

PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW OF THE FACULTY OF BUSINESS & HUMANITIES 2015/16

Phase 2: Programme Review

PROGRAMME PANEL REPORT

SCHOOL: Business
DEPARTMENT: Organisation & Professional Development
DATE: April 12 – 13, 2016

PROGRAMMES SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW

Major Awards

Proposed for Revalidation: Master of Business (NFQ L9)

Proposed for Validation: Master of Business in Accounting (NFQ L9)
Master of Business in Enterprise & Innovation (NFQ L9)
Master of Business in Information Systems (NFQ L9)
Master of Business in Marketing (NFQ L9)
(new denominated awards for existing programme streams)

Master of Business in Tourism (NFQ L9)
(new award and new programme stream)

PROGRAMME REVIEW PANEL MEMBERSHIP

Mr Damien Cahill, IR/HR Specialist, IBEC (Chair)
Mr Alan Burrows, Strategic Business Manager, Standard Life
Dr Cecilia Hegarty, Director PLATO EBR, University of Ulster, Belfast
Prof Jimmy Hill, Vice-President Academic Affairs & Research, National College of Ireland
Mr Eoin Langan, Head of School of Business, Athlone Institute of Technology
Ms Eva Juhl, Institutional Review Facilitator, Cork Institute of Technology

PROGRAMME REPRESENTATION

Programme Staff

Mr Don Crowley, Head of Department of Organisation & Professional Development
Mr Al Devine, Lecturer, Department of Organisation & Professional Development
Mr Niall MacLochlainn, Lecturer, Department of Organisation & Professional Development
Mr John Meyler, Programme Co-ordinator MBus, Department of Applied Social Studies
Ms Lisa Murphy, Lecturer, Department of Organisation & Professional Development
Dr Aisling Ward, Lecturer, Department of Tourism & Hospitality Studies

Learner Representatives

Mr David McCarthy, MBus, Stage 1
Mr Conor O'Callaghan, MBus, Stage 1 / graduate of BA (Hons) in Information Systems

Graduates

Mr Oliver Blackwell, MBus 2014; BIS Technology Consultant, PepsiCo, Cork
Ms Eimear Hynes, MBus 2013; Accountant, Oxford Global Resources, Cork
Mr John Lynch, MBus 2015; Independent Management Consultant / P-T Lecturer, Department of Accounting & Information Systems, CIT
Mr Bryan Murphy, MBus 2015; Business Development & Operations Management Consultant
Mr Kevin O'Callaghan, MBus 2015; Engineering Assistant, Cork Harbour Commissioners
Mr Tony Sexton, MBus 2013; Snr Supply Chain Manager, M/A-COM Technology Solutions, Cork

External Stakeholders

Ms Bríd Creedon, Eli Lily, Cork
Ms Clodagh Daly, John Daly Opticians / Founder & Manager, Oliver Plunkett St. Traders, Cork
Ms Trish Drinan, formerly Event Manager, Munster Rugby / currently student on the BBus in Management (P-T), Stage 2
Ms Melanie Kavanagh, Marketing Manager, Everyman Theatre, Cork
Mr Andrew Roche, Business Development Manager, Iarnród Éireann, Cork
Mr Sean Sheehan, Managing Director, WISETEK, Cork

A. PROGRAMME SUMMARY AND MAJOR CHANGES PROPOSED

MASTER OF BUSINESS (TAUGHT PART-TIME)

1. Programme Summary

The Master of Business offered by the Department of Organisation & Professional Development is a taught part-time degree associated with 60 ECTS credits. The programme runs over four semesters, distributed over two (somewhat extended) academic years. It was originally presented to HETAC in 2005 by a consortium of CIT, Athlone IT and IT Tralee as a full-time programme with two streams, Accounting and Marketing. Between 2006 and 2008, the Institute validated a P-T delivery mode and two additional streams, subsequently running the programme in P-T mode only. The programme is addressed at entrants with management or leadership roles in a wide variety of organisations and businesses who wish to improve their effectiveness, decision-making and networking capabilities, learn how to empower others and encourage innovative thought, and learn how to effectively create and communicate a vision. The Panel heard that many graduates had been promoted to more senior positions in their organisation following graduation. Among the strengths of the programme are an emphasis on live case studies as well as on the strategic elements of business.

The normal minimum entry requirement is an Honours degree in Business or a cognate discipline, including science and technology, at Second Class Honours Grade 2 combined with at least five years appropriate work experience. RPL applicants with significant business experience at a strategic level are also considered. The Panel heard that a drop in total annual enrolments from 2010/11 to 2014/15 from 63 (respectively 64) to 40 was mainly due to the start of the MA in Human Resource Management and the levelling-out of pent-up demand. The annual intake into the programme had now 'naturally bedded in' at 20 – 25 new entrants; after this the programme team considered the spaces to be filled.

All learners take five mandatory 5-credit modules (three in Sem. 1, two in Sem. 2), followed in Sem. 3 by three grouped 5-credit electives in a stream of their choice. In the final semester learners complete a 20-credit research thesis. Only two modules are currently common with other programmes, *International Corporate Strategy* (MGMT9004, Sem. 1 M) and *Applied Corporate Strategy* (MGMT9005, Sem. 2 M), which are shared with the MA in HRM.

2. Major Changes Now Proposed

A number of significant changes are proposed both to the programme and the award available. Currently, all graduates are awarded a generic Master of Business irrespective of elective choice in Semester 3. Semester 3 electives are currently grouped into four specialist streams, as follows: Accounting, Enterprise & Innovation, Information Systems and Marketing (albeit only the Enterprise & Innovation and Marketing streams have been running for several years). Under the existing programme, students select one of the elective groups in Semester 3 and subsequently complete a 20-credit research project in Semester 4.

The Department of OPD now proposes

- a) To add a new specialist stream in Tourism to the existing programme specialisations. This is to be covered by three new 5-credit Tourism modules in Semester 3 and completion of a research project on a Tourism-related topic in Semester 4;
- b) To add to the existing generic MBus award – which is to be retained – a number of additional new named Master of Business awards which will reflect the Stage 2 specialisms selected by the students. The proposed new awards are: MBus in Accounting, MBus in Enterprise & Innovation, MBus in Information Systems, MBus in Marketing, and MBus in Tourism. Following validation of the new awards, each of the Semester 3 elective groups is to become a mandatory module group on one of the new specialised programmes, which are to have a common entry and Stage 1;
- c) In parallel to this, to allow students who do not wish to specialise in any one area to select a maximum of two Semester 3 modules (10 credits in total) from one specialist group together with one 5-credit module from another. Students who avail of the new ‘mixed’ mode are henceforth to be conferred with the generic Master of Business award, while students who opt for a particular Stage 2 specialism are to be conferred with one of the new named awards.

B. PANEL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION TO ACADEMIC COUNCIL ON REVALIDATION

Contingent upon confirmation of the fulfilment of any Panel conditions and the successful completion of the internal programme and module moderation process, the Panel **RECOMMENDS to Academic Council that the Master of Business be revalidated** and that the related **new awards of Master of Business in Enterprise & Innovation, Master of Business in Marketing and Master of Business in Tourism be validated**, for five years or until the next Programmatic Review, whichever is sooner, with effect from September 2016.

1.1. However, as a **condition for the continuing revalidation of the above programme(s) and awards beyond the academic year 2016/17**, the Panel **requires** that the Department submit to Academic Council within the academic year 2016/17 an appropriately researched and benchmarked Feasibility Study on the potential for conversion of the programme to an MBA (see Section 3.1).

As a condition of revalidation respectively validation, the following additional Panel requirements must also be met:

1.2. **Requirement:** The Panel [...] requires the proposers to re-examine and revise the Programme Outcomes for the proposed new specialised awards to better express the individual specialist graduate profile of each denominated award, linking back to the learning outcomes of the specialist modules within each stream as appropriate (see Section 3.4).

1.3. **Requirement:** The Panel [...] requires the programme team to develop an overall programme assessment strategy and schema. This should outline the strategy on assessment for the programme as whole and its expression in the individual modules, followed by a clear and succinct overview of the nature and timing of the individual assessment events throughout the course of the programme.

As part of this, the Panel asks the programme team to review the nature, timing and volume of assessments throughout the programme. The outcomes of this review should feed into the development of the assessment strategy as appropriate (see Section 5.4).

1.4. **Requirement:** The Panel [...] requires that the positions of the modules Contemporary Issues in Marketing and Services Marketing Management should be switched in the curriculum. Contemporary Issues in Marketing should be included in Semester 2 as a mandatory module for learners on all programme streams, while Services Marketing Management should become part of the specialised Marketing stream in Semester 3 (see Section 6.5).

1.5. **Requirement:** The Panel [...] requires that the level of the module *Strategic Issues in Tourism* (No Code Yet) be corrected to Expert (see Section 6.9).

1.6. **Requirement:** The Panel notes that the End of Module Formal Examination has been omitted from th[e] module descriptor for the module *Destination Marketing* (No Code Yet). [...] The Panel [...] requires that the module descriptor be corrected to show the final examination (see Section 6.11).

The Panel **DOES NOT RECOMMEND validation of** the proposed **new awards of Master of Business in Accounting and Master of Business in Information Systems**. The Panel considers that there is insufficient demand for these specialisations to justify the introduction of new specialised awards, and it is satisfied that the needs of any legacy learners can be met by the existing Master of Business which is proposed for revalidation (see Section 3.2).

2. GENERAL

2.1 **Commendation:** The Panel *commends* the dedication and commitment of the academic staff on the programme, which was reflected in the positive comments from students, graduates and stakeholders alike.

2.2 **Commendation:** The Panel also *commends* the obvious accessibility of the academic staff, which was attested to by both students and graduates.

2.3 **Commendation:** The Panel *commends* the innovative use of live case studies in particular, which drew multiple positive comments.

2.4 **Commendation:** The Panel *commends* the overall quality of the programme as well as the high regard in which it is very obviously held by all stakeholder groups met by the Panel.

3. ENTRANT AND GRADUATE PROFILE, AWARD AND PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

3.1 AWARD TYPE

On review of the proposed programme specification and discussions with the stakeholder groups, the Panel finds that the MBus programme as it stands would fulfil the criteria for a Master of Business Administration.

Programme features leading to this assessment are, amongst others, the practice-based programme philosophy and the significant amount of work undertaken by the learners, as well as the consistently high standard achieved therein, all of which were unanimously confirmed by the stakeholders. The meetings and the programme documentation confirmed that the standard and quality of the individual deliverables and the capabilities of graduates are very high and invariably match, if not exceed, those produced by MBA programmes offered by comparator institutions, irrespective of sector.

The Panel also heard that, in terms of standing, an MBA would have been the programme/award of choice of most entrants, who only on progressing through the programme realised that the demands and standard of the CIT Master of Business were in fact higher than those of MBAs attended by students in other institutions whom they were acquainted with.

The development of the proposed discrete programme streams is one direction in which the programmes may be taken. However, the Panel is convinced that by not using Programmatic Review as an occasion to engage in a more fundamental programme review in order to align the achievable award and possibly credit load (see 3.3 below) to what they could be, the proposers have missed an opportunity to significantly reposition the programme in the manner which it clearly deserves.

Requirement: For this reason, as a condition for a continued revalidation of the programmes and awards as proposed beyond one academic year, the Panel **requires** that the Department of OPD should submit to Academic Council within the academic year 2016/17 an appropriately researched and benchmarked Feasibility Study on the potential for conversion of the programme to an MBA.

3.2 PROPOSAL FOR NEW MBUS IN ACCOUNTING AND MBUS IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS AWARDS

In the discussions on demand for the different specialisms, the proposers indicated that of the existing four streams, only two had run since the last Programmatic Review, Marketing and Enterprise & Innovation. There had been insufficient interest in either Accounting or Information Systems to run either of those specialisms since well before the last Programmatic Review.

The Department stated that they were not anticipating any change in this demand pattern over the next five years. The lack of interest in the Accounting stream was due to the fact that the amount of specialised content which could be offered in the context of the Masters was insufficient to gain professional accreditation for the programme from the main accountancy bodies. The strong regulatory environment in Accountancy however meant that any programmes without such accreditation were of no interest to learners wanting to specialise in this area. Similarly, the overall volume of technical material on the programme was not sufficient to attract learners with a specialist interest in information systems and technology. These opted for technically-based programmes from the outset, rather than go the route of an Information Systems stream on a Master of Business programme.

Given these factors, it is apparent to the Panel that the noted demand issues cannot be resolved by any module-level changes (see also Section 6.2 below), nor can they be addressed through the validation of new specialised awards.

On the contrary, the Panel considers that the introduction and promotion of new awards for specialisms which in the given context are unlikely to ever run would be highly problematic; in the extreme case it might even be perceived as a form of false advertising.

Overall Recommendation on Validation: For this reason, the Panel **does not recommend validation** of the proposed new awards ***of Master of Business in Accounting and Master of Business in Information Systems***.

The Panel considers that there is insufficient demand for these specialisations to justify the introduction of new specialised awards, and is satisfied that the needs of legacy learners (if any) can be met by the existing Master of Business which is proposed for revalidation. Within the context of the undenominated MBus, the Department will continue to be able to offer Accounting and Information Systems electives for which viable demand can be achieved, e.g. through module sharing with other programmes and/or introduction of elements of online or blended delivery (see also Sections 1 and 5.2).

3.3 CREDIT ALLOCATION AND PROGRAMME DURATION

Based on the programme documentation and discussions, the Panel finds that the programme credit weighting of 60 ECTS credits is not reflective of the student effort or the module content, both of which far exceed normal expectations as benchmarked against comparable 60-credit programmes in the market.

3.3.1 Recommendation: In order to help the programme compete sustainably in the current marketplace, the Panel ***strongly recommends*** that the credit weighting of the Masters should be reviewed with a view to raising it to 90 ECTS credits. This could be achieved by raising the credit for the final research project to a more standard 30 ECTS credits, which would far better reflect actual student effort. In addition, the credit weighting of several 5-credit modules taken in Semesters 1 – 3 might be amplified to 10 ECTS, again in line with the demands of these modules in terms of workload. When doing so, an appropriate alignment with the CIT criteria for large credit modules (requiring integrated learning, synthesis, authenticity and predominantly self-directed learning) needs to be ascertained.

The Panel suggests that the review of the programme credit weighting might productively be carried out in the context of the MBA conversion review.

3.3.2 Recommendation: The Panel also *recommends* that the possibility of an extension of the course duration through addition of a (short) fifth semester should be investigated in this context. This would help to better spread the student workload across semesters. It would also enable the Department to look at distributing the subject matter of some of presently overburdened 5-credit modules over two separate modules where this might be more appropriate than amplifying module credits, see also Recommendation 6.8 below.

3.4 PROGRAMME OUTCOMES

The Panel considers that the Programme Outcomes for the proposed new specialised award streams are insufficiently differentiated from the proposed generic MBUs and from each other to appropriately reflect the distinct graduate profile of each specialised programme stream.

Requirement: The Panel therefore ***requires*** the proposers to re-examine and revise the Programme Outcomes for the proposed new specialised awards to better express the individual specialist graduate profile of each denominated award, linking back to the learning outcomes of the specialist modules within each stream as appropriate.

3.5 PROGRAMME PROMOTION

Recommendation: Notwithstanding its recommendations resp. requirements concerning the untapped development potential for the programme, the Panel ***strongly recommends*** that the programme team should express, market and promote with confidence the evident quality, standard and stand-out features (such as the applied 'live studies') of this Masters, which are on par with or even exceed those of comparable offerings in other institutions and which reflect positively on the programme staff, department, and Institute.

4. PROGRAMME OPERATION AND PERFORMANCE

4.1 ENTRANT PROFILE AND PRESENCE REQUIREMENTS

Most programme entrants are in employment and continue to be so for the duration of the programme. Different stakeholders however also provided several – unsolicited – examples of interested potential entrants whose main reason for not applying had been the extent of the presence requirement on campus, which was considered comparatively high for a part-time postgraduate programme. A Panel recommendation on the potential use of online and blended learning elements to increase the chances of such applicants is included in Section 5.2.

5. PROPOSED PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION (INCL. DELIVERY AND ASSESSMENT)

5.1 LEARNER WORKLOAD

Upon review of the modules and discussions with the proposers and stakeholder groups, the Panel concludes that the learner workload associated with this 60-credit Masters programme is considerably heavier than that which would normally be expected at the low end of the ECTS credits spectrum for this award.

Graduates and students indicated that they were satisfied with the learning achieved and were complimentary of the qualifications and abilities of the teaching staff. A universal tenor of the comments was however that there were points in the programme – notably in the 2nd and 3rd semesters – where learners ceased to have any “life outside of the Masters” and were brought to the brink of crisis by its demands. The learners themselves felt that some of this pressure could be avoided through different planning and distribution of workloads.

It is likely that these observations are tied up to a certain extent with the type of entrants admitted to the Masters. Learners are frequently ambitious individuals in leadership positions who strive to excel in all aspects of life and who may find it hard to pace themselves when confronted with the simultaneous demands of work and academic study.

Notwithstanding this, the Panel is convinced that there are several ways in which the programme design and delivery can be amended to alleviate some of the pressures and achieve a more realistic and balanced workload while preserving quality and standards. Some recommendations to this effect have already been made above; some further recommendations in the sections on the detailed programme specification and the modules below should also be read against this backdrop.

5.2 USE OF ONLINE AND BLENDED LEARNING

Recommendation: The Panel *strongly recommends* that the programme team should review the programme delivery and assessment mechanisms with a view to introducing suitable elements of online or blended learning.

In the Panel’s view, judicious use of online and blended delivery can bring significant benefits for several programme areas. Amongst others, these include additional supports for group work, e.g. group formation tools or moderated/monitored online group discussions;

complementary mechanisms for staff-student communication, enabling strategic reductions in on-campus presence hours; improved sharing of resources; and improved learner access.

5.3 ENHANCED USE OF BLACKBOARD

In this context, learner and graduate feedback suggested that use of the Institute's Blackboard learning management system on the programme was currently limited to that of information portal for the distribution of lecture notes. However, Blackboard includes a number of interactive features which in the view of the Panel would greatly add to the programme team's repertory of delivery and assessment methods.

Recommendation: A review of the teaching & learning methodologies should therefore include considerations on how to enhance usage of Blackboard beyond a mere repository of lecture notes.

5.4 PROGRAMME ASSESSMENT STRATEGY AND SCHEMA

The Panel found that there is a notable bunching of assessments at certain points during the programme, particularly in Semesters 2 and 3. This adds to the already heavy workload and considerably exacerbates pressures on learners, as confirmed by the discussions with students and graduates.

Requirement: The Panel therefore *requires* the programme team to develop an overall programme assessment strategy and schema. This should outline the strategy on assessment for the programme as whole and its expression in the individual modules, followed by a clear and succinct overview of the nature and timing of the individual assessment events throughout the course of the programme.

As part of this, the Panel asks the programme team to review the nature, timing and volume of assessments throughout the programme. The outcomes of this review should feed into the development of the assessment strategy as appropriate.

Once finalised, the assessment strategy and schema should be prominently published in the programme literature (programme handbook, website etc.) and should be reviewed and updated annually as appropriate.

Being able to draw on a clear overall programme assessment strategy will in the Panel's opinion also have merit in the deliberations regarding an increase of programme credits to 90 ECTS.

5.5 GROUP WORK AND GROUP ASSESSMENT

In discussion with the Panel, some students and graduates observed that the organisation of group work could be optimised in some respects, particularly with regard to encouraging all members to 'pull their weight' and subsequently measuring individual contributions in assessment. While some of the noted points can likely be chalked up to group dynamics and the inherent learning curve of group work, an improved organisational framework would go some ways towards obviating some of the recurrent issues and providing students with a productive group learning experience from the start. When properly harnessed, the diverse entrant profiles have the potential to create a rich learning environment in which each group can benefit from a range of complementary skills. Feedback indicates however that group

formation for the most part happens randomly, based on convenience, rather than being the result of planning around existing knowledge and skills areas and availabilities.

Recommendation: The Panel therefore *recommends* that group work and modes of group assessment should be better operationalised.

With regard to group work, the programme team is asked to formulate and formalise guidance around group formation, effective group work and dispute resolution in groups in particular.

With regard to assessment, the team should look at the systematic inclusion of elements which would allow a better reflection of the individual contributions to group projects, such as reflective journals and peer assessment.

6. MODULES

This section presents the findings and recommendations from an indicative review of modules carried out by the members of the Peer Review Panel. The Panel notes that a comprehensive survey of module specifications could not be carried out in the context of this review.

Therefore, an overall recommendation of the Panel to revalidate the programme(s) under review is contingent on the successful completion of the subsequent internal programme and module moderation process carried out by, or on behalf of, the CIT Registrar's Office.

6.1 ALL MODULES – LEARNING OUTCOMES AND CONTENT

The Panel finds that the alignment between Learning Outcomes and Indicative Content could be more obvious in a number of modules.

Recommendation: The Panel therefore *recommends* that the modules should be re-examined and revised where necessary to ensure a sufficiently clear alignment between Learning Outcomes and content description.

6.2 ALL MODULES – SUCCESS CRITERIA AND MODULE CONTENT LOAD

In keeping with the general observations on learner workload, the Panel notes that a number of modules are not only very content-heavy, but also in some cases appear to have 'silent' prerequisites in terms of the learner's knowledge base. This particularly concerns some of the specialised Semester 3 modules, for example *Applied Marketing Communications* (MGMT9020); *Data Communications & Networks* (MGMT9023); *Information Systems Development* (MGMT9022); *Strategic Management Accounting* (MGMT9016); *Financial Accounting & Reporting* (MGMT9015). The Panel heard that the Programme Director and Head of Department guide learners on their chance of success in particular modules when discussing choice of specialism with each individual learner during Stage 1.

Given the intention of the Department to offer a new 'mixed' mode which would give interested learners access to modules from different specialism, the Panel deems it particularly significant that – as a minimum – every learner is clearly aware of the success criteria for each module (in terms of prior learning and requisite effort) before registering. However, as it stands

the transmission of this information takes up a lot of staff time, and is also insufficiently formalised to guard against unexpected personnel changes.

6.2.1 Recommendation: The Panel therefore **recommends** that guidance on the success criteria for individual modules and the different programme streams should be formalised and clearly set out in the relevant programme documents and literature. Where appropriate, this might include an indication of any recommended prior learning in the relevant module descriptor(s).

6.2.2 Recommendation: The Panel notes that the previous recommendation (6.2.1) is intended to complement, not preclude a thorough analysis of the content and credit load of all modules, which it **recommends** to the proposers to carry out in the context of considerations to raise the overall programme credits. As stated in Section 3.3 above, in the Panel's opinion several of the modules would be more realistically described with 10 ECTS credits in terms of content load and actual learner effort required. Where it is not feasible to raise the module credit load, the proposers should however still review each module with a view of identifying ancillary content which might be removed in the interest of achieving a more realistic learner workload.

6.3 ALL MODULES – SOFT SKILLS (SALES, NEGOTIATIONS, RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT)

Recommendation: As also suggested by the Industry Advisory Panel, the Panel **recommends** that the programme team should find ways of strengthening the learners' expertise and abilities in soft skills around sales, relationship management and negotiations, wherever this can best be integrated into a module or modules common to all stream, paying attention to inclusion of suitable assessments.

In the context of a move to a 90-credit programme, the proposers might also wish to consider inclusion of a separate 5-credit module dedicated to soft skills building.

6.2 RESEARCH METHODS (MGMT9009)

6.2.1 Recommendation: The Panel **strongly recommends** inclusion of an early (Week 3 or 4) piece of formative assessment specifically on academic writing in this module. Given that most entrants have been out of an academic environment for extended time periods, this would contribute greatly to increasing the learner's confidence in their written expression and give them an early low-stakes gauge of progress in this area.

6.2.1 Recommendation: In addition, student and graduate feedback indicated that the interval between *Research Methods* in the first semester and the *Research Thesis* (MGMT9010) in the last semester is frequently perceived as very long.

Though there are valid arguments for retaining the given module sequence (at least within the current 60-credit programme), the Panel **recommends** that the proposers should consider a short research-related session just prior to the start of Semester 4 which would recapitulate the most salient points from the earlier module and help ease learners into their individual research projects.

6.3 IT-ENABLED BUSINESS (No Code Yet)

Recommendation: The Panel **recommends** that this module should be amended to better reflect the strategic importance of ICT as an enabler in an overall business context.

6.4 INTERNATIONAL CORPORATE STRATEGY / APPLIED CORPORATE STRATEGY (MGMT9004 / 9005)

There is a noticeable degree of overlap between the learning outcomes and content of these two modules.

Recommendation: The Panel **recommends** that the modules should be revisited, with a view to removing any overlaps and repositioning the modules in the context of each other. In the context of a wider programme review, the programme team might even consider the possibility of amalgamating the two modules.

6.5 SERVICES MARKETING MANAGEMENT / CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN MARKETING (MGMT9011 / 9019)

In the Panel's opinion, the *Services Marketing Management* module presently included in the mandatory common Semester 2 curriculum is much narrower in scope than *Contemporary Issues in Marketing*, which forms part of the specialised Marketing stream in Semester 3. Having discussed the module sequence with the proposers also, the Panel concludes that exposure to current trends and developments in the general area of Marketing would be far more useful to learners across all streams than in-depth knowledge of a particular sub-field which they may not be relevant to their role.

Requirement: The Panel therefore **requires** that the positions of the modules *Contemporary Issues in Marketing* and *Services Marketing Management* should be switched in the curriculum. *Contemporary Issues in Marketing* should be included in Semester 2 as a mandatory module for learners on all programme streams, while *Services Marketing Management* should become part of the specialised Marketing stream in Semester 3.

6.6 CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN MARKETING (MGMT9019)

Recommendation: Given the focus on the contemporary, the Panel **strongly recommends** that the content of this module should be revised to include digital media and social media.

6.7 INNOVATION & CREATIVITY (MGMT9006)

Recommendation: The Panel **recommends** that this module should be revisited to foreground the element of creativity more strongly so as to achieve a better balance between the two elements overall.

6.8 ENTERPRISE FINANCE & LAW (MGMT9008)

On review of the descriptor, the Panel found that this module, which forms part of the Enterprise & Innovation stream, is extremely condensed and content-heavy. This was confirmed by the proposers, who stated that *Enterprise Finance & Law* consisted of two full modules 'compressed into one'.

Recommendation: The Panel **strongly recommends** that the content of this module should be examined and trimmed down to ensure a more realistic workload for learners opting for the Enterprise & Innovation stream.

Alternatively, in the context of an increase of the programme credits to 90 ECTS, the two quite discrete halves of the module could be separated out into two standalone 5-credit modules, with a possibility of making the Law content in particular part of the mandatory offerings for learners on all streams.

6.9 STRATEGIC ISSUES IN TOURISM (No Code Yet)

The Panel noted that the Tourism stream currently included one Advanced level module, *Strategic Issues in Tourism*. Amongst others this meant however that learners on the Tourism stream would not meet the requirements for a CIT Masters award, which are a minimum of 60 ECTS credits at Expert level. The proposers stated that the module was intended to be at postgraduate level, and confirmed that the material presented matched the Expert level.

Requirement: The Panel therefore **requires** that the level of the module *Strategic Issues in Tourism* be corrected to Expert.

6.10 TOURISM BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT (No Code Yet)

Recommendation: The Panel **recommends** that this module be revised to achieve a better alignment between title and content. In particular, it should be clarified that Event Management constitutes one element of Tourism Business Development only, rather than the main focus of the module.

6.11 DESTINATION MARKETING (No Code Yet)

Requirement: The Panel notes that the End of Module Formal Examination has been omitted from this module descriptor. The proposers confirmed that a formal exam is indeed intended to contribute 50% to the overall module mark. The Panel therefore **requires** that the module descriptor be corrected to show the final examination.

6.12 RESEARCH THESIS (MGMT9010; retitled from RESEARCH DISSERTATION)

While the programme schedule as submitted contained the existing approved version of module MGMT9010 (20 ECTS credits, Expert level) under its current title of *Research Dissertation*, an updated draft with the revised title of *Research Thesis* was tabled during the meetings. On cursory inspection the Panel found this to be generally appropriate, but notes it did not have an opportunity for in-depth analysis.

Recommendation: Given that this module describes the mandatory capstone project for all streams, the Panel **recommends** that the descriptor should receive appropriate attention during the internal module moderation process. A referral outside of the Registrar's Office is unlikely to be necessary.

7. OTHER FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 **Recommendation:** The Panel suggests that academic progression pathways to Level 10 beyond the traditional PhD for highly qualified graduates of this programme might form part of any future deliberations around the development of doctoral education in CIT.

8. DEROGATIONS SOUGHT

8.1 No derogations are sought.

C. PROGRAMME FINALISATION

*[This section will be completed by the **CIT Registrar's Office**.*

It records the implementation of any panel requirements and the completion of the internal module moderation process. Confirmation of completion by the CIT Registrar's Office is required for both before the programmes can be submitted to the CIT Academic Council for revalidation.]

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF PANEL REQUIREMENTS

2. MODULE AND PROGRAMME MODERATION

D. APPENDIX – TIMETABLE OF PHASE 2 MEETINGS

Department of Organisation & Professional Development Programmatic Review Panel - Master of Business Stream



Panel Schedule

Day One Tuesday 12th April

11.00 to 11.30 pm	Private Panel Meeting including presentation by Registrar's Office	Council Room
11.30 to 12.30pm	Faculty Overview Presentation / Discussion	Council Room
12.30 to 1.30 pm	Private Panel Lunch	Bistro
1.30 to 3.00 pm	Meeting with Dept. Teams re Programme Operation and Performance	Library Conference Room
3.00 to 3.30 pm	Private Panel Meeting (Tea/Coffee)	Library Conference Room
3.30 to 5.00 pm	Meet with Dept. Teams re Proposed Changes to Programme Structures	Library Conference Room
5.00 to 5.30 pm	Meet with Recent Graduates	Library Conference Room
5.30 to 6.00 pm	Meet with Employers	Library Conference Room
8pm	Panel Dinner	Kingsley Hotel

Day Two Wednesday 13th April

8.45 to 9.00 am	Private Panel Meeting - emerging themes	Rory Gallagher Theatre
9.00 to 9.30 am	Meet with Students	Library Conference Room
9.30 to 10.30 am	Tour of Relevant Dept. Facilities or Research / Project Overview	Various Locations
10.30 to 11.00 am	Private Panel Meeting (Tea/Coffee)	Library Conference Room
11.00 am to 12.30 pm	Meet with Dept. Teams re General Review of Modules	Library Conference Room
12.30 to 1.30 pm	Private Panel Lunch	Bistro
1.30 to 3.00 pm	Sub-panel meetings to draft outline reports	Library Conference Room
3.00 to 3.30 pm	Feedback to overall panel - themes	Rory Gallagher Theatre
3.30 to 3.45 pm	Feedback to faculty, school and department management	Rory Gallagher Theatre