

**Cork Institute of Technology**

**PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW OF THE  
CRAWFORD COLLEGE OF ART AND DESIGN**

**PHASE 2: PROGRAMME REVIEW**  
(OCTOBER 2009)

**FINAL REPORT OF THE  
PEER REVIEW GROUP**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Introduction</u>	p. 3
<u>Statement by the Peer Review Group Chair</u>	p. 4
<u>Membership of the Phase 2 Peer Review Group</u>	p. 5
<u>Findings and Observations from Meeting on Phase 1 Recommendations and Strategic Plan</u>	p. 6
<u>Findings and Observations from Meeting on Overarching Programme Issues</u>	p. 8
<u>Findings and Observations from Programme Sessions – Department of Fine Art &amp; Ceramic Design</u>	p. 9
<u>Findings and Observations from Programme Sessions – Department of Art &amp; Design Education</u>	p. 12
<u>Findings and Observations from Programme Sessions – Department of Art Therapy &amp; Continuing Visual Education</u>	p. 14
<u>Principal Findings and Recommendations</u>	p. 17
<u>Timescale for Implementation of Recommendations and Outlook</u>	p. 23
<u>Appendix: Phase 2 Panel Timetable</u>	p. 23

## INTRODUCTION

Programmatic Review is a statutory five-yearly academic quality review in which independent peer evaluators analyse a suite of programmes with an emphasis on quality and flexibility of response to changing needs. It is concerned with extending the validation of programmes already validated; it does not validate new programmes.

In Cork Institute of Technology, this review is conducted on a faculty / college basis. Under the Institute's revised academic quality system, Programmatic Review takes place in two phases. Each phase is built on a self-study by the faculty or constituent college of relevant aspects of its operations. Documentation on the findings and proposals arising from self-study is submitted to the Peer Review Group (PRG) for review and evaluation during each phase. The review of faculty documentation is complemented by meetings of the Peer Review Group with faculty / college staff, students and other stakeholders.

The overall aims of Programmatic Review are to ensure that the programmes of a faculty / college remain relevant to learners, employers and other stakeholders; that the strategy, resources and systems of the faculty / college and the Institute at large are sufficient to support and develop the academic activities; that there is demand for the graduate profile produced by the programmes; that the Programme Outcomes correctly describe the desired graduate profile; and that the programmes deliver the Programme Outcomes. The two phases of the review address these overall aims with different emphases and to a different extent.

For the faculty / college under review, Programmatic Review affords the opportunity to step back from the day-to-day business of programme delivery to reflect on its present performance and future direction. However, it is important that Programmatic Review is understood as only one stage in a continuous monitoring and improvement cycle, the overall goal of which is to ensure the maintenance and constant improvement of the Institute's education and training provision.

In 2009, CIT's constituent Crawford College of Art and Design underwent a Programmatic Review of its systems and programmes. For some of the college's programmes, this was the third academic quality review in short sequence, following Modularisation & Semesterisation Conversion & Revalidation reviews of all CIT programmes carried out in two phases in 2007 and 2008 and a Level 8 Conversion review of the BA (Hons) in Fine Art and BA (Hons) in Ceramic Design in 2008.

Phase 1 of Programmatic Review was dedicated to strategic and high-level issues and was completed on 28 April 2009. An Interim Report on the outcomes of the Phase 1 review was made available to CCAD in advance of Phase 2 to inform and steer the second phase of the self-study process. The Phase 1 Report included some recommendations which CCAD was requested to address in time for the Phase 2 panel meetings. In addition, the report earmarked a few issues for more detailed discussion in Phase 2.

The Phase 2 PRG meetings took place on 19 October 2009. The morning meetings were given over to the implementation of Phase 1 recommendations and overarching programme issues. Discussion followed on from the review by the PRG of a CCAD Response to the Phase 1 Report document submitted as part of the Phase 2 documentation. The afternoon was dedicated to a detailed programme review. This was conducted by department, with each breakout panel composed of both external and internal panellists as per CIT's revised academic quality system. The findings and recommendations from Phase 2 of Programmatic Review are summarised in this Final Peer Review Group Report.

The purpose of the present Final Report is two-fold: to outline noteworthy issues and findings from the individual Phase 2 panel meetings, and to provide a summary set of final recommendations based on PRG observations and findings from both Programmatic Review phases (see section "Principal Findings and Recommendations").

As far as possible, the Principal Findings and Recommendations in this report revisit the thematic structure emerging from the Phase 1 Interim Report. Both documents should be read in conjunction with each other and together form the complete record of the 2009 Programmatic Review in the Crawford College of Art and Design. Where any Phase 1 recommendations have either been deemed to have been implemented or

(as in one case) have been revised by the PRG in the light of further information provided for Phase 2, this has been stated as appropriate in the Final Report.

Finally, the PRG would like to express its warm appreciation of the welcome, hospitality and support extended by the Crawford College of Art and Design and Cork Institute of Technology. The members of the PRG found the panel discussions to be extremely productive and would like to commend staff, students and stakeholders of CCAD for their obvious engagement, professionalism and openness in discussion, as well as for great effort expended in carrying out and documenting the preceding self-study.

#### **STATEMENT BY THE PEER REVIEW GROUP CHAIR**

This Programmatic Review considered CCAD's recent achievements and critically assessed the significance and originality of its strategic thinking. Throughout the duration of the visit the visiting panel were extremely well received by teaching staff and senior management. Without exception all our questions were addressed in an open and professional manner. Any additional information required during the visit was delivered freely and efficiently.

The panel recognised CCAD's history and acknowledged its success in producing an impressive list of successful practitioners. The increasingly competitive nature of Higher Education in Ireland will require CCAD to be even more ambitious in relation to its distinctive offer and to ensure that all staff are fully involved in the successful delivery of its vision. Our view, as a panel, was to help CCAD become a major centre for art and design education and thus contribute to Ireland's development as a creative knowledge economy.

I would like to record my thanks to the panel. They were consistently focussed and constructive throughout all of the formal and informal sessions with staff.

Our recommendations have been carefully formulated – I commend them to anyone who cares deeply about the future development of CCAD. I believe they are worthy of your most serious consideration.

Professor Alan Livingston

## **MEMBERSHIP OF THE PHASE 2 PEER REVIEW GROUP**

All members of the Phase 1 Peer Review Group continued on to Phase 2 of the Programmatic Review. For the programme phase, the continuing panel members were joined by Ms Lorraine Neeson (plenary panel sessions and Fine Art & Ceramic Design break-out session) and two internal panellists, Mr Ray Coughlan (Art & Design Education break-out session) and Mr Jim Walsh (Art Therapy & Continuing Visual Education break-out session).

### **Prof Alan Livingston CBE (Chair)**

Rector (retired), University College Falmouth

### **Mr Ray Coughlan**

Head of School of Humanities, CIT

### **Dr Annie Doona**

Registrar, Dun Laoghaire Institute of Art, Design and Technology

### **Mr Eamonn Maxwell**

Director, Lismore Castle Arts

### **Ms Mary McCarthy**

Director, National Sculpture Factory

### **Prof Ian Montgomery**

Dean of Faculty of Art, Design and the Built Environment, University of Ulster

### **Ms Lorraine Neeson**

Practising Artist, Killarney /  
Assistant Lecturer, Limerick Institute of Technology /  
Visiting Lecturer, National College of Art and Design

### **Ms Deirdre Ní Argáin**

Art Therapist (former Chair of the Irish Association of Creative Art Therapists) /  
Head of Art Department, Milford Care Centre

### **Mr Leslie Reed**

CEO (retired), Crafts Council of Ireland

### **Mr Jim Walsh**

Head of Department of Social & General Studies, CIT

### **Ms Eva Juhl**

Delegated Authority Facilitator, Office of the Registrar and VP for Academic Affairs, CIT

## **FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS FROM MEETING ON PHASE 1 RECOMMENDATIONS AND STRATEGIC PLAN**

### **Present:**

Ms Orla Flynn, Acting Head of College

Mr Kevin Gill, Head of Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design

Mr Albert Walsh, Head of Department of Art & Design Education

Mr Ed Kuczaj, Head of Department of Art Therapy & Continuing Education

Mr Harry McCormick, Senior Lecturer, Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design

Ms Susanna Broderick, Lecturer, Department of Art & Design Education

Ms Bill Flynn, Lecturer, Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design

Mr Mike Murphy, Lecturer, Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design

### **General Issues and Findings**

- The PRG heard that CCAD had dealt with a number of issues highlighted in the Phase 1 Interim Report, namely interaction with external stakeholders, CCAD's Strategic Plan, and CCAD's research capability. The Acting Head of College stated that progress did not fully match expectations due to a number of intervening factors, but was confident that many of the planned measures could be in place by the end of the academic year.
- The Acting Head also stated that the staff response to the Phase 1 Report had been delayed somewhat due to its circulation after the 20th June holiday deadline, which meant that most staff only read the report after the initial September start-up period.
- The release of significant capital funds from the devolved grant during the summer months occupied much of the college management's time, as the money had to be spent by a September deadline. Though this diverted attention from other Programmatic Review objectives, the funds went some ways towards addressing some of the health & safety issues highlighted in the Phase 1 Report.

### **Allocation of Teaching Hours**

- The PRG heard that staff retirements had contributed to a reduction in staff numbers required by the Government's Employment Framework. However, the teaching needs created by the retirements and the expertise of the remaining whole-time staff were not always matched. Any unmet teaching needs would now have to be delivered via part-time casual hours, albeit only by staff already on the payroll. Some of the new staff employed for 2009/10 (particularly in Semester Two) would thus be staff who had previously taught on evening or part-time programmes in CCAD. This development might indirectly contribute to research activity in the college, as most of these staff were research-active or already held postgraduate qualifications.
- The Acting Head of CCAD stated that the CIT resource allocation mechanisms did not allow the allocation of any potential surplus lecturing hours to any other responsibilities as long as teaching duties existed. The PRG noted this, and concludes that in view both of the externally-driven developments and the constraints outlined, its Phase 1 recommendations regarding the redistribution of staff duties following a teaching load review cannot reasonably be met as intended.

### **Strategic Plan and Changes to the Academic Management Structure**

- The PRG heard that the current overarching CIT Strategic Plan did not represent CCAD very well. A new plan for 2010 – 20015 was currently being developed. The Acting Head of College was on the Strategic Planning Council and would ensure that CCAD and its interests were fully represented.
- The PRG heard that development of the CCAD Strategic Plan had been delayed due to the impending integration of the Department of Media Communications into CCAD. The Media Communications suite of programmes included those with a significant visual arts emphasis such as Visual Communications and Multimedia. The vision for the joinder was to bring all the visual arts- and design-related disciplines under one umbrella. Among the intended benefits were the expansion of the range of activities and research areas for CCAD and the production of synergies between staff and

students of the hitherto separate areas with regard to sharing of expertise, project collaborations etc. In time, there could also be significant sharing of modules between arts and media programmes. Under the resulting management structure, the Acting Head of Media Communications would join the CCAD Executive Board, which presently consisted of the Acting Head of College and the Heads of the three existing departments.

### **Research Capacity**

- Discussions with the Institute's Head of Research with regard to extending CCAD's research capacity were continuing. However, Phase 1 of the Programmatic Review had been beneficial in itself by raising the mutual awareness of research activities among staff.
- The PRG heard that many CCAD staff excelled in their own individual research areas, which might not have been brought to the PRG's attention sufficiently clearly during Phase 1. The PRG acknowledged this, but cautioned that relying on isolated staff research activities as a means of attracting suitable postgraduate students was not a viable strategy to grow research capacity. The PRG heard that areas of excellence were emerging in art education and art therapy and that these would be further developed. The PRG considered that the college's overall research strategy needed to be very clear, especially given the integration of Media Communications. This would also open CCAD to a new spectrum of possible research areas and pool of prospective students.

### **External Relations**

- The section in the Interim Report detailing CCAD's relationships with external stakeholders was received critically by some CCAD staff. Of concern to staff was a perceived discrepancy between the reported stakeholder perception of a low level of external staff and student activity in many areas and actual staff and student engagement. The PRG confirmed the consistency of the stakeholder views presented to it in this regard. In the PRG's opinion, the fact that such views were reported – whether borne out by the facts or not – corroborated its recommendation that CCAD needed to work on raising the visibility of, and awareness about, the external activities of its staff and students. To do so, CCAD staff and students needed to be proactive in going out and realising their ambitions and needed to project themselves externally in a positive way as being part of CCAD. In turn, staff engagement in external activities should be supported by the college, and staff should be assisted in their further development. Ongoing activities such as collaborations and exhibitions needed to be brought to the attention of the public. However, it was not only necessary to communicate CCAD's activities out into the community, CCAD also needed to invite the community in by opening its doors and extending a genuine welcome.

### **Staff Development**

- The Acting Head of College reported that a staff development day was held in September which involved some 47 CCAD staff. Staff spoke freely in a cordial, open environment. In general, CCAD staff found the day to be a good experience, were relaxed, and felt free to speak their minds, although some staff felt that the strong emphasis on the positive prevented them from addressing some negative realities during the meeting itself. The event did however serve to remind CCAD staff that there was actually very little friction between staff members and that they shared common goals. The PRG suggested that staff development days should take place twice per year to embed a culture of open, frank discussion amongst staff.
- CCAD staff noted that there was an existing annual staff forum which had been taking place for the last eight years. Many new programme developments had come from this forum, and it was felt that the forum was a good incubator for fostering ideas. However, the annual staff forum included only academic staff from the Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design, while the main benefit of the recent staff development day was that it included all CCAD staff. The Acting Head of College expressed her gratitude to the CIT Registrar's Office for supporting this day as an outcome of the Phase 1 Report.

## **Building**

- It was noted that the view of CCAD staff with regard to the CCAD building was not all negative. The location in particular was a great benefit and was part of CCAD's attraction. The scale of the building also lent itself to the existing sense of community.

## **FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS FROM MEETING ON OVERARCHING PROGRAMME ISSUES**

### **Present:**

As in previous meeting

### **Modularisation & Semesterisation (M&S)**

- The PRG heard that the implementation of Modularisation & Semesterisation coincided with the CIT-wide roll-out of the Banner student record system. Banner had caused quite a lot of operational issues for staff with regard to entering exam results, issuing of results to students etc. CCAD staff expressed an interest in being granted a measure of flexibility in this regard, as they did not feel the centralised system was advantageous for their students. However, the PRG considers that the Programmatic Review process is not the most suitable mechanism to address issues of this nature. It suggests that problems related to Institute-wide administrative systems should be dealt with internally through the management structure.
- While there had been much focus on the disadvantages of modularisation, some positive effects were also now emerging, for instance with regard to assessment and synergies created through module sharing across several programmes. The PRG also heard, however, that there was an underlying view shared by many staff that the standard CIT model of M&S did not best suit art and design teaching, and that some constraints of this system should not apply to CCAD to the same extent as to other areas of the Institute.
- The PRG heard that the Department of Media Communications was largely compliant with the standard Institute model of modularisation, though Department staff would also have preferred a more flexible approach in some respects.
- CCAD staff reported that the long inter-semester break in December/January had proven to be problematic for students, whose studio practice was disrupted by such a lengthy gap in their studies.
- While the PRG considers it outside of its remit to make findings with regard to the general model of modularisation in Cork Institute of Technology, the PRG members would urge CCAD staff to bring any shortcomings in the M&S structure which impact negatively on the student experience to the attention of Academic Council. The PRG also suggests that it would be advantageous if CCAD could present the Institute with a set of solutions which would better suit the specific requirements of art & design education while still remaining in keeping with the general principles of modularisation in CIT.

### **Skills Development**

- The issue of skills development was raised during the Phase 1 student session by students of the Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design, who felt that their skills development was not being adequately addressed. The PRG heard that this issue had been addressed by the college to a certain extent through the introduction of specific modules in certain skills areas. There was an argument that these skills should be delivered during the studio practice module, which was not happening at the moment. There was also a view among staff that skills could only be demonstrated to students in workshops, but could not be "taught", as their development required ongoing practice by the students themselves. The PRG suggested that CCAD might need to define what a skill was, and what level of training should be acquired by students during their studies. There had to be a distinction between this training and the continuing professional development of the practising artist. In other art education providers, the Tutor Demonstrator role had proven to be very effective in this area, and was one which CCAD was exploring.

## **Feedback on Student Performance**

- This had been discussed at meetings in CCAD in June and September. There was agreement that the assessment briefs issued to students had to be clear and concise, with aligned marking schemes for all staff involved in the assessment. The PRG noted that feedback to students should be clear and not over-ambitious. If a student's work continually received positive feedback, their module mark should reflect this. The PRG heard that CCAD had put a new system into place whereby students formally met with their Head of Department 2 – 3 times per year. This system was commended by the PRG.

## **FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS FROM PROGRAMME SESSIONS – DEPARTMENT OF FINE ART & CERAMIC DESIGN**

### **Present:**

Ms Orla Flynn, Acting Head of College

Mr Kevin Gill, Head of Department

Mr Harry McCormick

Ms Trish Brennan

Mr Tony McClure

Mr Mike Murphy

Ms Bill Flynn

Mr Markus Jungmann

Ms Roisin Collins

Ms Debbie Dawson

Dr Julian Campbell

Ms Orla Boyle

Ms Pamela Hardesty

### **Graduate Support**

- The Programme Panel heard that there was recognition in CCAD that the first 2 – 3 years following graduation were the most difficult for graduates. The college intended to put a support programme in place to assist such graduates.

### **Continuing Professional Development**

- The Programme Panel heard that quite a few CCAD staff were involved in staff development and took part in various training days and courses. To obtain support for CPD measures, staff members were required to submit specific proposals to the college, which were considered and approved where appropriate. While some staff members exhibited enthusiastic and continuous engagement in their own professional development, from a college perspective it was necessary to strike a balance between facilitating such staff and encouraging members of staff who showed less initiative to also avail of development opportunities.

### **External Relations**

- The Programme Panel noted that the need to embrace partnerships was a key issue for CCAD going forward. The Programme Panel had formed the impression that there was a definite modesty among college staff which meant that they were not always represented at arts activities or events at which they would excel.

### **Programme Descriptors and Semester Schedules**

- The Programme Panel acknowledged the Department's engagement and effort in converting the BA (Hons) in Fine Art and the BA (Hons) in Ceramic Design to a modularised and semesterised delivery format without losing the academic focus or ethos of the programmes. The Programme Panel took note of the fact that a review of the assessment scheduling and weighting would be undertaken in the near future through an internal review process initiated by Academic Council.

- The Programme Panel noted that the introduction of *Professional Practice* into the Fine Art and Ceramic Design programmes could be a unique selling point. To be of maximum benefit to the programmes, this had to be set up correctly, particularly with regard to integration with studio practice. Staff needed to be creative in terms of working around the constraints of the modularised structure to achieve this integration. Prior to the introduction of the *Professional Practice* module, elements of professional practice had been delivered over the years, but not in a formalised fashion.
- The Head of Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design outlined some of the practical difficulties facing Fine Art & Ceramic Design students with regard to participating in the Free Choice elective. As the dedicated timetable slot assigned to Free Choice was on Wednesday afternoons, participation in Free Choice would be detrimental to the students' core studio practice, which required lengthy periods of uninterrupted studio work. In addition, CCAD students found it difficult to travel to Bishopstown to take part in Free Choice electives offered on the main CIT campus. Some students had however taken Free Choice modules in the Cork School of Music, which was geographically closer. While the Programme Panel acknowledged the difficulties posed by these practical obstacles, its members considered that delivery practice should still reflect the semester schedules and vice versa. Should the resources and supports to enable student participation in Free Choice not be available to CCAD, then the Department had the option to seek derogation from the Free Choice requirement under CIT's M&S guidelines. The Programme Panel also asked the Department to consider the potential advantages of Free Choice not only for students, but also for the college at large, for instance as an opportunity to strengthen inter-faculty and external linkages.
- The Programme Panel heard that the factor that differentiated the CCAD Fine Art programmes from other comparable programmes within the field was their ethos. Students were challenged to take control of their own learning and embrace the multidisciplinary approach to programme delivery.
- There was evidence from LIT of students making use of disused buildings or external spaces for exhibition spaces. This had also been undertaken by CCAD but had not been documented or advertised.
- With regard to the positioning of the CCAD Fine Art programmes in the national context, the college was aware of certain important developments which required close observation in the short term, particularly the impending introduction by NCAD of a 3-year Honours degree in the near future. It might become necessary to articulate the advantages of the 4-year Honours degrees offered by CCAD over the new 3-year Honours degrees. Furthermore, CCAD also needed to remain cognisant of any moves within CIT at large towards a 3+2 model. Government funding was an additional factor which would impact on any such developments.

### **Common First Year**

- Prior to introduction of a common first year entry, two separate entries were in place for Fine Art and Ceramics. There were quite a few modules which are common to both programmes. The Programme Panel considered that the amalgamated 1<sup>st</sup> Year might not give students a sufficiently good grounding in either Fine Art or Ceramics. Department staff stated that the common First Year was designed to give the students an interesting and varied educational experience, but acknowledged that it was without a doubt underpinned by an implied Fine Art ethos which influenced students in their decision regarding progression to 2<sup>nd</sup> Year.
- Attempts had been made to strengthen the visibility of Ceramic Design in 1<sup>st</sup> Year, for instance by bringing a Ceramics lecturer onto the 1<sup>st</sup> Year programme team and by dedicating one day per week to Ceramics teaching. This had however not had the envisaged impact, amongst others because it had been found that the one day did not provide enough exposure to enable students to get into Ceramics at a sufficient depth.
- (For further discussion of related issues, see "Ceramic Design Programme" in the present section and Section 7, "Ceramic Design", in "Principal Findings and Recommendations", both below.)

## Module Descriptor Issues

- The Head of Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design outlined that the modules for both programmes as presented to the Programme Panel had been approved for the most part, but that this was not altogether obvious from the semester schedules due to operational Webtool issues. A supplementary document indicating the nature of the changes made was issued to the Programme Panel. Most changes to Module Descriptors had been minor. It was agreed that any module issues identified in desk review which were not specifically discussed in the panel meetings could be dealt with 'off-line' by the Head of Department in consultation with the CIT Module Moderator and Registrar's Office. Any PRG recommendations on the re-validation of the programmes would be made pending verification of the implementation of any changes as agreed by the Module Moderator and Registrar's Office,
- The Programme Panel noted that the programme documentation as presented was hard to navigate and did not provide an intuitive or indeed accurate indication of the programme and delivery structure. Department staff stated that a simplified overview of the programme was available for prospective students and was presented to the students at induction. The Programme Panel noted that a visual mapping of the programme and delivery structure would be very beneficial.

## Ceramic Design Programme

- The Programme Panel heard that there had been ongoing discussions regarding the structure of the Fine Art and Ceramic Design programmes and the continuance of a separate Ceramics award. Four options had been discussed as follows:
  - Leave the programme structure as is, with a common CAO entry and subsequent progression into a specialised 2<sup>nd</sup> Year. This had been deemed untenable as, with very few exceptions, all students progressing into 2<sup>nd</sup> Year continued in Fine Art rather than Ceramic Design, even where they had entered the common 1<sup>st</sup> Year having earlier expressed a preference for Ceramic Design.
  - Merge both awards into a BA (Hons) in Fine Art. This option was also discarded as it did not appropriately reflect the existing staff expertise and could lead to long-term staffing issues.
  - Expand the Ceramic Design programme into a broader programme with a focus on making which might include, amongst others, print-making, textiles, glass and metalwork. However, this option might create differentiation issues for prospective students. There were also issues with the availability of appropriately qualified staff and the retention of a design element within such a programme.
  - Alter existing entry so that students would be able to choose Ceramics at CAO entry stage. If this option was chosen, there might be implications for CCAD's vulnerability with regard to 1<sup>st</sup> Year intake numbers. There were also questions over the long-term viability of a stand-alone Ceramics programme.
- There was an undertaking by CCAD to increase the intake for the Ceramics programme. The market trend was militating against this aim, as Ceramics numbers were continuing to drop nationally. It was noted that LIT was countering national and European trends by maintaining its numbers in Ceramics. However, the Programme Panel noted that LIT had an interlinked suite of design programmes so there was no direct comparison with CCAD. It was the opinion of CCAD staff that while Ceramics intakes were low, there was still a demand for such programmes. There were currently 19 students in the CCAD Ceramics programme. Only one of these had come directly through the 1<sup>st</sup> year common entry.
- It was noted that a growth in student numbers would enhance Ceramics delivery, in that any possible increases in staffing levels and a consequent expansion of the range of Ceramics expertise crucially depended on increased student numbers.
- A number of CCAD Ceramics graduates were practitioners of international renown. These links should be exploited to help promote Ceramics at CCAD.

- The Programme Panel commended Ceramics staff on having forged recent linkages with other providers of third-level education in Ceramics providers as well as with the Craft Council of Ireland in order to facilitate visiting lecturers and share expertise etc.
- The Programme Panel noted that the present Programmatic Review might well be the last opportunity for CCAD to secure a future for its Ceramics programme. Following discussion, Programme Panel members stated that their preferred option would be the creation of a broader-based programme with a crafts focus.
- The Acting Head of CCAD outlined that the decision arrived at by CCAD staff was to create a separate point of entry for the Ceramics programme in the first instance. This was to be accompanied by some changes in the programme structure to better reflect the applied philosophy of such a programme. Over the next 3 – 5 years then, the intention was to introduce further skills areas (such as glass or textiles) in a staggered fashion, to allow for the appropriate resolution of the consequent staffing and space issues. Eventually, it was hoped that CCAD would be in a position to offer a comprehensive *BA (Hons) in Applied Arts* to stand alongside a separate *BA (Hons) in Fine Art*.
- In the interim, it was proposed to change the initial title of the stand-alone Ceramics programme to *BA (Hons) in Applied Arts with Ceramics* to give the programme a more distinct identity. 'Design' was to be removed from the title, as the revised Ceramics programme would not incorporate a significant design element.
- The Programme Panel expressed its broad agreement with the redevelopment of the Ceramic Design programme in the direction outlined. The Programme Panel strongly concurred that the skills expansion required for a broad future Applied Arts programme should be focussed on a single area to begin with, and that growth into additional skills areas should be initiated only as and when only previous ones became established. Given the existing staff expertise and physical resources, the Programme Panel considered it realistic that the initial focus should lie on Ceramics. One area to be considered for future skills expansion might also be photography.
- CCAD management and staff jointly confirmed that they saw the redevelopment of Ceramics as an opportunity to make a positive out of a negative situation. The Ceramics staff in particular were satisfied with the proposal and considered it to be the most positive development in recent years. The operation and management of the new programme would follow the guidelines of the CIT academic quality system, with a separate Course Board and Course Coordinator to be established for the programme. Synergies with other programmes – most notably Fine Art – in terms of shared modules would of course be retained and would be further expanded as appropriate.
- In the view of the Programme Panel, it was essential that CCAD received and allocated the appropriate resources to support the proposed transformation of the Ceramics programme. The necessary level of stakeholder consultation on the proposed changes needed to be further clarified. All opportunities to make the programme as successful as possible needed to be exploited, including non-standard delivery of the new programme, delivery at external locations, etc. The Programme Panel heard that the programme team for the new Ceramics programme were ready to market the new programme as soon as it had received approval.

## **FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS FROM PROGRAMME SESSIONS – DEPARTMENT OF ART & DESIGN EDUCATION**

### **Present:**

Mr Albert Walsh, Head of Department

Ms Susanna Broderick

Mr Mark Ewart

### **Student Population, Graduates and Recruitment**

- The Programme Panel heard that CCAD has been engaged in teacher training since the 1970s. Since its launch in 1997, the *Higher Diploma in Arts for Art & Design Teachers* had grown from 12 to 30 graduates, thus reaching the upper level of its annual graduate target of 25 – 30.
- The recruitment strategy for the two new start-ups, the *MA in Art & Design Education* and the *MA in Visual Arts Education for Primary and Early Years Education*, included fact sheets and a dedicated website. Alumni of the Department's Higher Diploma and the community education sector in particular had been targeted. To date, there had been in excess 40 applications for 30 places.
- The typical student on the Higher Diploma would have an undergraduate Level 8 Qualification recognised by the Teaching Council and varying teaching experience. Despite disappointing response rates from a recent graduate survey, the Department had found that graduate profiles for the programme varied greatly and included 'grinds' tutors and night class lecturers.
- Given the graduate profile, one of the challenges for the Higher Diploma going forward would be the tension of educating students to teach within the current structures of the Irish education system while also anticipating future skills needs.
- Praise received in the graduate survey for 'regular feedback and tutorial support' had been a welcome acknowledgement. However, programme staff had been disappointed by comments regarding the 'average' quality of workshops, especially group workshops.

### **New Teaching Council Review and Accreditation Process**

- In the context of imminent changes to the teacher registration process and the new Teaching Council's review and accreditation process for initial teacher education programmes, programme staff expressed a concern that the modularisation of undergraduate programmes might potentially cause issues with regard to eligibility for entry to the Higher Diploma. Staff made the point that on introducing new modules some BA programmes might not contain enough traditional art & design content to satisfy the registration conditions.
- Programme staff also noted that the programme would in future be subject to two quality assurance reviews at different times, the Institute's Programmatic Review process and the new Teaching Council's review and accreditation process for initial teacher education programmes. This would obviously pose new challenges for the programme staff.

### **Integration with CCAD**

- The Programme Panel heard that the Department of Art & Design Education was housed in an annexe which was physically separate from the main CCAD building.
- There was a feeling among staff and students of the Department that the Art & Design Education programmes were not fully appreciated within the college. This might lead students to feel they were 'different' and might impede integration into the college at large.
- In terms of inter-departmental links, the Department had more connections with the Department of Art Therapy & Continuing Visual Education than with the Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design. Programme staff expressed a desire to strengthen connections with the Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design, particularly with regard to the delivery of workshops. However, staff stressed that they had a good working relationship with all staff in CCAD.

### **Modularisation and Semesterisation**

- Though there had been a lot of initial fears, programme staff had found that the conversion to a modularised and semesterised delivery format had worked to the benefit of the Higher Diploma, if anything. Amongst others, M&S had brought about a clearer breakdown of wider, more comprehensive subject areas into a number of discreet elements. Whereas ICT had previously been

'buried' in the Teaching Practice subject, for instance, it had now been accorded a module in its own right, which raised its status and underlined the growing importance of technology in the field of Art & Design Education. Delivering and assessing the programme across two semesters had actually helped keep the programme quality and standards high. In response to a panel query, programme staff concurred that development of practice was the one area which might benefit from the introduction of 'long thin modules'.

### **Programme Design and Delivery**

- The Programme Panel considered that the Programmatic Review documentation really 'undersold' the programme and also omitted several important aspects of delivery practice, such as the areas of multiculturalism and inclusion.
- Panel members considered there was a need for a programme handbook – as distinct from a student handbook – which would cover the programme in minute detail and could function as the authoritative reference document for all involved in programme delivery.
- The Panel also suggested that it was important to let the creativity and dynamism inherent in the programme shine through in the programme document, as these formed an essential part of the learning experience and professional practice in the area of Art & Design Education.
- The Panel considered that the assessment criteria and strategies throughout the programme documentation did not always reflect the learning outcomes. It was difficult in places to see how the learning outcomes were assessed. In some cases the assessment criteria themselves would potentially preset assessment difficulties, for instance those related to assessing classroom presence. In the view of the Panel, work is needed to tidy up those assessment criteria and relate them more clearly to the learning outcomes (see also "Principal Findings and Recommendations").
- The Panel heard that the question had arisen for programme staff as to whether the placement of the Higher Diploma programme at Level 8 of the NFQ was indeed appropriate. This arose from the observation that other, comparable consecutive teacher education programmes offered by NCAD and the universities were referred to as Postgraduate Diplomas in all related literature, and the award offered was a Postgraduate Diploma award, which would normally be classified as Level 9 on the National Framework. The CCAD programme under review had however been placed at Level 8 and accordingly was offered as a Higher Diploma. Programme staff understood that a Department of Education working group was due to report on this matter at the end March 2010.
- In addition to the observations and findings recorded in this section, a number of findings on the structure and design of the programmes of the Department of Art & Design Education leading to specific principal recommendations have also been recorded in the section "Principal Findings and Recommendations" (see below).

### **FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS FROM PROGRAMME SESSIONS – DEPARTMENT OF ART THERAPY & CONTINUING VISUAL EDUCATION**

#### **Present:**

Ms Orla Flynn, Acting Head of College

Mr Ed Kuczai, Head of Department

Ms Julie Aldridge

Ms Catherine Phillips

Ms Terrie Young

Ms Helle Helsner

#### **Facilities**

- The Programme Panel chair was given a tour of facilities at the O'Herlihy Building on the Model Farm Road. Resources as presented were adequate but the location of the facility in part of a former

business unit was markedly different from that of the main campus on Sharman Crawford Street. The Panel found that the character of the department indicated both specialist and generalist provision, but that the Department was challenged by the lack of a clear identity.

### **Staffing**

- The Programme Panel found the staff complement as presented to be barely adequate and highly reliant on the one full-time member of staff who is also Head of Department. It was noted that the Department consisted of one full-time staff member (HoD), one staff member working on a 15 hour per week contract, two further staff on 12 hours per week contract, and one staff member on 9 hours per week contract. It was noted there were 60 students in the Department. Beyond this, the stringent embargo on extra staff teaching hours was constraining opportunities for the Department to develop, which was also putting existing staff under considerable pressure. The Panel recommends that this situation should be addressed.
- The Programme Panel found there to be an underlying lack of localised administrative support and, due to a gap in maternity cover on foot of the Employment Framework, very limited or no technical support. The Programme Panel asks that this issue should be addressed as soon as feasible.
- The Programme Panel considered that the absence of a risk register and a clear policy for part-time staff induction was also concerning.

### **Learning Resources**

- The Programme Panel considered that information access for students while available is inadequate. While the Panel understands the budgetary constraints, it asks the Department to ensure that up-to-date reading material is provided and that online learning resource access is provided where appropriate. In particular, the Programme Panel considers it important to facilitate those part-time learners who have difficulty accessing learning materials while off campus.

### **Identity**

- The Programme Panel heard that the Department had a rich complement of provision types. These ranged from the highly specialist Art Therapy programme to other short-course 'hobby type' provision. In the view of the Programme Panel, the widening access agenda of the Department should be celebrated – the energy and enthusiasm of the course team appears to successfully engage a wide range of students. The Art Therapy programme has an excellent reputation despite the lack of resources. However, the core teaching team is aware of the evolving identity and character of the college and looks positively at new course developments. The Panel recommends that CCAD/CIT may wish to review the title of the Department.

### **New Programme Development in Arts & Healthcare**

- The Programme Panel cautioned that liaison with stakeholders and thorough research were needed before contemplating the development of an MA in the area of arts & healthcare. The art therapy profession still lacked a clearly defined identity in the workplace, and it was less than certain if the workplace would support the development of yet another separate professional profile in the area.

### **Teaching and Learning**

- The approach taken by the course team to the broad variety of student types appeared to be appropriate and well structured. The Programme Panel heard that staff engaged in team supervision sessions and there was good evidence of appropriate (although unrecorded) pastoral support. The challenge to ensure comparability of learning between the full-time and part-time delivery modes was innovatively addressed through the use of peer learning between groups with amalgamated teaching in some groups. The Programme Panel commends this.

### **Assessment**

- The assessment regime appeared to the Programme Panel to be relatively inflexible and prescriptive, although the course team recognised opportunities for development. In addition, the student effort associated with some assessments appeared disproportionately high when set against the credit weighting of the module: one example is the requirement to deliver a 12,000 – 15,000 word essay in a 5-credit module. It is recommended that the course team simplify the assessment strategy and revise requirements in places to make it easier to manage.

### **Staff Development**

- The Programme Panel noted that the Department's staff development policy was unclear and would benefit from discipline-specific impact.

### **Placement**

- The Programme Panel found that placement activity was strong, with good professional engagement. However, the Panel heard that due to budget constraints part-time staff were undertaking visits in their own time. The Panel recommends that this should be addressed.

### **Outreach/Research**

- The Programme Panel heard that there were further opportunities to develop research, but that academic outreach was constrained by resource limitations. Staff noted links with the European Communities of Arts in Education, the University of Melbourne, Australia and reported their attendance at the Arts and Health Conference in Lithuania. Staff are to be congratulated on their enthusiasm and spirit in this area.

### **Programme Structure and Programme Document**

- The Programme Panel noted that improvements could be made to the layout, resource lists and editing of the programme document, especially the Module Descriptors.
- The Programme Panel however commended the programme team on adapting the content and structure of the programme to keep up with the changing demands of the workplace, particularly by incorporating ideas about art and healthcare, different models of practice, and the development of the art therapist as a member of a multi-disciplinary team.

## **PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The findings and recommendations in this section are organised around the issues and themes identified during both review phases for ease of reference. Many of the findings are however interrelated and intersect with more than one theme / issue.

### **1. Identity / Distinctiveness**

- a. The PRG considers that a sustained ambition to be the best art college in the region, if not the country will be key to securing CCAD's future as a serious player in national and international third-level visual arts education and combating any potential perception of stagnation.
- b. In order for CCAD to realise this ambition, the PRG wishes to reiterate its earlier recommendations that it is essential for the college to know, embrace, continue to build up, and communicate its strengths and distinctive features in a proactive, ambitious and sustained manner.
- c. The PRG found that there was a tendency in the Programmatic Review documentation to 'undersell' the activities of the college and its individual departments / programme teams. PRG members observed that a number of noteworthy facets only emerged in discussion with CCAD staff during the panel sessions, both plenary and break-out. In the view of the PRG, this further illustrates the necessity to not only strengthen the distinctive features of the college and each programme, but also to ensure that these are well understood and communicated internally and externally.
- d. Related to this, the PRG recommends that CCAD should place stronger emphasis on building up and maintaining good and efficient communication (in terms of strategy, channels and practices), both internally (with and between staff and students) and with external stakeholders.

### **2. Strategic Plan**

- a. Following on from the points made under 1., the PRG recommends that CCAD develop and communicate a coherent College Strategic Plan that clearly articulates its ambition to be a key regional, national and international player in third level art & design education.
- b. The PRG also wants to re-emphasise the crucial role of a College Strategic Plan as a means of providing strategic direction for internal activities (including interaction with CIT) and as a focal point for the recruitment of learners and the building of external relationships.
- c. It is crucial that the CCAD Strategic Plan should be built on a sound understanding of the college's identity and 'unique selling point' and should show a true commitment to difference. This should be reflected in the clarity and boldness with which key decisions are communicated in and through the Strategic Plan.
- d. Finally, the PRG also considers it important that responsibility for the implementation of the College Strategic Plan should be embraced and shared by all CCAD staff.

### **3. Externality**

- a. The PRG considers that the dimensions of externality have not as yet been fully understood by CCAD staff. Both the documentation submitted and the panel discussions provided good evidence that many staff members were and are engaged in a variety of external activities. However, these activities appear to be carried out in a largely ad-hoc manner and do not appear to be derived from, or linked to, an overall strategy. In addition, staff connections or networking activities are in the view of the PRG not sufficiently utilised or harnessed for the long-term strategic gain of the college.

- b. The PRG considers CCAD would benefit greatly from fostering, on an institutional level, relationships and partnerships with national and international organisations that may enable the college, its staff and students to be inspired and challenged. Such relationships will also connect the college to a wider network of activities and opportunities.
- c. The PRG therefore recommends that the external dimensions of the college's relations and activities need to be specifically mapped out in and supported by the CCAD Strategic Plan.
- d. CCAD's externality strategy should include the building of meaningful, embedded long-term partnerships. CCAD should proactively seek out and make use of key players in the regional, national and international visual arts environment. To achieve these aims, the college may need to risk entering 'uncomfortable', challenging partnerships, including partnerships in which CCAD would clearly be the 'junior partner'.
- e. The PRG further recommends that CCAD should make a strategic commitment to using (external) prizes and major competitions as a means to establish the CCAD 'brand'. This should be done by selecting a number of prizes and competitions for their 'fit' with the established strengths of the college and targeting these institutionally.
- f. The PRG considers that there is also a need to build up international links through measures such as staff travel to centres of good practice and the development of staff exchanges.
- g. Finally, the PRG also finds that the college may be understating and possibly undervaluing its ERASMUS activities as a mechanism for establishing an international presence. The PRG therefore asks CCAD to ensure that sufficient attention is paid to ERASMUS activities, both in terms of their visibility and their strategic potential for building international relations.

#### **4. Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and Research**

- a. The PRG found that staff development activities are ongoing in CCAD. However, the CPD activities also appear fragmented, again due to the lack of an integrated plan for their coordination and development. The PRG therefore recommends that a Continuing Professional Development strategy and framework should be prepared and should form an integral part of an overall Faculty Strategic Plan. The CPD strategy/framework should have a lifespan of 3 – 5 years and should make provision for the establishment of an appropriate infrastructure to sustain the long-term development of this area.
- b. Any planning for future CPD activities should include a strong commitment to providing opportunities and incentives for international staff travel. It should also outline mechanisms by which the experience gained by individual staff members availing of these opportunities may be fed back and made productive for the staff and students of the college at large.
- c. The PRG observations with regard to staff research activity are comparable to those on CPD. Therefore, the PRG asks that CCAD should also prepare a 3 – 5-year strategy and framework for the development of research which is in keeping with the overall strategic direction of the college and which again provides for an appropriate infrastructure to ensure the long-term sustainability of research activity in CCAD.
- d. In this context, the PRG particularly recommends that the emerging areas of excellence in art therapy and art education should be supported and further developed.
- e. Finally, the PRG notes that it is likely that the development of strategies for research and CPD will impact on staffing strategy also, and asks the college to take this into consideration in the development of these strategies.

#### **5. Health & Safety**

The PRG commends the college on the amount of work undertaken over the summer to address a number of outstanding Health & Safety and access concerns. The Panel asks CCAD

and CIT management to ensure that the remaining Health & Safety and access issues remain on the agenda as priority items, and that neither college nor Institute are exposed in terms of liability.

## **6. Staffing (Art Therapy)**

Given the risk to the continued delivery and quality of the Art Therapy programmes in particular and the limitations on development imposed by the current staffing structure of the Department of Art Therapy & Continuing Visual Education, the Panel asks that the college should aim to increase the number of full-time staff in the Department as soon as circumstances permit.

## **7. Programme Documentation**

Following on from point 1.c, PRG members suggest that Cork Institute of Technology might consider its protocols and guidelines for the production and maintenance of programme documents. It is suggested that this should be done with a view to establishing which document or set of documents constitutes the official (standing) programme document between Programmatic Reviews, which functions and audiences this document is intended to serve, and whether there are valid information needs not appropriately or effectively addressed by the present extent/format of the official programme documentation.

## **8. Programme Structure Overall / Modularisation & Semesterisation (M&S)**

- a. The PRG would like to express its appreciation of the scope and complexity of the task carried out by college staff in converting all CCAD programme structures to a modularised and semesterised format. The PRG appreciates that the conversion to a modularised and semesterised mode of delivery is likely to have posed specific challenges for visual arts programmes, not all of which might necessarily have been resolved in a straightforward and immediately satisfactory manner in the initial conversion.
- b. That said, the PRG would like to encourage college staff to take full ownership and responsibility for M&S within CCAD. In the documentation and discussions, the PRG noted a tendency among CCAD staff to preserve a habitual view of M&S as an imposition. The PRG would like to suggest that staff might benefit from questioning the usefulness of such a perception. Rather than this, the PRG asks staff to actively seek to identify ways in which M&S can be made to work for the programmes of the Crawford College.
- c. The PRG found that the actual delivery structures and pathways through the visual arts programmes in particular are not easily and well represented within the constraints of the Programme and Module Descriptor format. The PRG therefore asks college staff to pool their visual and representational skills to create an exemplary visual mapping of these programmes which would have the potential to become a sectoral benchmark.
- d. The PRG notes that it is outside of its scope and remit to make recommendations with regard to deviations from the standard college-wide model of modularisation sought by college staff. The PRG recommends that any such requests will need to be submitted to the Academic Council of Cork Institute of Technology directly.

## **9. Programme and Module Descriptors – Fine Art and Ceramic Design**

- a. The PRG notes that the *Free Choice* module is omitted from the Semester Schedules submitted for Semesters 3 – 6 for both Fine Art and Ceramic Design. Moreover, though *Free Choice* is included in Semester 2 of each programme, the credit total from the mandatory modules (after respective correction of the status of *Subsidiary Study 102*) comes to 30 credits, which effectively precludes students from selecting *Free Choice* in Semester 2 also. For Semesters 3 – 6, the Department of Fine Art and Ceramic Design should therefore either include *Free Choice* in the schedules or make a derogation application to Academic Council via CIT's Module Moderator. In addition, if the Department intends to correct the status of

*Subsidiary Study 102* to mandatory as stated, a *Free Choice* derogation will also need to be sought for Semester 2.

- b. The PRG notes that a number of individual Module Descriptors also require amendment. The PRG asks that, following consultation with the CIT Module Moderator, all appropriate amendments should be implemented and that the finalised Module Descriptors should be submitted to the Registrar's Office and CIT Module Moderator for sign-off prior to the submission of the programmes to Academic Council for revalidation.
- c. Following on, **the PRG recommends the BA (Hons) in Fine Art and BA (Hons) in Ceramic Design to Academic Council for revalidation, subject to the verification of the implementation of any amendments as agreed by the CIT Module Moderator and Registrar's Office.** It should be noted that revalidation of the *BA (Hons) in Ceramic Design* is granted on an interim basis and presupposes the implementation of further PRG recommendations with regard to the Ceramic Design programme (see 7 below) as soon as practicable.

#### **10. BA (Hons) in Ceramic Design**

- a. The PRG heard that, following a lengthy process of investigation and consultation, the Department of Fine Art and Ceramic Design with the support of CCAD management wishes to propose that a separate CAO code and 1<sup>st</sup> Year intake should be reinstated for the Ceramics programme. Some remodelling of the programme to further support its standalone nature was also envisaged. The new title proposed for the standalone programme was *BA (Hons) in Applied Arts with Ceramics*. Based on the documentation and discussions, the PRG approves these proposals in principle, with some provisos as outlined in 10.b – d below.
- b. Outlining the reasoning behind the proposal, Department staff stated that the existing joint 1<sup>st</sup> Year was geared towards Fine Art more than Ceramics and inculcated a strong and distinctive Fine Art ethos into the students. This meant that, with rare exceptions, students who had entered the programme with the intention of pursuing the Ceramic Design option did not actually continue into the specialised 2<sup>nd</sup> Year of the Ceramics programme. Given this situation, however, the PRG considers that the proposed revisions outlined in documentation and discussion do not go far enough towards the creation a distinct 'applied arts' ethos for the standalone programme. Therefore, PRG support for a standalone Ceramics programme is conditional on a more exhaustive redesign of Year 1, with a view to creating a 1<sup>st</sup> Year which strongly expresses and instils a specific Ceramics philosophy from the outset.
- c. Once revision of the Module Descriptors and Semester Schedules for the standalone Ceramics programme has been completed, the finalised programme proposal, including the final proposal for a new programme title, should be submitted to the PRG prior to submission to Academic Council for approval.
- d. Finally, the PRG considers that the sustainability of a new standalone Ceramics programme requires careful monitoring. Therefore, the PRG asks that the viability of the standalone programme should undergo an initial review two years from the start-up of the programme, taking into account both intake and the progression rate of the first cohort.

#### **11. Programme and Module Descriptors – Art & Design Education**

- a. The PRG notes that two new Masters level programmes offered by the Department, the *MA in Art & Design Education* and the *MA in Teaching Visual Arts for Primary and Early Years Education*, had only been validated in May 2009 and did not therefore merit or require a detailed programme review in the context of the present Programmatic Review process. Unless otherwise noted, the recommendations and findings in this section therefore apply to the *Higher Diploma in Arts for Arts & Design Teachers* (Level 8) only.
- b. The PRG is pleased with the learning outcomes of the *HD in Arts for Arts & Design Teachers* overall, and generally considers that the programme documents submitted do not do justice

to the quality of the delivered programme which emerged from discussions with programme staff.

- c. The PRG recommends that the Department should consider renaming certain modules to achieve a better representation of the module material and to make the module more appealing to potential students. Most notably, 'ICT' should be replaced by 'New Media' in all relevant module titles.
- d. The PRG noted that no mention is made in the Module Descriptors of a commitment to multiculturalism and inclusion, even though discussions with programme staff revealed that great work was carried out in this area in the actual programme delivery. The PRG therefore recommends that the relevant Module Descriptors should be revised accordingly to reflect and formalise good practice.
- e. The PRG also found that the provision of skills for future education models is not specifically incorporated in the programme as submitted, and recommends that the appropriate Module Descriptor should be revised to explicitly include such skills provision.
- f. The module levels should be reviewed throughout, with a suggestion that perhaps some modules warrant an 'Intermediate' level, whilst others merit to be classified as 'Advanced'.
- g. Related to this, the PRG also suggests that the terminology used throughout the Module Descriptors should be reviewed for consistency and appropriateness to the level of the module.
- h. The PRG considers that the module learning outcomes and assessment criteria might require closer alignment at times, and asks the Department to review the relationship between learning outcomes and assessment criteria throughout the Module Descriptors.
- i. The PRG notes that, while 'effective use' of Harvard Referencing system is a learning outcome of the Semester 1 research methods module (EDUC8004, *Research Methods ArtEd 1*), this referencing system has not been applied in the Module Descriptors themselves. This should be addressed for the sake of consistency.
- j. Finally, **the PRG recommends the *Higher Diploma in Arts for Arts & Design Teachers* to Academic Council for revalidation, subject to the verification of the implementation of any amendments as agreed by the CIT Module Moderator and Registrar's Office.**

## **12. Access to Learning Resources – Art Therapy and Continuing Visual Education**

The PRG asks the Department to ensure that up-to-date reading materials are provided for learners as far as possible within given budgetary constraints. Access to online learning resource access should also be provided where appropriate. In particular, the Programme Panel considers it important to facilitate those part-time learners who have difficulty accessing learning materials while off campus.

## **13. Programme and Module Descriptors – Art Therapy and Continuing Visual Education**

- a. The PRG recommends that the programme team simplify the assessment strategy and revise requirements in places to make assessments easier to manage for learners on the *MA in Art Therapy*.
- b. **The PRG recommends the *Master of Arts in Art Therapy* to Academic Council for revalidation, subject to the verification of the implementation of any necessary amendments to the Programme and Module Descriptors as agreed by the CIT Module Moderator and Registrar's Office.**

## **TIMESCALE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND OUTLOOK**

- The PRG commends the Crawford College of Art and Design on the work already carried out towards the implementation of its Phase 1 recommendations.

While progress on some issues might have been somewhat slower than expected (production of a college strategic plan, externality and research strategies; formal establishment of external links; review of research capacity; mechanisms to obtain student feedback), progress statements on all Phase 1 recommendations have been submitted to the PRG as requested. In most cases, these statements include an action plan or statement of intent with regard to future measures.

- To ensure that the momentum of progress towards implementing the Programmatic Review recommendations is not lost, the PRG would like to underscore the importance of a timely implementation review as per CIT's academic quality process (which requires the Acting Head of College to submit an initial follow-up report within 2 years of Programmatic Review). The members of the PRG would like to express their willingness in principle to participate in such a review if called upon.
- The PRG notes that the circulation of the Phase 1 Report to CCAD at the beginning of the academic summer break had been mentioned as a contributory factor in the delay of a staff response and the implementation of some Phase 1 recommendations. To derive maximum benefit from a phased approach to Programmatic Review, it is therefore suggested that it might be preferable to complete both phases within one and the same academic year to avoid disruption of the process.
- With regard to the proposed standalone Ceramics programme, the PRG asks that the completed programme proposal, including a final proposal for a new programme title, should be submitted to the PRG (or an appropriately composed sub-group thereof) for review prior to submission to Academic Council for approval.

## APPENDIX: PHASE 2 PANEL TIMETABLES

### Crawford College of Art and Design - Programmatic Review 2009

#### Phase 2: Programme Review

Date: Tue 20 October 2009

Venues: Jury's Hotel / CCAD / O'Herlihy Building, Model Farm Road

Time	Event	Format / Topics	Venue	To Attend
8:45 AM	PRG assembles		Jury's	
9 - 10 AM	Initial Meeting of PRG	Introductions, main issues from documentation	Jury's	<i>Private Panel Meeting</i>
10:00 - 10:45 AM	Phase 1 Recommendations, Strategic Planning	Impl. of Phase 1 Recomm./ Progress report on Programme of Work; CCAD Strategic Plan	Jury's	CCAD Mgt. Team, Course Board Rep's, FA Board of Studies Chair
10:45 - 11:00 AM	Tea/Coffee Break		Jury's	
11:00 AM - 12:00 PM	Overarching Programme Issues	Operation of M&S, Skills Development, Feedback on Performance	Jury's	Acting Head of CCAD, Heads of Department, Course Board Rep's
12:00 - 1:15 PM	Lunch		Jury's	
1:15 - 4:15 PM	Individual Programme Meetings - 3 Parallel Sessions (inc. transfer from/to CCAD as appropriate) → see individual timetables	FACD session: to include overall programme structure  Art Therapy session: to include CPD / Adult Ed. activities	FACD: Jury's / Art Education: CCAD / Art Therapy: Model Farm Road	Each session: Head of Department, Programme Staff
4:15 - 4:45 PM	Tea/Coffee Break		Jury's	
4:45 - 5:45 PM	Panel Close-Out Meeting		Jury's	<i>Private Panel Meeting</i>
5:45 - 6:15 PM	Initial Panel Feedback to CCAD Senior Staff / Phases 1 and 2		Jury's	Acting Head of College, Heads of Department
6:15 - 8:30 PM	Private Time / Transfer to Restaurant			
From 8:30 PM	Panel Dinner		Café Paradiso (Western Road, opposite Jury's)	Panel, Acting Head of College, Heads of Department

Crawford College of Art and Design - Programmatic Review 2009

Programme Meetings

Department: Fine Art and Ceramic Design

Venue: Jury's Hotel

Time	Event	Format / Topics	Venue	To Attend
...	...	...	...	...
1:15 - 2PM	Overall Programme Suite	Develop. of progr. portfolio, grad./ stud. perf. and 'career profile', viability, FA and CD, plans for CD	Jury's	Acting Head of College, Head of Department, Programme Staff for Fine Art / Ceramic Des.
2 - 2:15 PM	Tea / Coffee Break		Jury's	
2:15 - 3:15 PM	BA (Hons) in Fine Art	Programme Structure, Modules	Jury's	Head of Dep't, Programme Staff for BA (Hons) in Fine Art
3:15 - 4:15 PM	BA (Hons) in Ceramic Design	Programme Structure, Modules	Jury's	Head of Dep't, Programme Staff for BA (Hons) in Ceramic Design
...	...	...	...	...

Crawford College of Art and Design - Programmatic Review 2009

Programme Meetings

Department: Art & Design Education

Venue: CCAD

Time	Event	Format / Topics	Venue	To Attend
...	...	...	...	...
1:15 - 1:30 PM	Transfer to CCAD			
1:30 - 2PM	Overall Programme Suite	Programme portfolio, grad./ stud. performance and 'career profile'	CCAD	Head of Department, Programme Staff
2 - 3 PM	Higher Diploma in Art & Design Education	Programme Structure, Modules	CCAD	Head of Dep't, Programme Staff
3 - 3:15 PM	Tea / Coffee Break		CCAD	
3:15 - 3:45 PM	MA in Art & Design Ed. / Teach. Visual Arts for Primary ... Ed.	Programme Structure, Modules	CCAD	Head of Dep't, Programme Staff
3:45 - 4:15 PM	Transfer to Jury's			
...	...	...	...	...

Crawford College of Art and Design - Programmatic Review 2009

Programme Meetings

Department: Art Therapy and Adult Education

Venue: O'Herlihy Building, Model Farm Road

Time	Event	Format / Topics	Venue	To Attend
...	...	...	...	...
1:15 - 1:30 PM	Transfer to Model Farm Road			
1:30 - 2:30 PM	MA in Art Therapy	Programme Structure, Modules	O'Herlihy Bldg.	Head of Department, Programme Staff
2:30 - 3 PM	Other Art Therapy Programmes	Programme portfolio, links with MA, programme viability / develop.	O'Herlihy Bldg.	Head of Dep't, Programme Staff
3 - 3:15 PM	Tea / Coffee Break		O'Herlihy Bldg.	
3:15 - 4 PM	Adult Education Courses	Programme portfolio, viability and development of programmes	O'Herlihy Bldg.	Head of Dep't, Programme Staff
4 - 4:15 PM	Transfer to Jury's			
...	...	...	...	...

- END -