



SOUTH EAST TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

COURSE EVALUATION 3

ASSESSORS' REPORT TO ACADEMIC COUNCIL

COURSE EVALUATED: Bachelor of Science in Software Systems Development
Bachelor of Science (H) in Software Systems Development

SCHOOL: Science and Computing

DEPARTMENT: Computing and Mathematics

INTRODUCTION

The following is a review report to Academic Council from the panel of assessors on the proposal from the School of Science and Computing at South East Technological University to change certain aspects of the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Science (H) in Software Systems Development through the University's Course Evaluation Stage 3 (CE3) process. In accordance with the regulations governing the evaluation of new programme proposals, as set out in the South East Technological University *Programme Quality Assurance Enhancement Policy and Procedures*, the programme proposal was reviewed by a panel of assessors.

The panel of assessors who contributed to this report were:

- Dr Ross Anderson, Lecturer in Biomechanics, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, University of Limerick
- Dr Colette Moloney, Assistant Registrar, South East Technological University
- Dr Matt Pain, Reader in Biomechanics, School of Sport, Exercise, and Health Sciences, Loughborough University
- Fiona Ryan, Consultant and Senior Project Manager, Sports Tech Ireland, Limerick
- Dr Colin Shewell, Lecturer in Computer Science, University of Ulster
- Laura Widger, Academic Council Representative, South East Technological University

In accordance with the regulations set out in the aforementioned *Programme Quality Assurance Enhancement Policy and Procedures*, a review meeting took place on 18 June 2024. The review meeting was conducted virtually via Teams. The following members of the South East Technological University team were present:

- Prof. Peter McLoughlin, Head of School of Science and Computing, South East Technological University
- Dr Alan Davy, Head of Department of Computing and Mathematics, South East Technological University
- Dr Richard Bolger, Lecturer, Department of Sport and Exercise Science, South East Technological University
- Dr Siobhan Drohan, Lecturer, Department of Computing and Mathematics, South East Technological University

- Amanda Freeman-Gater, Lecturer, Department of Computing and Mathematics, South East Technological University
- Dr Michael Hanlon, Lecturer, Department of Sport and Exercise Science, South East Technological University
- Aubrey Storey, Lecturer, Department of Sport and Exercise Science, South East Technological University
- Dr Frank Walsh, Lecturer, Department of Computing and Mathematics, South East Technological University

The assessors wish to thank the members of the development team for engaging generously and openly with the review process.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONDITIONS

2.1 General Remarks

The panel commends the School on seeking to amend existing programmes to allow for cross-disciplinary delivery, in line with the University's Strategic Plan, and for seeking to encourage more female participation on computing programmes by including an attractive applied option as an elective stream. The panel compliments the team on their obvious depth of knowledge in the subject area and their proposal to bring that depth of knowledge to a new elective stream by utilising existing modules to harness the experience gained in delivering same in the School of Health Sciences. The panel **recommends approval of the changes proposed for the Bachelor of Science and the Bachelor of Science (H) in Software Systems Development** until the next School Review in the School of Science and Computing. **Approval is conditional on the submission of a revised programme document that takes account of the conditions and recommendations outlined below; and the submission of a summary document describing the responses and actions of the School to address the conditions and recommendations made by the review panel.**

Areas for attention have been emboldened in the text for convenience of reference. Action is required on items marked 'Conditions' and such action is mandatory if the programme is to be approved; action is highly recommended on items marked 'Recommendations'.

2.2 *Conditions*

- There was some inconsistency noted in the document, particularly between the module descriptors and the programme schedules, and the assessment in the module descriptors was not given in the format as per approved programme schedule. **The School should review the documentation to ensure that there is consistency between the programme schedules and the proposed module descriptors, in the areas of module title, assessment, and contact hours. The programme schedules should be presented in the standard SETU format, particularly in the area of assessment.**

2.3 *Recommendations*

- In discussion with the panel, the School outlined how the proposed stream integrated into the programme as a whole, specifically how the core modules on the programme enhanced the stream specialisation and the option for the learner to use the final year project to specialise further in his/her area of interest. In addition, the School gave a clear rationale for their choice of modules for inclusion, the vision for the stream and the potential career pathways for graduates. **The School should consider enhancing the proposal document, student handbook and any promotional material relating to the programme, by including a discussion on how core modules on the programme supplement and enhance the learning in the stream. The School should also clearly articulate the aim of the stream and possible career options for graduates.**
- **At the next opportunity to review, the School should consider amending the Indicative Content for the module ‘Internet of Things: Standards and Protocols’ to better reflect the nature and content of the module, as it is delivered.** At the review meeting, a more applied hardware nature was described which is not immediately obvious from the module descriptor.
- The proposal document detailed practical group sizes and argued that the amendments to the programme would be cost neutral. However, it is not within the remit of the panel to agree or approve class sizes or resources for the programme. **Prior to offering the stream to learners, the School should engage with the School of Health Sciences, in conjunction with the Central Timetabling Unit, to identify and quantify the resources required to offer the stream and seek approval for same, if necessary.**

Signed:

Laura Widger

Date:
