose of periodic review is to assist the University to assure itself of the quality of each of its constituent units, and to utilise learning from this developmental process in order to effect improvement, including:

- To monitor the quality of the student experience, and of teaching and learning.

- To monitor research activity, including: management of research activity; assessing the research performance with regard to: research productivity, research income, and recruiting and supporting doctoral students.

- To identify, encourage and disseminate good practice, and to identify challenges and how to address these.

- To provide an opportunity for units to test the effectiveness of their systems and procedures for monitoring and enhancing quality and standards.

- To encourage the development and enhancement of these systems, in the context of current and emerging provision.

- To inform the University's strategic planning process.

- The output report provides robust evidence for external accreditation bodies.

- The process provides an external benchmark on practice and curriculum.

- To provide public information on the University's capacity to assure the quality and standards of its awards. The University's implementation of its quality procedures enables it to demonstrate how it discharges its responsibilities for assuring the quality

and standards of its awards, as required by the Universities Act 1997 and the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012.

The Review Process

1.4   Typically, the review model comprises four major elements:

- Preparation of a Self-assessment Report (SAR)

- A visit by a Review Group (RG) that includes UCD faculty and/or staff and external experts, both national and international. The site visit normally will take place over a two or three day period

- Preparation of a review group report that is made public

- Agreement of an action plan for improvement (quality improvement plan) based on the RG report's recommendations. The University will also monitor progress against the improvement plan

Full details of the review process can be found on the UCD Quality Office website: www.ucd.ie/quality.

The Review Group

1.5   The composition of the Review Group for the UCD School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy was as follows:

- Professor Alexander Evans, UCD School of Agriculture and Food Science (Chair)

- Dr Grace Morgan, UCD School of Chemistry (Deputy Chair)

- Professor Fionn Stevenson, University of Sheffield, UK (Extern)

- Professor Gertrud Jørgensen, University of Copenhagen, Denmark (Extern)

- Professor Kieran Donaghy, Cornell University, USA (Extern)

1.6   The Review Group visited the School from 19-21 April 2016 and held meetings with School faculty and staff; undergraduate and postgraduate students; the SAR Co-ordinating Committee; other University faculty and staff, including the College Principal and viewed the Schools facilities. The site visit schedule is included as Appendix 3.

1.7   In addition to the SAR, the Review Group considered documentation provided by the School and the University during the site visit.

Preparation of the Self-assessment Report (SAR)

1.8   Following a briefing from the UCD Quality Office, the School of Architecture, Planning and Environmental Policy (APEP) set up a Self-assessment Co-ordinating Committee (SARCC) to lead the preparations for their quality review process.

1.9   The SARCC met on 7 occasions between April 2015 and March 2016 and the membership of the SARCC is set out below:

	Role & Discipline	Drafting the SAR - Allocation of tasks
Dr Elizabeth Shotton	Chair of SARCC School Director of Research (Architecture)	• Research Activity • Summary of SWOT Analysis and School Recommendations for Improvement
Mr Adam Trodd	School Manager	• Support Services
Prof Hugh Campbell	Head of School, Dean of Architecture (Architecture)	• Introduction and Context • Staff and Facilities
Prof Mark Scott	Deputy Head of School Head of Environmental Policy (Planning & Environmental Policy)	• Organisation and Management
Dr Karen Foley	Head of Subject (Landscape Architecture)	• Teaching, Learning and Assessment • Curriculum Development and Review
Ms Orla Hegarty	Coordinator of Professional Diploma in Architecture (Architecture)	• Management of Quality and Enhancement • External Relations
Mr Philip Crowe	Student Representative (Landscape Architecture)	• Survey of Students

1.10   The SARCC communicated with faculty and staff not on the Co-coordinating Committee throughout the preparation phase of the review process, including:

- Teaching & Curriculum targeted faculty and staff survey

- Student focus group

- Employer targeted survey (by Curriculum Review Team)

- Graduate targeted survey (by Curriculum Review Team)

- Alternative Research Metrics faculty and staff survey

- Management of Quality and Enhancement targeted faculty and staff survey

- Away Day Consultation including all permanent faculty and staff and representatives from hourly-paid faculty and staff

- Draft Report circulated to School Executive for review

- Draft Report sent to permanent faculty and staff for comment

- Draft Report sent to research funded faculty and staff for comment

- Draft Report sent to hourly-paid faculty and staff for comment

The University

1.11   University College Dublin (UCD) is a large and diverse university whose origins date back to 1854. The University is situated on a large modern campus about 4 km to the south of the centre of Dublin.

1.12   The University Strategic Plan (to 2020) states that the University's mission is: "to contribute to the flourishing of Dublin, Ireland, Europe and the world through the excellence and impact of our research and scholarship, the quality of our graduates and our global engagement; providing a supportive community in which every member of the University is enabled to achieve their full potential".

The University is currently organised into six colleges and 37 schools:

- UCD College of Arts and Humanities

- UCD College of Business

- UCD College of Engineering and Architecture

- UCD College of Health and Agricultural Sciences

- UCD College of Social Sciences and Law

- UCD College of Science

1.13   As one of the largest universities on the island of Ireland, UCD supports a broad, deep and rich academic community in Science, Business, Engineering, Health Sciences, Agriculture, Veterinary Medicine, Arts, Law, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences. There are currently more than 26,000 students in our UCD campus (approximately 16,300 undergraduates, 7,800 postgraduates and 2,200 Occasional and Adult Education students) registered on over 70 University degree programmes, including over 6,300 international students from more than

121 countries. The University also has over 5,400 students studying UCD degree programmes on campuses overseas.

UCD School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy (APEP)

1.14   With a faculty and staff complement of 44.5 FTEs, the UCD School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy (APEP) is one of six schools in the UCD College of Engineering & Architecture. The School, established in September 2015, is the result of an amalgamation of the previously existing School of Architecture (which included Architecture and Landscape Architecture) with the Planning and Environmental Policy (PEP) group that had previously been in the School of Geography Planning and Environmental Policy in the College of Social Sciences and Law. Taken together, these disciplines encompass most aspects of the built, designed and planned environment, across all scales, and across a range of methodological approaches. All faculty and staff in the School are located in the Richview/Newstead area of the UCD campus, which also includes UCD Civil Engineering and the state-run Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). All four subject areas in the School offer professionally accredited undergraduate and graduate programmes within a research-intensive learning environment.

Commendations

1.15   The Review Group was favourably impressed with the School's engagement with the review process, and with the input from the faculty, staff, students and stakeholders who met with them.

1.16   It was evident that the Co-ordinating Committee's approach was inclusive, constructive and developmental.

1.17   It was clear that a significant amount of work went into preparations for the review and the Self-assessment Report prepared by the School was deemed excellent – it was robust, honest and clearly articulated the challenges faced by the School. The Review Group strongly support the School's decision to engage with the review process and seek external input at such an early stage in its lifecycle.

2. Organisation and Management

2.1   The School is in a transition phase, having only been established 6 months before the review site visit. The Review Group acknowledges this merger as a step with huge potential, but also notes that the merger poses challenges for the School in building a new common identity while still keeping and developing the identities and qualities of the existing disciplines and programmes, which are in effect the building blocks of the new School.

2.2   The School is a lively entity with a strongly beating heart in Richview and Newstead, despite the physical challenges of these disparate locations which lie on the periphery of the UCD Belfield campus. It has world class researchers, teachers and practitioners who together

provide an excellent student experience in the leading School of the built environment in Ireland.

2.3   The disciplinary groups are very different as to size, staff-student ratio, thematic profile, methods, culture and prospects for community impact – and it will be a challenge to unite them into a cohesive unit. To do so, it is essential that the leadership of the School – supported by the College - create 'strategic room for change' with respect to finances and staff, as well as developing and building resources.

2.4   At present, the identity and role of the Landscape discipline in the School is unclear. Landscape Architecture, as a research and teaching field, has great potential to be the link between Planning, Environment Policy, and Architecture.   There are examples of this potential within the School – a good first step – but this potential needs to be understood and developed more fully.

2.5   The School has many hourly-paid and fractional posts. While there are advantages to this, it creates difficulties at many levels (the staff structure is expanded upon in Section 3 below).

Commendations

2.6   The Review Group finds that the new School addresses competently a research and teaching field that covers the built and natural environments (including related problems, for example environmental, technical, aesthetic and social),that goes from the regional scale to individual building parts. This School is simply a good idea.

2.7   The School has multiple possibilities for transdisciplinary research and teaching. Some good examples exist (e.g. in research) others are planned (e.g. in graduate programmes) and there is scope to exploit others.

2.8   The School (with the Architecture programme in the lead) has instigated a bold and creative plan to increase its number of non-EU fee paying students to mitigate the effects of the economic cuts that have been experienced in Ireland in recent years. This is well conceived and seems to be efficiently pursued with the assistance of the College. If the School succeeds with this plan – and the Review Group believes that it is likely to do so – the economic benefits will create room for the strategic change that the Review Group would like to see.

2.9   The Head of School has a good grasp of how the School budget is planned and organised and has excellent support from the College Finance team.

Recommendations

2.10   The School name is long, but all the same, it does not comprise all disciplines. Landscape is not visible, and for Environmental Policy the name signals too much design. The Review Group encourages the School to consider changing the name of the School to something that signals integration and which is more inclusive (e.g. School of the Built Environment).

At the same time researchers and research groups in the School should be encouraged to market themselves under more specific names e.g. "I am from Environmental Planning / Landscape Architecture / Architecture / Planning in the School of the Built Environment, UCD".

2.11 There is a sense of reorganisation fatigue within the School. This School should prepare its Quality Improvement Plan as part of the process of this review and then not be asked to undertake major change for a reasonable interval.

2.12 The budget and financial organisation of the School still reflects the old schools in the sense that each disciplinary group still has its own pay-line or sub-budget. The groups thus exist as economic "silos" in the organisation. It is essential to eliminate such budgetary "silos" in order to create room for strategic decisions by the new School leadership for investment and new positions "between disciplines". The School should set a realistic timeframe for this budgetary merger, for example, 2 years. The budget should not look backwards, but should be seen as a living document to allow, discuss and implement change.

2.13 The Review Group recommend that the School should consider appointing an Advisory Board to help drive change in the newly formed School. The Board could initially be convened for 2 years with the option to make it permanent following a review of its effectiveness. The Board should comprise members from outside the School, including from other UCD Schools and stakeholders.

2.14 The School should establish a well-understood and streamlined organisational structure that caters for both efficiency and inclusiveness. To facilitate this the School should:

2.14.1 consider forming a smaller, executive (or management) team with representation from the four disciplines - while the current School Executive is diverse and relatively highly populated which is positive during the transition phase, in the longer term, it may be better to have a leaner, more streamlined committee.

2.14.2 establish a Teaching and Learning Committee as a matter of urgency.

2.14.3 ensure that the role of School Director of External Relations & Communications is filled – responsibilities should include partnership development, recruitment of students and alumni engagement.

2.14.4 include students in appropriate School Committees and events - while the School operates staff/student committees and students are represented on the Programme Board, there is scope to include students more. The School should also encourage and further support students holding student-led events such as talks, exhibitions, debates and careers fairs.

2.15 It is important that internal communication in the School be enhanced. The Review Group commends the School on its recent development of an internal communications strategy and recommends that this is given a high priority and undertaken as soon as possible.

2.16   It is essential that the School establish a robust induction policy, procedure and subsequent mechanism for the exchange of information within the School. This is particularly needed for new faculty, staff and students as well as hourly-paid faculty and staff that need answers to questions along the lines of "how does the School/University work?" and "where do I get help with HR questions?" The Review Group recommend that the School Office be open and staffed during all office hours and that it becomes the administrative centre for the School where information can be disseminated and problems can be solved.

2.17   There has been a lot of reflection on where the School came from and what it comprises at present. The Review Group recommend that the School now increase its efforts in forward thinking and in articulating a shared ambition and vision. This should also include clear articulation of the identity of each of the disciplines in the School and how they interlink.

3. Staff and Facilities

3.1   The staff composition differs considerably between Planning and Environmental Policy (PEP), Landscape Architecture and Architecture. The Review Group noted the difference in the balance between full-time faculty and part-time and hourly-paid faculty and staff. Whilst PEP has a more conventional University staff structure with full-time researchers, Architecture (and to some extent Landscape Architecture) has many part-time and hourly-paid faculty and staff to cater for the need to include practice perspectives and expertise in teaching.

3.2   Especially in Architecture - and to some extent Landscape Architecture – there is a severe imbalance between permanent full-time and part-time/hourly-paid faculty and staff. Permanent faculty and staff are in the minority, part-time lecturers are in the majority, and many hourly-paid teachers are hired on short-term contracts (some of whom have, however, been teaching studios for many years). While a considerable teaching input from practice-based staff is necessary, the balance between practice-based, part-time staff and academic, full-time staff seems to have tipped too far. The Review Group believes that this is detrimental to strategic thinking and planning of research and teaching.

3.3   The School faces a particular challenge with the staffing structure as set out in 3.2 and the School's work allocation practices. The unusual imbalance of exceptionally few full-time faculty compared to a very large number of fractional and hourly-paid faculty and staff in Architecture is not sustainable. In the medium-term, this fragmentation is preventing the School from developing a strong collegiate research culture based on a healthy number of PhD students underpinning the growth of individual research groups aligned with key themes. Such an evolutionary research culture can enhance research-led teaching which is strongly grounded in a developing theoretical discourse. A partial re-balancing of staffing would also help nascent practice-based research to develop with more opportunities for practitioners to engage with a wider range of academics in the School. The introduction of, for example, a new University post of 'University Teacher' would help to valorise those practitioners who wish to be teaching-only, rather than developing practice-based research.

These faculty and staff would continue their scholarly reflection while developing best pedagogical practice.

3.4   In terms of student and staff experience, there is a major decision to be made about whether to significantly upgrade and consolidate the current School facilities within which learning and teaching take place or to eventually relocate the School entirely to a more central part of the campus. The School is pro-actively developing a strategy which will allow for a phased upgrade of the existing Richview and Newstead buildings, including the former Earth Institute building, to enable it to become more coherent and provide more opportunities for interdisciplinary learning and teaching where this is desirable. In the short-term, there is an excellent opportunity to audit current space use between the four disciplines and take advantage of spatial redistributions to allow initial mixing of landscape, planning and architecture students in some studios which will in turn help to generate new interdisciplinary developments.   The former Earth Institute building also provides an excellent opportunity for interdisciplinary research within the School, which the Review Group supports.

3.5   The buildings at Richview urgently need maintenance and upgrading.   Some are overcrowded and the Review Group was particularly concerned that the buildings are not currently accessible to students, faculty, staff and stakeholders with physical disabilities.

3.6   The rooms at Newstead, which are currently used for Landscape Architecture, are excellent and not crowded. There are different views on how to solve the maintenance and crowding problems in Richview. One is to build a new building adjacent to the Engineering Building in the centre of the UCD campus and move the whole School there; the other (preferred by the School itself) is to renovate and supplement the existing facilities at Richview. To support its second idea, the School has developed an interesting and creative blueprint for this solution which the discipline experts on the Review Group fully supported.

3.7   The Review Group noted that there is some confusion as to who is responsible for certain facilities management tasks. There is also a problem with security control for some buildings as an abundance of keys/keycards seem to exist.

Commendations

3.8   The Review Group met a positive, loyal, engaged and high-quality faculty and staff despite the hard economic times they have been through; and despite reorganisation, they have an optimistic spirit.

3.9   The buildings in Richview are special and full of character. Most of the functions fit well into the building structure.

3.10   The School is to be commended on its pro-active approach to developing a strategy for the revitalisation of the Richview and Newstead campus both in the short and long term, which takes the sustainable approach of re-using and improving existing buildings rather than demolishing them.   The Review Group support this approach especially, in relation to

climate change imperatives and the need for the University to reduce embodied carbon emissions.

3.11 The Richview Library provides an exceptional learning environment with a very pro-active librarian and unique resources, for example, the map collections are also available to the public. The national value of this collection should not be underestimated, particularly given its significant use by practitioners, which also provides a conduit for the profession to work with the School. As such, the Library is also part of the Schools out-reach in a very positive manner.

Recommendations

3.12 The Review Group strongly recommends that the School review the number of hourly-paid faculty, staff and non-permanent fractional lecturers. The balance between permanent and non-permanent faculty and staff needs to be changed in order to enhance research capacity, to strengthen strategic, long-term planning of teaching, and to make it possible for academic staff to take part in studio teaching.

3.13 The School also needs to develop a policy regarding hourly-paid posts. There should be an appropriate balance between short-term and transitory appointments (lasting no longer than a few years) with a view to continually refreshing teaching from best practice, and those developed into proper (possibly larger fractional) posts where faculty and staff have the benefits of career development and promotion. The present imbalance with too few larger fractional and full-time posts needs to be addressed to help improve the balance of management loads for these posts.

3.14 The School should liaise with UCD HR regarding the development of career paths for the (fewer) part-time lecturers. This should include considering how to involve them in research activities or to establish a category of, for example, University Teacher.

3.15 The recruitment procedure for part-time and hourly-paid staff should be transparent and competitive.

3.16 Contracts for part-time lecturers and hourly-paid staff should be reviewed to ensure clarity regarding working conditions and workloads.

3.17 Mitigating dissatisfaction among the hourly-paid faculty and staff as to their lack of involvement in teaching decisions, communication with the permanent faculty and staff, job content (lack of responsibility), planning of their workload, communication with the School, and experience of lack of payment for preparation and administrative tasks should be considered as an important short-time-task for School management.

3.18 In respect of recommendation 3.17, the School should create a communication forum or other structure that can foster a teaching environment and collegial atmosphere to address inclusion of part-time lecturers and hourly-paid faculty and staff in academic exchange and teaching and management decisions.

3.19   In terms of a strategic recruitment strategy, the Review Group recommends that the School seeks to create new permanent inter-disciplinary positions, to help cohesion and collaboration in the School. Possible areas for consideration include Landscape Urbanism, Housing, Smart Cities, Resource Efficiency, Climate Adaptation, Urban or Environmental Design. The Review Group also advises the School to prioritise international recruitment. When the opportunity arises, the School should consider appointing a full professor in Landscape Architecture to support its central role as a link between disciplines. The School should develop a five-year staff succession plan to help steer recruitment when the opportunity arises.

3.20   UCD, at University level, should actively consider and support the imaginative and sustainable prospects proposed (sketch plan and funding ideas) by the School to upgrade the Richview campus, bearing in mind the University's commitment to sustainable development and the need to reduce embodied carbon emissions overall. It is a strong wish from the School, and needs to be taken seriously, before a final decision is made.

3.21   The University should urgently review the maintenance and upgrading requirements for the buildings at Richview, in particular, ensuring compliance with legislative requirements regarding access for people with disabilities.

3.22   The School should consider reorganising the use of Newstead/Richview to enhance the utilisation of space and integrate students and teachers more. Whilst Richview is cramped, Newstead has ample space. The Review Group proposes that some architecture and landscape architecture studios should be co-located in Newstead, to integrate the students better and to create mutual learning and friendly competition among the students.

3.23   The Review Group also recommends the continued use of the Earth Institute building for the School's research purposes.

3.24   As there are too many access cards in circulation, the Review Group recommends that UCD Estates, together with the School, examine possible access and security issues in Richview and Newstead.

3.25   The School needs to develop a functioning and attractive common room for faculty and staff (there is the space).

4. Teaching, Learning and Assessment

4.1   The School of Architecture, Planning and Environmental Policy (APEP) brings together four distinctive disciplines which share common ground in terms of producing graduates who are able to make a positive difference towards enhancing the built environment to meet people's needs and address the current global challenges. Faculty and staff are clearly open to the possibilities that this re-organisation offers in terms of teaching, learning and assessment.

4.2 Each discipline has significant strengths in terms of its research-led learning and teaching agenda and, while noting the importance of maintaining professional disciplinary identities, each appears willing to learn from the others as well as identifying and forming interdisciplinary collaborations where these are mutually beneficial.

4.3 APEP has a major opportunity at this point in its formation to add value to learning and teaching programmes through these interdisciplinary collaborations which in turn can help in the formation of the new identity of the School as well as to further enrich the diversity of programme offers which will help to make the School more resilient in a rapidly changing world.

4.4 At the same time, the School faces very particular challenges in relation to the delivery of learning and teaching given its present accommodation, governance, staffing structure and resources which all need to be resolved to help it grow successfully (see also Sections 2 and 3 above).

4.5 Practitioner-based learning and teaching is the lifeblood of any professional discipline and any re-balancing of staffing will need to take into account the need for increased communication and co-ordination between academics and part-time practitioners in the School. Time should be made to allow for essential strategic dialogues between the two groups at key points in the year, in relation to programme development (see also Sections 2 and 3 above).

4.6 There is also the opportunity to bring programmes closer to practice through the development of new methods of learning and teaching, which should include technology enhanced learning, new studio teaching methods and improved mentoring for employability.

Commendations

4.7 The School has a broad range of learning and teaching modules, with talented faculty and staff, who are very flexible and generous in their approach to delivering these on a collaborative basis.

4.8 There is an exceptionally strong studio culture in APEP due to highly dedicated faculty and staff.

4.9 There is a very strong relationship between the Professions and the School, with Alumni and other stakeholders keen to support the School and contribute to practice-based research live projects.

4.10 Excellent reports from external examiners.

Recommendations

4.11   Clear investment needs to be made to create time for faculty and part-time practitioners to be in dialogue with each other at key points in the year, to aid strategic programme development.   This could take the form of annual programme reviews and planning meetings, attended by all learning and teaching faculty and staff.

4.12   One of the early tasks of the newly formed Learning and Teaching Committee should be to examine the similarities and difference among programmes offered by the School, with a view to removing redundancy and enhancing offerings, while reducing overall teaching loads.

4.13   The School needs to develop a strong Learning and Teaching Strategy, which includes a full audit of all disciplinary modules and programmes, to help identify new niche programmes and modules that bridge the various disciplines. This is an essential precursor to defining any new teaching roles in the School.

4.14   All the programmes should be engaging directly with global challenges and bring to the campus best practice from the practitioners and professions.

4.15   Investment needs to be made in developing a robust School Faculty and Staff Development Strategy for all staff, which will allow them to benefit from learning about new pedagogical developments, software, and methods to enhance the student experience. This needs to be combined with a more explicit and written induction process for both faculty, staff and part-time practitioners at a School level (see also 2.16).

4.16   Provision of appropriate software, space and resource for IT delivery remains a challenge for the School, and the University is strongly encouraged to provide more learning technologist support, GIS, Adobe and other proprietary licences on a local basis for students as these are core to their learning process.

5. Curriculum Development and Review

5.1   Generally, there is a very healthy and broad mix of modules in the School, which provide a strong platform for the various programmes offered.   The curricula of the various programmes appear coherent, well rounded and are informed by relevant professional accreditation standards.

5.2   The School management has been highly strategic in terms of developing a viable growth plan for its learning and teaching through diversification of its student base. This in turn should generate income to enable strategic investment in new posts and new facilities, both of which are key to improving student experience.

5.3   In tandem with the plans for growth, the various disciplines in the School have actively sought to collaborate and develop new programmes which encourage greater

interdisciplinarity. Care needs to be taken when developing new programmes, that they do not compete with existing ones, both in terms of timetabling and student recruitment. There is also a significant opportunity to work with practice and introduce credit-bearing internships which should increase student employability and help them to pay for the cost of the programme.

5.4   While the undergraduate and Masters' programmes appear strong generally, there is a challenge in terms of how to re-valourise Landscape Architecture programmes which potentially have a key role to play in the School, and the University beyond, in terms of research-led teaching. The distinctiveness of learning and teaching in Landscape Architecture needs to be more developed in relation to Planning and Architecture. This will help Landscape to define its contribution to interdisciplinary learning and teaching activities within the School. This in turn could help the development of Landscape modules which support the other disciplines in the School, eventually leading to the development of dual-accredited Landscape programmes in collaboration with the other disciplines in the School.

5.5   At present the studio curriculum is largely delivered by part-time practitioners, which provides an excellent connection with practice issues and developments. However, it is vital that faculty are also involved in the studios in order to enrich the student experience through encountering different theoretical and research propositions via their design work, particularly at the Masters level. This can also help to further integrate the module teaching carried out elsewhere by faculty, into the studio as well as providing research-led teaching.

5.6   Students increasingly require clear guidance in relation to key transition points in their careers which cover their application to the School, arrival and orientation as well as their leaving the School and gaining employment. This is particularly so, given the School's plans to increase diversity among the students in order to enrich their learning experience and provide them with the cultural agility to work in any environment, globally. The School would benefit from looking at examples of best practice in this area.

5.7   The PhD programme is relatively small for the size of the School and is hampered by a lack of suitably qualified faculty and staff to grow numbers. The School intends to address this by employing new faculty. At the same time, the proposed ratio of PhD students to supervisor at 2:1 is low compared to other institutions, and the School may wish to reflect on this in terms of its redistribution of administrative loads, once a staffing review is completed and actioned. At present, there are a number of excellent PhDs coming out of the School, but students appear to be unclear about what the PhD programme strategy is or how they fit into the wider School.

Commendations

5.8   The School is to be commended for its bold plans to strategically diversify its student intake through internationalisation, and to grow its income in order to invest in staffing and resources and thus significantly improve the student experience.

5.9   The development of various new Masters programmes in the School that enhance students ability to work within an interdisciplinary environment is welcome, given the increasing need for diverse professional collaboration in practice.

5.10   The development of an international curriculum through international accreditation by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) is to be commended.

5.11   The School is commended on its positive engagement with programme review given that the School is also in transition.

5.12   The high employment level of graduates is commendable.

5.13   The proposal to develop a practice-based Housing Masters programme is an excellent idea, given the significant challenge that this sector presents.

5.14   The Review Group supports the transition of the Policy and Environmental Planning programme, from a BA to a BSc in the School ALPEP Programme Board.

Recommendations

5.15   A more market-orientated approach needs to be taken in terms of redeveloping or developing new Masters programmes. For example, there is an opportunity to develop new and innovative Masters programmes in Landscape rather than reintroduce programmes that disappeared previously.

5.16   The School should consider the introduction of credit-bearing internships across all its Undergraduate and Masters programmes.   There is a good precedent in the M.Eng programme Year 4, which is supported by College level internship co-ordinators, and of which the School could take advantage.

5.17   The Landscape Architecture faculty and staff within the School are encouraged to carry out a review of their interests and expertise in order to tease out a clearer identity and USP, which they then need to project more strongly to the other School disciplines, in relation to their learning and teaching and to their research strengths. Landscape Architecture needs to be viewed as an equal partner in relation to research and programme development, as well as all publicity in the School.

5.18   A clear strategy needs to be developed for the PhD programme, which sits within an overall Learning and Teaching strategy. This would help PhD students to gain a broad range of initial research skills and understanding as well as to integrate them more within the School in terms of teaching opportunities which can support existing faculty, staff and part-time practitioners. A more formal process for identifying PhD student teaching capabilities and locating these in relation to teaching requirements is required. The development of industry scholarships will help to support the PhD programme.

5.19   A review of the curriculum to ensure the delivery of transferable skills related to students transitioning from one part of their career to another is recommended.

5.20   Faculty and staff should be encouraged to adopt different methods of assessment e.g. peer assessment and group-work assessment at all stages, including final submissions.

5.21   Collaboration should be fostered amongst students of the built environment professions (including Engineering) to develop a language of collaboration for subsequent professional practice.

5.22   Dates for portfolio submissions within teaching term should be clarified in advance, to ensure that there are no clashes with other module submissions, and that students are aware of these from the outset.

5.23   Excessive student workload at key points needs to be addressed through comprehensive time management and timetabling, co-ordinated across all programmes. This should include strict and reasonable deadlines for submission of work. For example, dates for submission of portfolios should be in week 12 of the semester at the latest and not during the study week or after exams.

6. Research Activity

6.1   Research conducted within the School addresses a broad swath of issues concerning the natural and built environments. It engages with University-level research institutes addressing issues that span the natural and computational sciences, humanities, and domestic and European policy.

6.2   A number of research-active faculty and staff, including part-time staff, are producing excellent and impactful work. The volume of research activity, including and especially externally funded research, has been on the rise.

6.3   As set out in sections 2 and 3 above, interdisciplinary collaboration is extensive with scope to increase as the School becomes more cohesive.

6.4   The School has an active Research Committee in place, with representation from all disciplines. As the School is in transition, their challenge is to blend a number of different approaches to research activity and to learn from good practice elsewhere in the new School, while building on each disciplines' strengths. The Committee is new and both the research-related strengths and weaknesses that characterise APEP are not unusual in schools of planning and design. Such schools must work to develop and sustain research cultures in which diverse contributions are appreciated. Going forward, the School needs to identify and articulate its own research strengths and ambitions in conjunction with its parent College's Research Strategy.

6.5   There is a need to improve the recognition of discipline-specific research metrics at UCD. The current metrics result in an undervaluation of APEP research output. Some of this is due to the unconventional innovations of faculty and staff in professional practice.

6.6   The Architecture and Landscape Architecture cohorts, in particular, would benefit from a more targeted approach that is set out in a clear, over-arching School Research Strategy that identifies national and international funding streams. In this regard, some metrics to define what research quality means in this diverse grouping could be useful, e.g. peer review literature, monographs, books, reports for government and the private sector.

6.7   The School has the opportunity to formalise and develop the postgraduate and postdoctoral researcher experience in the School, in line with UCD best practice. Current funding for postgraduate and postdoctoral researchers is inadequate and the School should consider how this can be addressed. The School also faces a capacity challenge for supervising postgraduate research in Architecture and Landscape Architecture.

6.8   The School Research Committee organises a regular School-wide research seminar series with internal and internal speakers. While this is well promoted, in the interests of further developing the School research culture, there needs to be buy-in with regular attendance from senior members of faculty and staff across all disciplines within the School.

Commendations

6.9   Faculty and staff in Planning, Environmental Policy, and Landscape Architecture, in particular, are to be commended for their collaborative projects.

6.10   Research administration is facilitated by a dedicated research manager in the School.

6.11   School faculty are influential in policy circles.

6.12   The PEP grouping have worked hard to successfully establish a global reputation in the last decade.

6.13   Evidence provided by the School indicated that the impact of research conducted by the School's faculty and staff exceeds that of competitor schools.

6.14   The Research Committee is actively promoting a developing cross-discipline research culture within the School.

Recommendations

6.15   Exploit new opportunities that an interdisciplinary school creates to open new vistas on societal challenges, while building on areas of shared interest and expertise.

6.16   Establish what counts as 'quality' in research—take charge of the yardstick used for measurement. With the support of the College, engage with the UCD Research Office to

update the research matrices used in the University, to include measures that are more relevant to the disciplines within the School.

6.17   Obtain or provide support (beyond that provided by the School's dedicated research manager), for faculty and staff to develop and sustain research activity and exploit strategic funding opportunities.

6.18   Work on theorising practice-based research to bring 'know-how' to the level of 'know-that', while reviving design theory.

6.19   Thread research more visibly throughout curricula School-wide, emphasising the everyday use and testing of theories (as explanations, justifications, and interpretations) in the world of practice.

6.20   Continue to build numbers of PhD students and postdoctoral researchers.

6.21   When developing the School Research Strategy, the following should be considered:

6.21.1   In delivering professional degree programmes that embody a studio culture, or entail many faculty-student contact hours, faculty and staff are challenged to preserve time to focus on academic research.

6.21.2   A strategic approach to obtaining adequate research funding should be a priority.

6.21.3   Identifying and working with governmental and non-governmental organisations and other 'natural' clients, to develop and pursue a problem-driven, interdisciplinary research programme with high policy relevance.

6.21.4   Bringing more attention to the knowledge transfer that the School facilitates through translational research.

6.21.5   The School should ensure adequate resources and attention is given to preparing the next generation of research academicians.

6.21.6   Dedicating more human resources to research support activities—e.g., proposal preparation or liaising with funding agency programme officers.

6.21.7   Envisioning and pursuing joint projects with other Irish or European institutions e.g., managing transitions in regional infrastructure systems.

7. Management of Quality and Enhancement

7.1   The School has a diverse range of faculty and staff across quite different disciplines with different needs. All engaged very well with the periodic quality review process, especially at such an early stage in the development of the School, and the Review Group was impressed

with the quality of its Self-assessment Report and associated documentation. The School used the preparations for its quality review to further its strategic planning. The School has worked hard to identify its strengths, as well as opportunities and challenges for the School as it establishes itself.

7.2   The disciplines within the School already engage with a variety of approaches to evaluate the quality of their outputs. The School is bringing together existing processes and structures and the Review Group would encourage the School to consider where these efforts could be streamlined and merged. The opportunity to introduce systematic processes to ensure that consistent quality is maintained should benefit the School in the long-term. See also Section 2 above.

7.3   Current quality processes include engagement with external accreditation processes, student feedback, external examiner reports, informal mentoring of faculty and staff, in addition to Staff-Student Liaison Committees. There is scope to review the effectiveness of these existing quality mechanisms and to identify overlaps and gaps. This could include, for example: the introduction of annual programme review; an assessment of how the School closes the feedback loop for students, faculty, staff and stakeholders; a review of the School's policies and processes; and improved internal induction and mentoring support for all faculty and staff.

Commendations

7.4   The School is to be commended for its engagement with the University periodic quality review process and the quality of its Self-assessment Report.

7.5   The School engages well with University quality mechanisms, for example, a robust external examiner system, to assure the academic standards of its modules and awards.

7.6   The Head and Deputy Head of School have worked hard to develop an inclusive management structure which has guided the establishment of the new School Executive.

7.7   The School Executive meets regularly which is important in building knowledge and trust between the new partners, and the development of a shared vision for the School.

7.8   The new Programme Board is a very positive step towards integration of the management of teaching quality. This will ensure a shared approach towards the grading process.

Recommendations

7.9   Taking into consideration that the School is undergoing a significant amount of change and working to embed new structures and processes in a relatively short space of time, the Review Group would recommend that:

7.9.1   the School clearly map out its current structures, processes and procedures.

7.9.2   the School should set out a work programme to address any overlaps and gaps identified by the mapping exercise.

7.9.3   the work programme should be made up of a series of short, achievable projects, with clear timelines, that are planned to be delivered over a number of years.

7.9.4   the School should engage with other University units, for example, UCD Human Resources and UCD Agile to support these mapping and planning exercises.

8. Support Services

8.1   The School engages with a wide variety of supports and services provided by other UCD units, including the College of Engineering & Architecture, IT Services, Human Resources, Library, T&L, research support, Estates and Services, Finance, International, and Research. Feedback from the School indicated that, for the most part, the School has a positive relationship with these University support units.

8.2   While feedback from the School indicated that UCD Estates have engaged with them regarding the physical facilities in Richview (as set out in section 3 above), the Review Group was agreed that it is urgent that decisions regarding the infrastructure at Richview be made in the near future.

8.3   Decisions about facilities at Richview should also include the provision of appropriate catering facilities. There are no catering facilities available at Richview during the Summer period and after 6pm in term-time, which is an issue for practitioners lecturing until 8pm, students participating in late classes, faculty and staff who work late.

8.4   The School has considerable software and hardware needs, not all of which are currently being met by UCD IT Services provision. The School should carry out a needs assessment of their requirements, in conjunction with UCD IT Services, to identify whether any additional supports, for example campus-wide availability of relevant software licenses, could be made available and/or to identify items for the School's budget planning over the coming years.

8.5   The School's plans to increase its non-EU student numbers, as set out in Section 2 above, are supported by the College. Delivery of such an ambitious plan requires significant input from UCD International. The School should be proactive in its engagement with UCD International to drive targeted overseas student recruitment and to ensure effective supports are in place for international students on arrival.

8.6   As stated in Section 5 above, students require increased career guidance and support, especially if internships are introduced. The UCD Career Development Centre provides many supports for students and advice for Schools, which the School could engage with more effectively.

8.7   There is scope for the School to further develop its networks with industry partners, including architectural practices (see also section 9), with a view to attracting additional funding, sponsorship and support research grant applications.

Commendations

8.8   The School is to be commended for establishing and maintaining good relationships with University-wide service providers, especially with the School's remote location on campus.

8.9   The School engages positively with UCD International on its Erasmus programmes.

Recommendations

8.10   Facilities in Richview urgently require improvement.

8.11   While the School engages well with UCD International to support delivery of its international student recruitment plan, there is scope for further development of this relationship, in particular, to develop a tailored induction programme and to ensure good residential accommodation for oversees students on arrival.

8.12   The School should conduct a needs assessment of their IT requirements, in conjunction with UCD IT Services.

8.13   The School should meet with the UCD Career Development Centre to identify the supports available for students and the School.

8.14   The School should seek advice and guidance from UCD Research and UCD Development and Alumni Relations, to support more effective engagement with industry and alumni networks.

9. External Relations

9.1   There is extensive public engagement, both nationally and internationally, by faculty and staff from across the School's disciplines. Faculty in the School are in prominent positions of leadership in academic societies, journal editorships, and industry and government councils. In this post-crisis period, the School is well-positioned to contribute to national debates on development/planning and environmental issues.

9.2   There is increasing involvement with international institutions and increased representation of international students in School programmes. As set out in section 8, this represents an excellent opportunity for the School.

9.3   All programmes are accredited by appropriate external professional bodies. Employers of APEP graduates are generally satisfied with the level of preparation students receive. The improving economy is contributing to closer involvement with construction and design industries.

9.4 The formation of the new School provides an opportunity to do more in the way of development (fund-raising) to involve alumni and employers of the School's graduates. Moreover, development work and job placement and career services provided to graduates over their working lives can be coordinated and used to create social networks that can address multiple purposes and needs of the School.

9.5 The School's external communications can be inconsistent and there is scope for the School to develop a comprehensive communications plan to manage its engagement with national and international stakeholders, including, current students, alumni, industry, government and potential research partners.

Commendations

9.6 The School attracts many external visitors to its campus.

9.7 The different disciplines in the School are engaged in many excellent external relations activities.

Recommendations

9.8 Develop *with the full participation of key stakeholders,* a Communications and Marketing Strategy, that communicates the School's joint narrative and vision, and includes a clear, step-by-step plan for the School's external activities. The School should seek support from both University Relations and the College when developing their plan.

9.9 Promote and invigorate a School-wide student organisation and empower it (as the alumni organisation of the next generation), to undertake significant activities, such as the organisation of on-campus career fairs or the production of a regular (digital) newsletter for alumni and stakeholders.

9.10 Develop further—*and refresh regularly*—the School website as a key tool to promote the School and maintain visibility. Use the website, moreover, as a two-way communication tool.

9.11 Continue to engage with professional bodies and consider organising receptions for UCD alumni of the School at *every* professional meeting.

9.12 Involve faculty and staff directly in exploring development activities.

9.13 Engage more with international students and international institutions of higher learning. The joint degree programmes the School is pursuing represent a promising start.

9.14 Recognising that alumni identify strongly with schools from which they have graduated and want to 'give back,' work to develop and maintain alumni relationships and involve alumni

regularly in on-campus panel discussions of matters of professional practice, pro-seminars, and internship, job placement, and mentoring programmes, and fund-raising.

9.15   As a general rule, involve the communities of practice served by the School at every level and every theatre of the School's operations.

9.16   The School should emphasise the significant role played by the School's Library as a resource for planning and design practitioners in Ireland.

**UCD School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy –
Full List of Commendations and Recommendations**

This Appendix contains a full list of all commendations and recommendations made by the Review Group for the UCD School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy and should be read in conjunction with the specific chapter above. *(Please note that the paragraph references below refer to the relevant paragraphs in the report text)*

A.   Introduction and Overview

Commendations

1.15   The Review Group was favourably impressed with the School's engagement with the review process, and with the input from the faculty, staff, students and stakeholders who met with them.

1.16   It was evident that the Co-ordinating Committee's approach was inclusive, constructive and developmental.

1.17   It was clear that a significant amount of work went into preparations for the review and the Self-assessment Report prepared by the School was deemed excellent – it was robust, honest and clearly articulated the challenges faced by the School. The Review Group strongly support the School's decision to engage with the review process and seek external input at such an early stage in its lifecycle.

B. Organisation and Management

Commendations

2.6   The Review Group finds that the new School addresses competently a research and teaching field that covers the built and natural environments (including related problems, for example environmental, technical, aesthetic and social),that goes from the regional scale to individual building parts. This School is simply a good idea.

2.7   The School has multiple possibilities for transdisciplinary research and teaching. Some good examples exist (e.g. in research) others are planned (e.g. in graduate programmes) and there is scope to exploit others.

2.8   The School (with the Architecture programme in the lead) has instigated a bold and creative plan to increase its number of non-EU fee paying students to mitigate the effects of the economic cuts that have been experienced in Ireland in recent years. This is well conceived

and seems to be efficiently pursued with the assistance of the College. If the School succeeds with this plan – and the Review Group believes that it is likely to do so – the economic benefits will create room for the strategic change that the Review Group would like to see.

2.9   The Head of School has a good grasp of how the School budget is planned and organised and has excellent support from the College Finance team.

Recommendations

2.10   The School name is long, but all the same, it does not comprise all disciplines. Landscape is not visible, and for Environmental Policy the name signals too much design. The Review Group encourages the School to consider changing the name of the School to something that signals integration and which is more inclusive (e.g. School of the Built Environment). At the same time researchers and research groups in the School should be encouraged to market themselves under more specific names e.g. "I am from Environmental Planning / Landscape Architecture / Architecture / Planning in the School of the Built Environment, UCD".

2.11   There is a sense of reorganisation fatigue within the School. This School should prepare its Quality Improvement Plan as part of the process of this review and then not be asked to undertake major change for a reasonable interval.

2.12   The budget and financial organisation of the School still reflects the old schools in the sense that each disciplinary group still has its own pay-line or sub-budget. The groups thus exist as economic "silos" in the organisation. It is essential to eliminate such budgetary "silos" in order to create room for strategic decisions by the new School leadership for investment and new positions "between disciplines". The School should set a realistic timeframe for this budgetary merger, for example, 2 years. The budget should not look backwards, but should be seen as a living document to allow, discuss and implement change.

2.13   The Review Group recommend that the School should consider appointing an Advisory Board to help drive change in the newly formed School. The Board could initially be convened for 2 years with the option to make it permanent following a review of its effectiveness. The Board should comprise members from outside the School, including from other UCD Schools and stakeholders.

2.14   The School should establish a well-understood and streamlined organisational structure that caters for both efficiency and inclusiveness. To facilitate this the School should:

2.14.1 consider forming a smaller, executive (or management) team with representation from the four disciplines - while the current School Executive is diverse and relatively highly populated which is positive during the transition phase, in the longer term, it may be better to have a leaner, more streamlined committee.

2.14.2 establish a Teaching and Learning Committee as a matter of urgency.

2.14.3 ensure that the role of School Director of External Relations & Communications is filled – responsibilities should include partnership development, recruitment of students and alumni engagement.

2.14.4 include students in appropriate School Committees and events - while the School operates staff/student committees and students are represented on the Programme Board, there is scope to include students more. The School should also encourage and further support students holding student-led events such as talks, exhibitions, debates and careers fairs.

2.15 It is important that internal communication in the School be enhanced. The Review Group commends the School on its recent development of an internal communications strategy and recommends that this is given a high priority and undertaken as soon as possible.

2.16 It is essential that the School establish a robust induction policy, procedure and subsequent mechanism for the exchange of information within the School. This is particularly needed for new faculty, staff and students as well as hourly-paid faculty and staff that need answers to questions along the lines of "how does the School/University work?" and "where do I get help with HR questions?" The Review Group recommend that the School Office be open and staffed during all office hours and that it becomes the administrative centre for the School where information can be disseminated and problems can be solved.

2.17 There has been a lot of reflection on where the School came from and what it comprises at present. The Review Group recommend that the School now increase its efforts in forward thinking and in articulating a shared ambition and vision. This should also include clear articulation of the identity of each of the disciplines in the School and how they interlink.

C. Staff and Facilities

Commendations

3.8 The Review Group met a positive, loyal, engaged and high-quality faculty and staff despite the hard economic times they have been through; and despite reorganisation, they have an optimistic spirit.

3.9 The buildings in Richview are special and full of character. Most of the functions fit well into the building structure.

3.10 The School is to be commended on its pro-active approach to developing a strategy for the revitalisation of the Richview and Newstead campus both in the short and long term, which takes the sustainable approach of re-using and improving existing buildings rather than demolishing them. The Review Group support this approach especially, in relation to climate change imperatives and the need for the University to reduce embodied carbon emissions.

3.11   The Richview Library provides an exceptional learning environment with a very pro-active librarian and unique resources, for example, the map collections are also available to the public. The national value of this collection should not be underestimated, particularly given its significant use by practitioners, which also provides a conduit for the profession to work with the School. As such, the Library is also part of the Schools out-reach in a very positive manner.

Recommendations

3.12   The Review Group strongly recommends that the School review the number of hourly-paid faculty, staff and non-permanent fractional lecturers. The balance between permanent and non-permanent faculty and staff needs to be changed in order to enhance research capacity, to strengthen strategic, long-term planning of teaching, and to make it possible for academic staff to take part in studio teaching.

3.13   The School also needs to develop a policy regarding hourly-paid posts. There should be an appropriate balance between short-term and transitory appointments (lasting no longer than a few years) with a view to continually refreshing teaching from best practice, and those developed into proper (possibly larger fractional) posts where faculty and staff have the benefits of career development and promotion. The present imbalance with too few larger fractional and full-time posts needs to be addressed to help improve the balance of management loads for these posts.

3.14   The School should liaise with UCD HR regarding the development of career paths for the (fewer) part-time lecturers. This should include considering how to involve them in research activities or to establish a category of, for example, University Teacher.

3.15   The recruitment procedure for part-time and hourly-paid staff should be transparent and competitive.

3.16   Contracts for part-time lecturers and hourly-paid staff should be reviewed to ensure clarity regarding working conditions and workloads.

3.17   Mitigating dissatisfaction among the hourly-paid faculty and staff as to their lack of involvement in teaching decisions, communication with the permanent faculty and staff, job content (lack of responsibility), planning of their workload, communication with the School, and experience of lack of payment for preparation and administrative tasks should be considered as an important short-time-task for School management.

3.18   In respect of recommendation 3.17, the School should create a communication forum or other structure that can foster a teaching environment and collegial atmosphere to address inclusion of part-time lecturers and hourly-paid faculty and staff in academic exchange and teaching and management decisions.

3.19   In terms of a strategic recruitment strategy, the Review Group recommends that the School seeks to create new permanent inter-disciplinary positions, to help cohesion and

collaboration in the School. Possible areas for consideration include Landscape Urbanism, Housing, Smart Cities, Resource Efficiency, Climate Adaptation, Urban or Environmental Design. The Review Group also advises the School to prioritise international recruitment. When the opportunity arises, the School should consider appointing a full professor in Landscape Architecture to support its central role as a link between disciplines. The School should develop a five-year staff succession plan to help steer recruitment when the opportunity arises.

3.20   UCD, at University level, should actively consider and support the imaginative and sustainable prospects proposed (sketch plan and funding ideas) by the School to upgrade the Richview campus, bearing in mind the University's commitment to sustainable development and the need to reduce embodied carbon emissions overall. It is a strong wish from the School, and needs to be taken seriously, before a final decision is made.

3.21   The University should urgently review the maintenance and upgrading requirements for the buildings at Richview, in particular, ensuring compliance with legislative requirements regarding access for people with disabilities.

3.22   The School should consider reorganising the use of Newstead/Richview to enhance the utilisation of space and integrate students and teachers more. Whilst Richview is cramped, Newstead has ample space. The Review Group proposes that some architecture and landscape architecture studios should be co-located in Newstead, to integrate the students better and to create mutual learning and friendly competition among the students.

3.23   The Review Group also recommends the continued use of the Earth Institute building for the School's research purposes.

3.24   As there are too many access cards in circulation, the Review Group recommends that UCD Estates, together with the School, examine possible access and security issues in Richview and Newstead.

3.25   The School needs to develop a functioning and attractive common room for faculty and staff (there is the space).

D. Teaching, Learning and Assessment

Commendations

4.7   The School has a broad range of learning and teaching modules, with talented faculty and staff, who are very flexible and generous in their approach to delivering these on a collaborative basis.

4.8   There is an exceptionally strong studio culture in APEP due to highly dedicated faculty and staff.

4.9   There is a very strong relationship between the Professions and the School, with Alumni and other stakeholders keen to support the School and contribute to practice-based research live projects.

4.10   Excellent reports from external examiners.

Recommendations

4.11   Clear investment needs to be made to create time for faculty and part-time practitioners to be in dialogue with each other at key points in the year, to aid strategic programme development. This could take the form of annual programme reviews and planning meetings, attended by all learning and teaching faculty and staff.

4.12   One of the early tasks of the newly formed Learning and Teaching Committee should be to examine the similarities and difference among programmes offered by the School, with a view to removing redundancy and enhancing offerings, while reducing overall teaching loads.

4.13   The School needs to develop a strong Learning and Teaching Strategy, which includes a full audit of all disciplinary modules and programmes, to help identify new niche programmes and modules that bridge the various disciplines. This is an essential precursor to defining any new teaching roles in the School.

4.14   All the programmes should be engaging directly with global challenges and bring to the campus best practice from the practitioners and professions.

4.15   Investment needs to be made in developing a robust School Faculty and Staff Development Strategy for all staff, which will allow them to benefit from learning about new pedagogical developments, software, and methods to enhance the student experience. This needs to be combined with a more explicit and written induction process for both faculty, staff and part-time practitioners at a School level (see also 2.16).

4.16   Provision of appropriate software, space and resource for IT delivery remains a challenge for the School, and the University is strongly encouraged to provide more learning technologist support, GIS, Adobe and other proprietary licences on a local basis for students as these are core to their learning process.

E. Curriculum Development and Review

Commendations

5.8   The School is to be commended for its bold plans to strategically diversify its student intake through internationalisation, and to grow its income in order to invest in staffing and resources and thus significantly improve the student experience.

5.9   The development of various new Masters programmes in the School that enhance students ability to work within an interdisciplinary environment is welcome, given the increasing need for diverse professional collaboration in practice.

5.10   The development of an international curriculum through international accreditation by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) is to be commended.

5.11   The School is commended on its positive engagement with programme review given that the School is also in transition.

5.12   The high employment level of graduates is commendable.

5.13   The proposal to develop a practice-based Housing Masters programme is an excellent idea, given the significant challenge that this sector presents.

5.14   The Review Group supports the transition of the Policy and Environmental Planning programme, from a BA to a BSc in the School ALPEP Programme Board.

Recommendations

5.15   A more market-orientated approach needs to be taken in terms of redeveloping or developing new Masters programmes. For example, there is an opportunity to develop new and innovative Masters programmes in Landscape rather than reintroduce programmes that disappeared previously.

5.16   The School should consider the introduction of credit-bearing internships across all its Undergraduate and Masters programmes. There is a good precedent in the M.Eng programme Year 4, which is supported by College level internship co-ordinators, and of which the School could take advantage.

5.17   The Landscape Architecture faculty and staff within the School are encouraged to carry out a review of their interests and expertise in order to tease out a clearer identity and USP, which they then need to project more strongly to the other School disciplines, in relation to their learning and teaching and to their research strengths. Landscape Architecture needs to be viewed as an equal partner in relation to research and programme development, as well as all publicity in the School.

5.18   A clear strategy needs to be developed for the PhD programme, which sits within an overall Learning and Teaching strategy. This would help PhD students to gain a broad range of initial research skills and understanding as well as to integrate them more within the School in terms of teaching opportunities which can support existing faculty, staff and part-time practitioners. A more formal process for identifying PhD student teaching capabilities and locating these in relation to teaching requirements is required. The development of industry scholarships will help to support the PhD programme.

5.19   A review of the curriculum to ensure the delivery of transferable skills related to students transitioning from one part of their career to another is recommended.

5.20   Faculty and staff should be encouraged to adopt different methods of assessment e.g. peer assessment and group-work assessment at all stages, including final submissions.

5.21   Collaboration should be fostered amongst students of the built environment professions (including Engineering) to develop a language of collaboration for subsequent professional practice.

5.22   Dates for portfolio submissions within teaching term should be clarified in advance, to ensure that there are no clashes with other module submissions, and that students are aware of these from the outset.

5.23   Excessive student workload at key points needs to be addressed through comprehensive time management and timetabling, co-ordinated across all programmes. This should include strict and reasonable deadlines for submission of work. For example, dates for submission of portfolios should be in week 12 of the semester at the latest and not during the study week or after exams.

F. Research Activity

Commendations

6.9   Faculty and staff in Planning, Environmental Policy, and Landscape Architecture, in particular, are to be commended for their collaborative projects.

6.10   Research administration is facilitated by a dedicated research manager in the School.

6.11   School faculty are influential in policy circles.

6.12   The PEP grouping have worked hard to successfully establish a global reputation in the last decade.

6.13   Evidence provided by the School indicated that the impact of research conducted by the School's faculty and staff exceeds that of competitor schools.

6.14   The Research Committee is actively promoting a developing cross-discipline research culture within the School.

Recommendations

6.15   Exploit new opportunities that an interdisciplinary school creates to open new vistas on societal challenges, while building on areas of shared interest and expertise.

6.16   Establish what counts as 'quality' in research—take charge of the yardstick used for measurement. With the support of the College, engage with the UCD Research Office to update the research matrices used in the University, to include measures that are more relevant to the disciplines within the School.

6.17   Obtain or provide support (beyond that provided by the School's dedicated research manager), for faculty and staff to develop and sustain research activity and exploit strategic funding opportunities.

6.18   Work on theorising practice-based research to bring 'know-how' to the level of 'know-that', while reviving design theory.

6.19   Thread research more visibly throughout curricula School-wide, emphasising the everyday use and testing of theories (as explanations, justifications, and interpretations) in the world of practice.

6.20   Continue to build numbers of PhD students and postdoctoral researchers.

6.21   When developing the School Research Strategy, the following should be considered:

6.21.1 In delivering professional degree programmes that embody a studio culture, or entail many faculty-student contact hours, faculty and staff are challenged to preserve time to focus on academic research.

6.21.2 A strategic approach to obtaining adequate research funding should be a priority.

6.21.3 Identifying and working with governmental and non-governmental organisations and other 'natural' clients, to develop and pursue a problem-driven, interdisciplinary research programme with high policy relevance.

6.21.4 Bringing more attention to the knowledge transfer that the School facilitates through translational research.

6.21.5 The School should ensure adequate resources and attention is given to preparing the next generation of research academicians.

6.21.6 Dedicating more human resources to research support activities—e.g., proposal preparation or liaising with funding agency programme officers.

6.21.7 Envisioning and pursuing joint projects with other Irish or European institutions e.g., managing transitions in regional infrastructure systems.

G. Management of Quality and Enhancement

<u>Commendations</u>

7.4   The School is to be commended for its engagement with the University periodic quality review process and the quality of its Self-assessment Report.

7.5   The School engages well with University quality mechanisms, for example, a robust external examiner system, to assure the academic standards of its modules and awards.

7.6   The Head and Deputy Head of School have worked hard to develop an inclusive management structure which has guided the establishment of the new School Executive.

7.7   The School Executive meets regularly which is important in building knowledge and trust between the new partners, and the development of a shared vision for the School.

7.8   The new Programme Board is a very positive step towards integration of the management of teaching quality. This will ensure a shared approach towards the grading process.

<u>Recommendations</u>

7.9   Taking into consideration that the School is undergoing a significant amount of change and working to embed new structures and processes in a relatively short space of time, the Review Group would recommend that:

   7.9.1   the School clearly map out its current structures, processes and procedures.

   7.9.2   the School should set out a work programme to address any overlaps and gaps identified by the mapping exercise.

   7.9.3   the work programme should be made up of a series of short, achievable projects, with clear timelines, that are planned to be delivered over a number of years.

   7.9.4   the School should engage with other University units, for example, UCD Human Resources and UCD Agile to support these mapping and planning exercises.

H. Support Services

<u>Commendations</u>

8.8   The School is to be commended for establishing and maintaining good relationships with University-wide service providers, especially with the School's remote location on campus.

8.9   The School engages positively with UCD International on its Erasmus programmes.

8.10   Facilities in Richview urgently require improvement.

8.11   While the School engages well with UCD International to support delivery of its international student recruitment plan, there is scope for further development of this relationship, in particular, to develop a tailored induction programme and to ensure good residential accommodation for oversees students on arrival.

8.12   The School should conduct a needs assessment of their IT requirements, in conjunction with UCD IT Services.

8.13   The School should meet with the UCD Career Development Centre to identify the supports available for students and the School.

8.14   The School should seek advice and guidance from UCD Research and UCD Development and Alumni Relations, to support more effective engagement with industry and alumni networks.

I. External Relations

Commendations

9.6   The School attracts many external visitors to its campus.

9.7   The different disciplines in the School are engaged in many excellent external relations activities.

Recommendations

9.8   Develop *with the full participation of key stakeholders,* a Communications and Marketing Strategy, that communicates the School's joint narrative and vision, and includes a clear, step-by-step plan for the School's external activities. The School should seek support from both University Relations and the College when developing their plan.

9.9   Promote and invigorate a School-wide student organisation and empower it (as the alumni organisation of the next generation), to undertake significant activities, such as the organisation of on-campus career fairs or the production of a regular (digital) newsletter for alumni and stakeholders.

9.10   Develop further—*and refresh regularly*—the School website as a key tool to promote the School and maintain visibility. Use the website, moreover, as a two-way communication tool.

9.11   Continue to engage with professional bodies and consider organising receptions for UCD alumni of the School at *every* professional meeting.

9.12   Involve faculty and staff directly in exploring development activities.

9.13   Engage more with international students and international institutions of higher learning. The joint degree programmes the School is pursuing represent a promising start.

9.14   Recognising that alumni identify strongly with schools from which they have graduated and want to 'give back,' work to develop and maintain alumni relationships and involve alumni regularly in on-campus panel discussions of matters of professional practice, pro-seminars, and internship, job placement, and mentoring programmes, and fund-raising.

9.15   As a general rule, involve the communities of practice served by the School at every level and every theatre of the School's operations.

9.16   The School should emphasise the significant role played by the School's Library as a resource for planning and design practitioners in Ireland.

**UCD School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy –
Response to the Review Group Report**

The periodic review process has been extremely valuable and timely, facilitating the critical evaluation of the scope and ambition of the newly formed School, which encompasses the four distinct disciplines of Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Planning and Environmental Policy. The Review Group Site Visit was a positive and constructive experience. We welcome the endorsement of the Review Group for our activities through commendations and will carefully consider the recommendations during the Quality Improvement Planning process.

There was a high level of engagement from all staff categories and from the student community, both in compiling the Self-assessment Report and in interacting with the Review Group during the site visit. The School wishes to thank the Review Group for their time, expertise and constructive comments, both at the visit and in their helpful Report. The School is taking immediate action on the prioritised recommendations in parallel with the process of preparing the Quality Improvement Plan over the coming months.

The Review Group's positive recognition of the critical role of the Richview Library in serving both the School, as newly constituted, and the professions affiliated with the disciplines within the School, thus serving as a conduit for outreach, is very welcome. More broadly, the Review Group's recognition of the value of the School's proposal to continue siting itself in Richview/Newstead, rejuvenated as a state-of-the-art precinct for the Designed Environment, is also welcome, and points to the need for this option to be fully explored in the context of larger plans for UCD Campus Development.

With specific reference to the prioritised recommendations identified by the Review Group, the School's initial proposals/comments are outlined below:

(i)   **Recommendation: The Review Group recommended that the School should consider appointing an Advisory Board to help drive change in the newly formed School. The Board could initially be convened for 2 years with the option to make it permanent following a review of its effectiveness. The Board should comprise members from outside the School, including from other UCD Schools and stakeholders.**

Proposal/Comment: The School acknowledges the merit of this proposal, as it would aid the newly constituted multidisciplinary School in establishing how to best exploit the inherent potential of bringing these disciplines together in terms of teaching, research and external relations. The School Executive, in tandem with the Quality Improvement team, will identify appropriate candidates for this Advisory Group and hope to establish it for a two-year period from the end of 2016. The ambition for the composition of the Board will be to look beyond UCD, to access the required breadth and understanding of the challenges faced by a

multidisciplinary school of our size, and to draw in specialist expertise from within UCD such as UCD Research Partners.

(ii) **Recommendation: The School should establish a Teaching and Learning Committee as a matter of urgency.**

Proposal/Comment: The School concurs with the recommendation of the Review Group, and intends to establish a Teaching & Learning Committee representative of all four disciplines in the coming academic term. As the School's Head of Teaching & Learning is currently on sabbatical, an interim Head will be assigned immediately to nominate members to the Committee. The Committee will draw on the work of the ongoing Curriculum Review Committee.

(iii) **Recommendation: The Review Group strongly recommends that the School review the number of hourly-paid faculty and non-permanent fractional lecturers. The balance between permanent and non-permanent faculty needs to be changed in order to enhance research capacity, to strengthen strategic, long-term planning of teaching, and to make it possible for faculty to take part in studio teaching.**

Proposal/Comment: For clarity, it is important to note that many of our fractional lecturer posts are permanent across the disciplines, thus the staff categories found within the School are permanent full-time lecturers, permanent fractional lecturers, staff on Contracts of Indefinite Duration [CID] and, in transitory positions, fractional lecturers, hourly-paid staff and postdoctoral researchers. The School intends to review its staffing profile as part of the Quality Improvement plan to achieve an appropriate balance between hourly-paid, permanent and non-permanent fractional lecturers, full-time staff and postdoctoral researchers to best achieve its goals in research and teaching.

(iv) **Recommendation: The School also needs to develop a policy regarding hourly-paid posts. There should be an appropriate balance between short-term and transitory appointments (lasting no longer than a few years) with a view to continually refreshing teaching from best practice, and those developed into proper (possibly larger fractional) posts where faculty and staff have the benefits of career development and promotion. The present imbalance with too few larger fractional and full-time posts needs to be addressed to help improve the balance of management loads for these posts.**

Proposal/Comment: The School strongly agrees with the recommendation of the Review Group but notes that achieving a better balance between transitory positions and permanent posts, and more appropriate forms of contracts and career development opportunities will require input and coordination with UCD HR to identify or create better employment contract types, and appropriate mechanisms for career development and promotion. This process has already started with proposals for teaching track fellows, which would include opportunities for career development.

(v)   **Recommendation: The University should urgently review the maintenance and upgrading requirements for the buildings at Richview, in particular, ensuring compliance with legislative requirements regarding access for people with disabilities.**

Proposal/Comment: The School recognises that this is a critical issue to address, in concert with UCD Access & Lifelong Learning, which has become particularly urgent in light of a new student accepted 2016/17 with mobility issues. It is important to note that compliance with Health and Safety regulations and, more particularly, Fire Safety regulations is an equally critical issue to address at Richview. The School will request that UCD Estates carry out an audit as a matter of urgency and will work with UCD Estates to develop appropriate solutions to meet these requirements.

(vi)   **Recommendation: The School should consider reorganising the use of Newstead/Richview to enhance the utilisation of the space and integrate students and teachers more. Whilst Richview is cramped, Newstead has ample space. The Review Group proposes that some architecture and landscape architecture studios should be co-located in Newstead, to integrate the students better and to create mutual learning and friendly competition among the students.**

Proposal/Comment: The School acknowledges the virtue implicit in this recommendation, specifically the better integration of Landscape Architecture with the remainder of the School and a more appropriate use of space across the Richview/Newstead precinct. However, we would challenge the statement that the space allocated to Landscape Architecture in Newstead is ample and the implication that all space in Richview is cramped or used beyond its capacity. A review of space utilisation in Richview/Newstead across all four disciplines has been started, with the short-term goal of more balanced use of spaces across the precinct, capitalising on any opportunities for integration. However, in the longer term, the School would hope to enhance and enlarge the space available at Richview to enable Landscape Architecture to be relocated to Richview.

(vii)   **Recommendation: Clear investment needs to be made to create time for faculty and part-time practitioners to be in dialogue with each other at key points in the year, to aid strategic programme development. This could take the form of annual programme reviews and planning meetings, attended by all learning and teaching faculty and staff.**

Proposal/Comment: The School agrees that the complexity of the multidisciplinary nature of the School, coupled with the diversity of staff types has contributed to ineffective communication and collaborations, and is currently working toward developing a more effective communications strategy to address this issue in part. The School also agrees with the Review Group that more frequent and structured programme coordination meetings could be held across the School, beyond the main ALPEP Programme Board, which would give full-time and part-time staff better opportunities to work strategically together.

(viii) **Recommendation: The School should consider the introduction of credit-bearing internships across all its Undergraduate and Masters programmes. There is a good**

precedent in the M.Eng programme Year 4, which is supported by College level internship co-ordinators, and of which the School could take advantage.

Proposal/Comment: While the School acknowledges the value of internship opportunities in professional degree programmes, there is a complex landscape of overlapping frameworks, including the variability of available and consistent suitable employment opportunities, accreditation requirements, regulatory requirements (in architecture) and professional frameworks across the four disciplines, which make this a difficult recommendation to achieve. Equally, many of our programmes, particularly in Planning and Environmental Policy, are of 1-2 years in duration, making this especially difficult to address. Nevertheless, this recommendation will be taken under advisement and considered across the full complement of degree programmes offered by the School by the Teaching & Learning Committee to identify where opportunities exist, such as the facilitation of internships, with support from supported by College level internship co-ordinators, or recognition of learning achievements through credit-bearing dissertations.

(ix)   Recommendation: Faculty and staff should be encouraged to adopt different methods of assessment e.g. peer assessment and group-work assessment at all stages, including final submissions.

Proposal/Comment: There currently exists considerable diversity in assessment methods used across the modules delivered by the School, including group-work assessment at all stages. The School acknowledges that there are opportunities within several programmes to adopt some form of peer assessment, particularly in the Masters level programmes, and this will be reviewed by the Teaching & Learning Committee.

(x)   Recommendation: Develop *with the full participation of key stakeholders,* a Communications and Marketing Strategy, that communicates the School's joint narrative and vision, and includes a clear, step-by-step plan for the School's external activities. The School should seek support from both University Relations and the College when developing their plan.

Proposal/Comment: The School acknowledges the need for such a strategy and the value of gathering input from key stakeholders, but also recognise that it is a complex issue as the stakeholders vary across the disciplines. We will endeavour to use our considerable alumni for input into the process, and have plans in place to work closely with the Marketing & Engagement Manager for the College, in the coming year to address this need.

Beyond the principal recommendations made by the Review Group, there are a number of specific recommendations on which the School would like to comment:

2.12   Recommendation: The budget and financial organisation of the School still reflects the old schools in the sense that each disciplinary group still has its own pay-line or sub-budget. The groups thus exist as economic "silos" in the organisation. It is essential to eliminate such budgetary "silos" in order to create room for strategic decisions by the new School leadership for investment and new positions "between disciplines". The School should set

a realistic timeframe for this budgetary merger, for example, 2 years. The budget should not look backwards, but should be seen as a living document to allow, discuss and implement change.

Proposal/Comment: The School acknowledges the need for a budget that operates as a 'living document' to allow for monitoring, discussion and to facilitate management of resources. The School will explore options for a budgetary merger and, in the immediate term, an additional budget line will be established to support shared resources and cross-disciplinary endeavours, for example the Research Lecture Series, and strategic initiatives such as shared posts.

5.17   **Recommendation: The Landscape Architecture faculty and staff within the School are encouraged to carry out a review of their interests and expertise in order to tease out a clearer identity and USP, which they then need to project more strongly to the other School disciplines, in relation to their learning and teaching and to their research strengths. Landscape Architecture needs to be viewed as an equal partner in relation to research and programme development, as well as all publicity in the School.**

Proposal/Comment: This recommendation is linked to a number of other comments made by the Review Group on the subject of Landscape Architecture, including their lack of visibility in the School name. The School recognises the importance of valorising the Landscape Architecture programme more clearly and consistently in the School structure, the marketing and communications strategy, and the School name and believe that the provision of additional accommodation within the Richview precinct to relocate Landscape Architecture to Richview would further consolidate and support this ambition.   The rebranding of the School under a more inclusive name will also require the reconsideration of the name of the College.

5.22   **Recommendations: Dates for portfolio submissions within teaching term should be clarified in advance, to ensure that there are no clashes with other module submissions, and that students are aware of these from the outset.**
AND

5.23:   **Excessive student workload at key points needs to be addressed through comprehensive time management and timetabling, co-ordinated across all programmes. This should include strict and reasonable deadlines for submission of work. For example, dates for submission of portfolios should be in week 12 of the semester at the latest and not during the study week or after exams.**

Proposal/Comment: The School has consistently endeavoured to clarify deadlines in advance and to monitor the submission of portfolios relative to other deadlines. However, this coordination is an on-going issue and these issues will be reviewed by the Teaching & Learning Committee to find a more robust system for coordination.

Review Visit Timetable

UCD School of Architecture, Planning & Environmental Policy

18-21 April 2016

Pre-Visit Briefing Prior to Site Visit – Monday, 18 April 2016

17.00-19.15   RG meet in the hotel to review preliminary issues and confirm work schedule and assignment of tasks for the site visit

19.30   Dinner hosted by the UCD Registrar and Deputy President

Day 1: Tuesday, 19 April 2016 Venue: Architecture Boardroom, Richview

08.10   RG meet - UCD Research Building

08.15-08.45   RG meet with **College Principal,** UCD College of Engineering & Architecture – **UCD Research Boardroom**

09.00-09.30   Travel from UCD Research Building to UCD Richview

09.30-09.45   Private meeting of Review Group (RG)

09.45-10.30   RG meet with **Head of School/Dean of Architecture**

10.30-10.45   Break

10.45-11.30   RG meet with **SAR Coordinating Committee**

11.30-11.45   Break

11.45-12.30   RG meet **Programme Deans**

12.30-12.45	Break – RG review key observations and prepare for lunch time meeting
12.45-13.45	Working lunch (buffet) – meeting with employers (and/or other external stakeholders)
13.45-14.15	RG review key observations
14.15-14.45	RG meet with **representative group of faculty and staff from Planning & Environmental Policy** – primary focus on Teaching and Learning, and Curriculum issues.
14.45-15.00	Break
15.00-15.30	RG meet with **representative group of faculty and staff from Landscape Architecture** – primary focus on Teaching and Learning, and Curriculum issues.
15.30-15.45	RG tea/coffee break
15.45-16.15	RG meet with **representative group of faculty and staff from Architecture** – primary focus on Teaching and Learning, and Curriculum issues.
16.15-16.30	Break
16.30-17.15	RG meet with support staff representatives
17.15-17.30	Break
17.30-18.30	**Tour of facilities**
18.45	RG depart (Newstead)

Day 2: Wednesday, 20 April 2016
Venue: Architecture Boardroom, Richview

08.45-09.15	Private meeting of the RG
09.15-09.55	RG meet relevant **University support service representatives**
09.55-10.10	Break
10.10-11.00	RG meet with a representative group of **postgraduate students** (taught and research) **and recent graduates** (PG and UG)
11.00-11.15	RG tea/coffee break
11.15-12.15	RG meet with the School Research Committee (and other faculty and staff members nominated by the HoS)

12.15-12.30	Break - RG review key observations
12.30-13.15	Lunch – Review Group and Head of School
13.15-14.00	RG meet with **representative group of undergraduate students**
14.00-14.15	RG private meeting - review key observations
14.15-15.00	RG meet with **College Finance Manager, College Marketing and Engagement Manager, UCD HR** and **Head of School,** to outline School's financial situation and resources
15.00-15.15	Break
15.15-15.45	RG meet with **recently appointed members of faculty and staff**
15-45-16.00	Break
16.00-16.45	RG available for **private individual meetings with faculty and staff**
17.00-17.45	RG meet with **studio and hourly-paid faculty and staff**
17.45-18.00	RG private meeting – review key observations/findings
18.00-18.15	RG available for **private individual meetings with faculty and staff**
18.30	RG depart

Day 3: Thursday, 21 April 2016
Venue: Architecture Boardroom, Richview

09.00-09.30	Private meeting of RG
09.30-10.30	RG begin preparing draft RG Report and exit presentation
10.30-10.45	Break
10.45-12.30	RG continue preparing draft RG Report and exit presentation
12.30-13.00	RG meet with **College Principal** to feedback initial outline commendations and recommendations
13.00-13.30	Lunch
13.30-14.30	RG finalise first draft of RG Report and feedback commendations/recommendations

14.30-14.45   Break

14.45-15.00   RG meet with **Head of School** to feedback initial outline commendations and recommendations

15.15-15.30   **Exit presentation** to <u>all available faculty and staff of the unit</u> summarising the principal commendations/recommendations of the Review Group

15.30-16.00   Private meeting of Review Group

16.00   Review Group depart