

Report of Validation Panel for a Special Purpose, Minor or Supplemental Award

Date of Meeting:	January 17 th , 2017
Named Award:	Certificate
Programme Title:	Effective Teaching in Higher Education
Award Type:	Special Purpose Award
NFQ Level:	9
Intakes Commencing:	February 2017
ECTS/ACCS Credits:	20

PANEL MEMBERS

Name / Function / External Institution OR CIT Academic Unit
Geraldine O'Neill, Associate Professor, National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education
John Wall, Head of School, School of Lifelong Learning and Education, WIT.
Catherine Fehily, Head of School, CIT Crawford College of Art and Design.
Brian McGrath, Head of School, School of Business, CIT.
Roy Sleator, Professor, Department of Biological Sciences, CIT. (Chairperson)

PROPOSING TEAM MEMBERS

Name / Function / Academic Unit
Marese Bermingham, Head of the Teaching and Learning Unit, CIT.
Stephen Cassidy, Dean Of Academic Quality Enhancement, CIT.
Tom O'Mahony, Lecturer, Electrical & Electronic Engineering, CIT.

BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSED PROGRAMME

Teaching in higher education is one of the few remaining professions that does not required a professional qualification. The aim of the Special Purpose Award in Effective Teaching in Higher Education is to recognise, reward and enhance high quality teaching and learning practices that staff have developed through their experience of designing, teaching and assessing modules. The Award will provide a foundation basis for meeting the requirements for quality assurance of teaching and learning in the sector.

The Special Purpose Award is a 20 credit module spanning Effective Teaching, Assessment for Learning, Learning Technology and Curriculum Design. In accordance with Institute guidelines, derogation for this large credit module was sought from Academic Council and this derogation was granted at the December 2016 meeting of CIT's Academic Council. The assessment mechanism is a reflective digital portfolio; assessed against a rubric which will articulate the criteria and standard

FINDINGS OF THE PANEL

*NOTE: In this report, the term “Requirement” is used to indicate an action or amendment which in the view of the Panel **must** be undertaken prior to validation and commencement of the Programme. The term “Recommendation” indicates an item which the Course Board (or other relevant Institute unit) should implement at the earliest stage possible, and appropriate implementation of which should be the subject of ongoing monitoring.*

On consideration of the documentation provided and discussion of the programme with the proposers, the Panel has arrived at the following Findings, Requirements and Recommendations:

1. Validation Criteria

1.1 Is there a convincing need for the programme with a viable level of applications?

Overall Finding: Yes

Finding(s): This Special Purpose Award aligns strongly with the emerging ‘National Professional Development Framework for those who Teach’ which supports the concept of authentic work-based learning. This programme allows staff who teach the opportunity to be recognised for this activity, supported by reflection and evidenced-based practice.

Requirement(s):

Recommendation(s):

1.2 Are the level and type of the proposed award appropriate?

Overall Finding: Yes, subject to certain Requirements and/or Recommendations.

Finding(s): The award is set at level 9 and this is appropriate for this type of activity and in alignment with National and International practice. Reflection is a key aspect of this activity and this needs to be at a level appropriate for this award. Whereas the programme outcomes reflect the importance of ‘critical’ reflection, the criticality required for level 9 could be strengthened in the module learning outcomes and indicative content.

Requirement(s):

Recommendation(s):

- Emphasise the term ‘critical’ reflection in the module outcomes and in the module ‘indicative content’.

1.3 Is the learning experience of an appropriate level, standard and quality?

Overall Finding: Yes, subject to certain Requirements and/or Recommendations.

Finding(s): The module is of a high quality and allows for a wealth of appropriate teaching and learning activities for the participants. In particular it has a strong technological component. Its module outcomes and listed indicative content are consistent with many similar modules nationally and internationally. There are a few recommendations that would enhance the programme/module and be consistent with the ‘Programme Documentation’ document.

Requirement(s):

Recommendation(s):

- Given the Institution’s strategic aim to empower staff and students, it would be beneficial for the programme team to consider, prior to the next review, if more student (staff) choice could be built into the programme. For example, if this is aimed at senior staff, some staff might benefit and be more interested in critically

reflecting on their programme or institution-level design rather than module design. Could this, as an example, be an choice instead of the module design focus?

- The award should be available to staff who have five or more years' experience, but who are not full-time.
- Given the terminology of 'student-centred and 'blended design' learning in the 'Programme Documentation', these should be identified in the content, i.e. critiquing blended module designs.
- Developing students self-monitoring skills (formative assessment, Assessment As Learning) should be highlighted as a key component of assessment, as it is in line with the programme's student centred approach.
- Given the student-centred nature of the programme, module learning outcome 1 could be enhanced by wording such as 'Design, develop and *implement* teaching approaches, resources and *student learning experiences* that engage students in the learning process'.

1.4 Is the programme structure logical and well designed (including procedures for access, transfer and progression)?

Overall Finding: Yes

Finding(s): This is one large module and it has a clear and well considered structure. Its alignment with the other modules and potential progression routes have been considered.

Requirement(s):

Recommendation(s):

1.5 Are the programme management structures adequate?

Overall Finding: Yes

Finding(s): The module sits within the Institution's Teaching and Learning Unit, who's role is the professional development of staff.

Requirement(s):

Recommendation(s):

1.6 Are the resource requirements reasonable?

Overall Finding: Yes

Finding(s): The suggested participant numbers are low (5-10) and the resource implications are modest given the high level of self-directed activity.

Requirement(s):

Recommendation(s):

1.7 Will the impact of the programme on the Institute be positive?

Overall Finding: Yes

Finding(s): The module (Programme) has the potential to strongly enhance in particular senior staff's opportunity to critically reflect, dialogue and build the evidence-base for their teaching. It targets a group of staff who might otherwise not engage in this activity and has potential to have a strong impact on the Institution's Quality Assurance and Enhancement of teaching and learning. The programme/module team are to be congratulated on its development.

Requirement(s):

Recommendation(s):

CONCLUSION

Based on the above findings, the Panel recommends to Academic Council:

That the Programme be validated for five academic years, or until the next programmatic review, whichever is soonest, subject to implementation of the Requirements above, and with due regard to the Recommendations made.

APPENDIX A

Programme Outcomes

Upon successful completion of this programme the graduate will be able to demonstrate... :

PO2	Knowledge - Kind
(a)	Critical awareness of issues that impact student learning in their discipline.
PO4	Skill - Selectivity
(a)	Select and utilise specialist teaching and learning methodologies and technologies appropriate to their teaching context
PO5	Competence - Context
(a)	Act as an effective practitioner within their own disciplinary context.
PO7	Competence - Learning to Learn
(a)	Engage in evidence-based, reflective professional development
PO8	Competence - Insight
(a)	Critically reflect on the role of 'self' (i.e. teaching philosophy and approaches) and its impact on student learning

Stage Schedules

Stage 1

Mandatory								
Mod Code	Module Title	Co-ordinator	Level	Credits	FT Contact Hours	PT Contact Hours	Course Work	Formal Exam
EDUC9042	Teaching Practice In Higher Ed (Approved)	MARESE BIRMINGHAM	Expert	20.0	0.00	1.50	100.0	0.0