

Cork Institute of Technology

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

PHASE 1: STRATEGIC REVIEW

(APRIL 2009)

REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW GROUP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Introduction</u>	p. 3
<u>Membership of the Phase 1 Peer Review Group</u>	p. 4
<u>Preliminary Discussions</u>	p. 4
<u>Meeting with Senior Management</u>	p. 5
<u>Tour of Facilities / Meeting with CCAD Staff</u>	p. 6
<u>Facilities, Resources and Operational Issues</u>	p. 6
<u>Plans for Development</u>	p. 7
<u>Identity and Profile</u>	p. 8
<u>Education and Training Provision</u>	p. 8
<u>Staff Development</u>	p. 8
<u>Meeting with Students</u>	p. 9
<u>Meeting with External Stakeholders</u>	p. 10
<u>Principal Phase 1 Findings and Recommendations</u>	p. 11
<u>Phase 2 Issues and Summary of Programme of Work</u>	p. 13
<u>Appendix: Phase 1 Panel Timetable</u>	p. 14

INTRODUCTION

Programmatic Review is a statutory five-yearly quality process in which peer evaluators analyse the effectiveness of a suite of programmes, with an emphasis on quality and flexibility of response to changing needs. In Cork Institute of Technology, this review is conducted on a faculty basis and is built on a self-study by the faculty or constituent college under review, supplemented by meetings of the Peer Review Group with staff, students and other stakeholders.

Externally, Programmatic Review contributes to the enhancement of public confidence in the Institute and its awards. Internally, it affords the opportunity to step back from the ongoing business of programme delivery to reflect on the current status and future direction of a faculty/college and its programme portfolio. It is however important that Programmatic Review should be understood as one stage in a continuous monitoring and improvement cycle, rather than as a once-off effort to be survived and then forgotten about.

CIT's constituent Crawford College of Art and Design is currently undergoing the Programmatic Review of its systems and programmes. As per CIT's revised quality system, this process is conducted in two phases. Phase 1 was completed in April 2009 and looked at strategic and high-level issues. Phase 2 will take place in the autumn of 2009 and will be devoted to a detailed programme review. The outcomes of the Phase 1 top-level review are made available to CCAD well in advance of Phase 2 so that they may inform and steer the second phase of the self-study process.

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

MEMBERSHIP OF THE PHASE 1 PEER REVIEW GROUP

Prof Alan Livingston CBE (Chair)
Rector, University College Falmouth

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 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

Ms Eva Juhl
Delegated Authority Facilitator, CIT Registrar's Office

It is intended that the Phase 2 Peer Review Group will largely overlap with the Phase 1 membership and will also be chaired by Prof. Livingston to ensure continuity. A small number of additional members may however be invited to serve on the Phase 2 panel to ensure appropriate coverage of subject specialisms in individual programmes.

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS

Following a review of the Phase 1 college submission, a number of issues were discussed by the Panel during its initial private meeting.

- The Panel stated that it saw its role as that of a 'critical friend'.
- The Panel noted that there were obvious issues regarding the physical location of the college and the poor condition of the existing accommodation. The lack of a building which was or could be made 'fit for purpose' was also going to have an effect on future developments. The Panel supported college plans to explore links with the Cork Centre for Architectural Studies and felt this would offer distinct development possibilities.
- Student feedback included in the Phase 1 submission document highlights the fact that graduates leave college without a good sense of their career or employment prospects. Lack of IT skills was also highlighted. The Panel noted that the 2003 PRG report had also mentioned issues regarding the students' skills development.
- The Panel members agreed that they had gained little sense of CCAD's particular profile or 'brand' from the submission document. The Panel felt that CCAD's relationship with the wider Institute might be a contributing factor here. The document presented some evidence of external obstacles to CCAD's progress, but also displayed optimism that these could be dealt with.

- The Panel identified staff research and ~ development, associated timetabling issues, and lack of resources as areas for discussion.
- The Panel agreed that the impact of Modularisation & Semesterisation would need to be explored further (most likely during Phase 2 of the review). One question arising from the documentation was whether the strict M&S guidelines might need to be relaxed slightly for art programmes. However, the Panel noted that M&S also appeared to have provided new delivery options which might not have been available to CCAD previously.
- The Panel praised the development of the art therapy area and noted that CCAD's art therapy programmes were the only such offering in Ireland outside of QUB. However, both the internal links with the rest of the college and links with external stakeholders might need to be enhanced and developed further.
- The Panel considered that the overall complement of CCAD activities and programmes was not very cohesive. There appeared to be an amalgam of offerings that had developed over time without the application of a unifying strategy. Going forward, a transitional strategy to create greater coherence will be required. Areas such as textiles etc. should be developed.
- Links with external stakeholders need to be strengthened. Links to date appear to be quite limited and focus predominantly on the provision of student awards or residences. There was also a sense that the college was isolated from art practitioners in the city and wider region.
- The Panel noted that the submission document fails to mention an alumni strategy, including how the college could garner its leading alumni to act as champions for the college.

MEETING WITH SENIOR MANAGEMENT

Present:

Ms Orla Flynn, Acting Head of CCAD

Dr Brendan J. Murphy, President of CIT

Dr Barry O'Connor, Acting Registrar (CIT)

Dr Stephen Cassidy, Head of Teaching & Learning (CIT)

Mr Tadhg Leane, Head of Strategy & Policy (CIT)

Mr Ed Riordan, Deputy Registrar (CIT)

Mr Paul Sliney, Modularisation & Semesterisation Facilitator (CIT)

Dr Niall Smith, Head of Research (CIT)

- The President stated that both he and the Governing Body believed that the Crawford building as it stands was not fit for purpose. The development of CCAD was second on the Institute's list of development priorities. A development site had been donated by Cork City Council, but funding for a building would be a challenge in present economic conditions. The President was reasonably confident that he would be able to secure a commitment on funding within the next five 5 years. The Institute was looking for temporary accommodation as an interim measure, but the President acknowledged that this did have pedagogical implications.

Another area which would be explored for the future development of CCAD was the reintroduction of certain crafts/trades areas into the college. The President stated that a carefully selected range of crafts and trades could sit very well with the ethos of CIT as an education provider.

Finally, the President pointed out that deliberations about the future of CCAD needed to be placed in the context of a comprehensive review of the academic structures of Cork Institute due to commence in the near future. The President had proposed the creation of a Faculty of Arts, incorporating CCAD, the Cork School of Music and a number of departments presently located in the Faculty of Business & Humanities. Irrespective of the creation of an Arts Faculty, however, the links with architecture and other creativity and innovation collaborations would be enhanced going into the future.

- The Panel established with senior staff that there was some flexibility going forward in adapting the CIT model of Modularisation & Semesterisation to suit certain programmes. Over the 2009/2010 academic year, the M&S model would be reviewed in terms of its impact on programmes and other relevant aspects.
- The Panel heard that the introduction of M&S had resulted in a reduction of contact hours in CCAD from a pre-M&S average of 25 – 26 hours to 22 – 23 hours per stage. A series of efficiencies-related cutbacks would lead to a further reduction of contact hours to 19 – 20, particularly in Stage 4. The President noted that academic staff had found it quite difficult to adjust to the reductions in delivery time, particularly in the Arts where programmes traditionally tended to be quite unstructured and individual programme units big. Experience did not confirm, however, that high contact hours necessarily improved programme quality and benefited the student. Rather, it was the academic supports around delivery which needed to be increased.
- The Panel heard that a research strategy for CCAD had yet to be produced. The Head of Research outlined that the Institute's research strengths had now been established at a sustainable level and attention could be turned to developing areas which traditionally attracted less external funding, such as Fine Art. The Institute needed to provide core funding for these growth areas to attain a fundamental level of research activity in its constituent colleges. To ensure sustainability, it was essential that research in these areas was developed selectively. The Panel suggested that research development in these areas would be greatly supported by entering into collaborations with more established national and international research centres. It would also be of benefit if the Head of College and CCAD staff were enabled to travel to experience examples of best practice elsewhere.

TOUR OF FACILITIES / MEETING WITH CCAD STAFF

Present:

Ms Orla Flynn, Acting Head of College

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

Mr Ed Kuczaj, Head of Art Therapy and Continuing Visual Education

Mr Albert Walsh, Head of Art & Design Education

Ms Mary Cronin, College Administrator and member of the CCAD Programmatic Review Steering Group (PRSG)

Ms Julie Aldridge, Lecturer, Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design

Mr Mark Ewart, Nominee from HDip in Arts for Art & Design Teachers Course Board and member of the CCAD PRSG

Mr Markus Jungmann, Nominee from Ceramic Design Course Board and member of the CCAD PRSG

Ms Breda Lynch, Nominee from Fine Art Course Board

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

Mr Peter McTigue, Lecturer, Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design and member of the CCAD PRSG

Mr Mike Murphy, Chair of Department Research Committee, Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design

Ms Catherine Phillips, Nominee from MA in Art Therapy Course Board

Ms Vera Ryan, Senior Lecturer, Department of Fine Art & Ceramic Design

Facilities, Resources and Operational Issues

- During its tour of the facilities, the Panel observed with concern that the existing building still had a number of unresolved Health & Safety issues. The Acting Head noted that CCAD was the first area in CIT which had completed a risk assessment. An action plan had been drawn up, implementation of which was essential to maintaining a basic level of usability. The Panel supports this assessment.
- CCAD staff expressed the view that the space/accommodation issue was the single biggest issue facing CCAD in the immediate future. The Panel heard that the intake into the 1st Year had to be capped for Health & Safety reasons as well as because the college had a responsibility to ensure sufficient workspace for all its learners. CCAD was in a bind in that it could not increase the intake due

to space constraints, but at the same time needed to expand to strengthen funding requests for a new building. In the opinion of the Panel, it is imperative that temporary accommodation should be secured as soon as possible to address the most pressing spatial needs of the college in the short term. Once these are met, staff should then set about engaging in the 'blue sky thinking' which is crucial to the further development and rejuvenation of CCAD (see also the section on Identity and Profile below).

- The Panel heard that the Crawford College of Art and Design had been a stand-alone art college until it was amalgamated with the then Cork RTC in 1993. For some years, CIT contributed a budget, but did not involve itself in CCAD on an operational level. The Panel heard that there were some members of CCAD staff who would still prefer not to be linked with CIT. The Panel expressed the strong view that holding on to such a position could only obstruct the future development of CCAD. In order to move forward, college staff had to work as one cohesive body towards a set of common goals, and should also be prepared to work towards a mutually beneficial accord with the Institute at large.
- Senior staff as well as lecturers find themselves heavily involved in programme administration, as well as providing technical support to students in some cases. The Panel considers that this is not an adequate use of resources. Appropriate technical and administrative supports should be put in place to enable staff to focus on their core lecturing / management tasks and also the actual art practice which needs to inform teaching.
- Given the constraints of the present fiscal situation, the Panel suggested that management and staff should investigate different and innovative delivery models that don't necessarily depend on the short-term provision of new purpose-built accommodation.

Plans for Development

- The Acting Head of College gave a brief presentation on the CCAD Strategic Plan for the next 5 years. The plan hopes to achieve the following:
 - Have viable and sustainable student numbers across all undergraduate programmes. Establish vibrant research programmes in collaboration with other education providers.
 - Formalise relationships with external stakeholders at an institutional level, while at the same time recognising the contributions of individual staff members to arts events and organisations locally and nationally. Further develop the CCAD alumni association and formalise links that are, up to now, very informal. Use graduates with excellent reputations to further promote the college.
 - Increase linkages with local community and open the college to the community.
 - Increased recognition of lecturers of their role as professional educators.
 - Additional accommodation will be required to accommodate growth. Even with the existing student numbers, the current building is barely able to cope.
 - Ongoing and regular review of programmes outside of the 5-year Programmatic Review process.
 - Better representation of CCAD staff on CIT committees and activities.
 - CCAD to be seen as the higher education provider of choice for Art and Design programmes. Potential students would be aware of the linkages CCAD has with such organisations such as National Sculpture Factory, Glucksman Gallery etc.
 - Establish an international student cohort.
 - Establish EU partnerships with higher education providers, participate in European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA) events, be involved in EU education debates.
- The Panel stated that CCAD's future was dependent on the quality of its educational offerings and the college's ability to be competitive, as the introduction of third level fees was imminent.

- To initiate expansion, the college should take a strategic decision to develop and start up 3 – 4 new programmes. The successful operation of these programmes would then enable the college to submit a viable request for additional resources.

Identity and Profile

- The Panel emphasised that the CCAD ‘brand’ or unique selling point had not become evident through the submission document or from any distinctive features of the physical building, such as its signage. It also appeared to Panel members that neither CIT management nor CCAD staff fully understood what made CCAD unique and special, and this affected how the college projected itself externally. If the college was to develop, the unique profile of CCAD needed to be identified and made visible – both within CIT and externally – and CCAD staff needed to believe that their college is unique and distinct from its competitors.
- The Panel noted that although embarrassment about the building had likely contributed to the low morale and lack of confidence on the part of staff, this needed to be overcome and replaced by an appreciation of what the college had to offer ‘despite the building’. Low morale could not be attributed to the state of the building alone. Anecdotal evidence was presented by a staff member relating to some students who had expressed a preference for the education provided by CCAD over that received from another college with markedly better physical resources. The Panel stated there were also examples of UK colleges which had overcome poor physical resources to achieve a reputation of providing a quality education. These could be used as models for CCAD in approaching its particular difficulties.
- In this context, it was suggested that CCAD could make much more of its unique position in the midst of a vibrant local community of practicing artists coupled with quick access to Europe. These features should be exploited for future development.
- The Panel heard that the traditional designation of CCAD in exhibition reviews etc. was that of the ‘prime object-making college in Ireland’. Many staff members had got tired of this designation and felt pigeon-holed by it. There was also a perception that the college engaged in the same practices now as it had done 10 years ago, even though a lot had changed. CCAD staff also stated that they were in need of new ideas and ‘new fights’. The Panel supported the appetite and impetus for innovation evidenced in these statements and reiterated that CCAD needed to make a real effort to break out of the established views and sell what the college ‘was about’ to a new range of audiences.

Education and Training Provision

- Based on a comparison with other providers, the Panel was of the view that CCAD probably over-taught. There was no pedagogical justification for 23 hours of delivery in an Honours programme. In institutions where contact hours had been reduced, it was found that this not only provided learners with much-needed time for individual study and recovery, but also allowed teaching staff to keep themselves fresh and engage in further professional development. The Acting Head of College reminded the Panel that the recently announced cutbacks would lead to a further decrease in contact hours and brought the college much closer to THAS guidelines. However, it was likely that further reductions would need to be effected.

Staff Development

- The Panel heard that Cork Institute supported its staff through the provision of funding for staff development. A number of staff were supported to complete MA degrees and other qualifications.
- The Panel also heard that CCAD staff had a good record of exhibiting work. The Panel however cautioned that this work needed to be peer-reviewed and externally assessed by appropriately qualified assessors to be classed as research for purposes of an accreditation process.
- CCAD senior staff stated that academic managers did not have a lot of freedom to re-allocate resources received or lecturer hours freed up to staff development or project work. A staff member

stated that lecturers would be keen on the introduction of 'short sharp' training courses (of ca. 3 days' duration). At present, however, the ability to participate in such courses depended on being able to arrive at appropriate substitution arrangements with other members of the teaching staff.

MEETING WITH STUDENTS

Present:

Ms Deirdre de Courcy, Year 2 BA (Hons) in Ceramic Design

Ms Mags Geaney, MA in Fine Art (Research)

Ms Lorna Green, MA in Art Therapy

Ms Lydia McGrath, Year 3 BA (Hons) in Fine Art and CCAD Students Union Site President

Mr Adam O'Brien, CIT Students Union Vice President (Education) and graduate of the BA (Hons) in Fine Art

Ms Yvonne Paton, Year 4 BA (Hons) in Ceramic Design

Ms Eimear Twomey, Year 2 BA (Hons) in Fine Art

Ms Sabine Weissbach, Year 2 BA (Hons) in Fine Art

- The Fine Art student representatives in particular highlighted the lack of skills workshops as a serious issue. While workshops on basic production skills were provided in the first year, the provision decreased in later programme stages, with practically no workshops in Stages 3 and 4. Students felt that the fundamental skills taught in Year 1 left them insufficiently prepared to carry out more advanced projects in later programme stages. They also emphasised that a theoretical introduction to production skills was insufficient, in that the skills in question could only be acquired through hands-on practice. In this context, students also deplored a lack of adequate timetabling and structure with regard to the workshops.
- The Panel heard that some students had used their own initiative to organise workshops during the semester break. While they had been enabled to access some of the necessary physical resources during this time, access to others had been restricted for Health & Safety reasons.
- The provision of graduate skills in the Fine Art programmes needed to be enhanced to include topics such as self-promotion, establishing contact with galleries, pricing work etc. Students stated they would be happy to use the inter-semester break to develop these skills or go on work placement.
- In contrast with some of the above, the MA research student present presented a very positive view of her experience. She stated that she was in regular contact with her supervisor, received appropriate assistance with her research work and had been provided with adequate work space. The research student also praised the flexibility of the CCAD Postgraduate Coordinator and noted that there was good communication. The only negative comment related to the fact that the CIT Postgraduate Scholarships were no longer available. Feedback received from the representative for Art Therapy on her experience as a student on the programme was also very positive.
- Students considered that IT access had improved immeasurably from what had been a very poor situation. Further improvements were expected by the students for the near future, most notably through the provision of wireless network access.
- A survey of the current student cohort conducted by the Students' Union indicated wide-spread support for the Acting Head of College among students. Ms. Flynn's ability to motivate staff and students for change and her noted concern for students were particularly welcomed by the respondents. It was noted however that this survey was restricted to students based in the Sharman Crawford Street building. The Panel recommended that communication from the Students' Union should encompass all students who study under the CCAD umbrella, including those on part-time or off-site programmes.
- The Ceramics students present stated that they were often forgotten when it came to notification of events, student trips etc. They also noted that, despite the presence of a superb technician in the

department, the equipment could not be used unless a member of the lecturing staff was also present.

- Students considered that there was little opportunity to provide formal feedback to the CCAD management outside of Course Board meetings. Following student complaints about the absence of workshops (see first paragraph above), the SU site branch recently felt compelled to organise its own survey on provision, the results of which had been made available to the Head of the Fine Art Department. The Panel stated that the onus of finding outlets for their views should not rest on students. It was the responsibility of the academic management of CCAD to establish appropriate feedback mechanisms for students both through the programme boards and outside of them. It was also important that these mechanisms ‘closed the loop’ in terms of addressing student concerns and formally communicating the measures taken back to students.
- Students felt that feedback on their performance was of good quality in most cases. However, the Panel found inconsistencies across programmes in this regard. Students on some programmes reported receiving written and verbal feedback, while other students received verbal feedback only. The frequency and continuity of the feedback was also found to vary. Finally, in some cases students had found feedback from tutorials damaging rather than constructive. The Panel considers that these inconsistencies need to be addressed. CCAD needs to ensure that feedback on student performance is consistent, structured and constructive across all programmes. CCAD might also wish to explore alternative mechanisms for performance-related feedback, for instance allowing students to gauge their progress through a managed peer-review of their own work.
- Students reported that there seemed to be a lack of understanding of M&S and also the ECTS system amongst some CCAD staff. Some students felt that this lack of understanding of the credit accumulation system on the part of staff had also limited students’ access to ERASMUS exchanges. The Panel considers that this should be addressed, and students enabled to make full use of the ERASMUS scheme and other exchange opportunities available to them.
- The Panel heard that lack of exhibition space for students was also an issue. Student work often had to be displayed and critiqued in inappropriate surroundings such as corridors.

MEETING WITH EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS

Present:

Ms Helena Byrne, Fenton Gallery

Ms Elaine Coakley, Administrator, Backwater Studios

Ms Claire Hennessy, Director, Cork Printmakers

Ms Kathleen Hurley, Administrator, Backwater Studios

Ms Fiona Kearney, Director, Glucksman Gallery and member of The Arts Council

Mr Mark Lloyd, Director, Blue Box Project, Limerick

Ms Irene Murphy, Artist

Mr Mick O’Shea, Cork Artists’ Collective

Ms Dawn Williams, Crawford Art Gallery

- Stakeholders noted that there had been positive changes in their relationship with CCAD since the appointment of the Acting Head of College. General communication had also vastly improved. Even though some partnership models which had been suggested by stakeholders previously had not come to fruition, joint ventures and future collaborations were now being explored in a number of cases and links were being strengthened.
- Stakeholders shared the view that there was no sense of CCAD staff or students actively engaging with the large community of artists, galleries and other art institutions in Cork. Events promoted by local galleries etc. were not usually well attended by CCAD students, and no attempts were being made by students to visit local studios. Stakeholders strongly agreed that CCAD students exhibited a

'below the benchmark' curiosity with regard to the local arts environment and did not really exploit existing opportunities e.g. to access galleries outside of public viewing times.

- The Panel heard that there was no formal link between CCAD and the national network of art therapists. The representative present felt that as the leading provider of art therapy education in Ireland, CCAD should take a lead role in formulating policy in this area.
- Stakeholders confirmed that a lot of the arts activity in Cork had developed as a direct result of the contributions of CCAD graduates living and working in the city. CCAD missed an opportunity by not making greater use of alumni artists to give guest lectures, expand the students' skills-sets or act as sounding-boards for future development. Stakeholders expressed a concern that CCAD existed in an 'academic bubble' and did not receive a sufficient amount of input from practising artists.
- The observation was also made that on occasions where student groups attended exhibitions with their lecturers, no input was generally sought from gallery staff either prior to or during the visit.
- Stakeholders expressed the view that the format of the annual degree show was getting repetitive and needed to be revised. Some stakeholders reported receiving external feedback which indicated a drop in the standard of the shows in recent years, but this view was not universally shared. A number of stakeholders noted that their organisation had withdrawn sponsorship for final year bursaries and prizes at least partially as a result of what they perceived to be increasingly complicated arrangements and some communication gaps in the past.

PRINCIPAL PHASE 1 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Panel wishes to make special mention of the very **positive comments regarding the leadership** of the Acting Head of College, Orla Flynn, from staff, students and stakeholders. The Panel felt that there was a real sense that things had improved for CCAD. The Acting Head of College emphasised that change could only happen with the support of the Institute's senior management team, who themselves had displayed great leadership in their own areas.
2. To secure its future as a leading third-level provider of art education, **CCAD needs to build up its distinctiveness** and differentiate itself from other providers. It is essential that all Crawford staff understand the necessity for establishing a more distinct identity for CCAD – even as a constituent part of the larger organisation of CIT – and approach this task collaboratively with vision and boldness, starting with a review of existing skills and expertise across the disciplines. To help staff identify and develop CCAD's distinctive features, staff members are encouraged to travel and to observe practices in other institutions. CCAD should also consider enlisting the support of an external facilitator for this process. Finally, the Panel would like to see a determination across the college to ensure that CCAD's distinctive goals are incorporated into the wider Institute Strategic Plan.

For Phase 2 of the Programmatic Review, the Panel asks CCAD to identify key objectives and an outline vision for the development of a more distinct identity.

3. **New programme development** is key to the process of building up distinctiveness. This process **should build on existing strengths** within CCAD. The college should also not be afraid to ask whether there are areas/elements which could be scaled back to ensure continued viability and make possible new developments. Art Education and Art Therapy are both distinct programme areas which would merit further development. As the leading Irish provider of art therapy training, CCAD might consider engaging in the area of art and healthcare, including the establishment of a link with the Arts & Health Officer of the Arts Council. The Panel would however caution that the development of new programmes should not be allowed to divert the energies of management and staff from resolving any of its pressing 'housekeeping' issues in the first instance.
4. The **research capability** of CCAD staff **needs to be addressed** within a CIT and a national/ international context. In doing so, CCAD needs to ensure that what constitutes research is not just defined internally and privately. Instead, the definition of research should follow rigorous and widely

recognised external criteria and should be informed by good practice in Ireland and elsewhere. Research outputs need to stand up to peer-review. In the Panel's view, long-term maintenance of art practice is one of the best indicators of the ability to lead the college forward in the area of research. Research activity in CCAD should be linked to the Institute's overall Research Strategy.

The Panel asks that a review of CCAD's research capability should be completed in time for Phase 2 of the Programmatic Review. This should include appropriate, well-informed and externally verifiable definitions of the research carried out in the Crawford College.

5. There is evidence that the complement of contact hours exceeds the number of hours required for appropriate and efficient delivery of course material, with limited benefits to learners, particularly in the area of Fine Art. A recent Institute directive requesting efficiencies in teaching hours might have indirectly addressed this to an extent. However, the Panel recommends that a more targeted **review of the teaching load and allocation of delivery hours** across all programmes **should be carried out**. This review should, amongst others, aim to identify the best possible use of the range of expertise and skills among the teaching staff. Lecturer time freed up through this process should be used strategically as an opportunity to refresh the teaching staff by allowing them to engage in non-teaching activities which utilise their talents fully and productively, develop them further, and bring maximum benefit to the college.

The Panel asks that the teaching load review should be completed in time for Phase 2 of the Programmatic Review and should include proposals for the strategic utilisation of any lecturing hours freed up.

6. The Panel would like to encourage CCAD management and staff to **embrace** the fact that CCAD is part of the larger organisation of **Cork Institute of Technology**, and to exploit both the resources and the administrative processes of a big institution to the maximum possible.
7. The Panel considers that skills development has not been adequately addressed in the Phase 1 Faculty document. While the Panel heard from students and external stakeholders that there was still a perception externally that a more traditional, skills-based approach was central to the CCAD ethos, the student representatives met by the Panel were quite critical of skills development, both in relation to production skills and graduate skills.

The issue of **skills development** will therefore need **to be covered in more detail during Phase 2** of the Programmatic Review. CCAD should strive to obtain clarity not just on the skills set of its body of staff, but also on how skills development (of craft skills, professional skills and skills underpinning conceptual development) forms a part of the college's identity and of the distinct profile of its education provision. The issue of skills development should also be borne in mind in new programme development.

8. The panel strongly recommends that **CCAD should** review and **improve its mechanisms** and systems **for obtaining student feedback**. At the moment, whatever feedback is received from students appears to depend largely on the students' own initiative and energy. Even though the standard sectoral feedback forms may have been of limited usefulness, it is suggested that CCAD revisit these and amend them to suit its particular circumstances. The college should also determine and publish formal benchmark targets for addressing consistent student feedback on any issue. Any system that is put in place needs to be formalised and measurable. Finally, the college also needs to ensure that there is systematic student representation on all programme boards, including programmes offered in part-time and ACCS modes.
9. The Panel asks CCAD to ensure that **feedback on student performance** is consistent, structured and constructive across all programmes. CCAD might also wish to explore alternative mechanisms for performance-related feedback, for instance allowing students to gauge their progress through a managed peer-review of their own work. This issue **will be explored in greater detail during Phase 2**.
10. It is **critical that CCAD address its external relationships** without delay. The Panel found the feedback from the external stakeholders it met to be consistently critical, yet the Panel also wishes to note that

there was a good number and range of the regional art institutions represented at the meeting, and that all stakeholder representatives without exception expressed a willingness to build stronger relationships with the college. The stakeholders shared the view that CCAD operates largely in isolation from a vibrant local and regional external art environment. A number of stakeholders felt this was partly due to the perceived detachment among some college staff and expressed concern that this attitude would need to be addressed before a new set of relationships could be established.

The Panel therefore asks that CCAD should begin the process of building up its external links immediately, in an appropriately formalised and sustainable manner. Any surplus lecturing hours might fruitfully be used to allocate certain staff to take responsibility for establishing and maintaining formal external linkages. The summer months should be used to formalise at least some external links prior to Phase 2 of the Programmatic Review. In addition, CCAD is asked to produce a comprehensive strategy and implementation plan for addressing external relationships, which should also be completed for Phase 2.

11. The Panel appreciates that the issue of the CCAD building is not going to be resolved in the short term. **CCAD is therefore encouraged to think beyond the building** by considering how work can be taken to the city. In so doing, the building is allowed to become part of the externality of the art education and ~ production carried out in the college. Such an approach would also contribute to raising the profile of CCAD externally because it would necessitate and foster the building of external relationships. In addition to this, the Panel also recommends that the college should explore securing temporary accommodation locally to alleviate some of the spatial constraints in the short- to medium term. CCAD needs to guard against allowing the issue of the building to constrain the creativity of the staff or students.
12. Notwithstanding this, the Panel considers that the existing building still has quite a lot of **unresolved Health & Safety issues**. The Panel therefore strongly recommends that any outstanding Health & Safety or access concerns raised by previous panels should be addressed as a matter of urgency. CCAD needs to ensure that both the college and the Institute are not exposed with regard to liability, in particular that the Acting Head of College or staff members cannot be made personally liable.
13. Throughout the panel sessions, the Panel formed the impression that the three **academic departments** of CCAD **operate quite separately from each other**, leaving students in particular generally unaware of practices and developments in areas other than their own. For Art Therapy, this situation is exacerbated by its geographical separation from the main CCAD building. The Panel recommends that the Heads of Department should lead a concerted college-wide effort to increase the level of communication and collaboration between academic departments and to explore all possible synergies.

PHASE 2 ISSUES AND SUMMARY OF PROGRAMME OF WORK

1. In view of the review tasks that CCAD staff have been asked to carry out prior to the second phase of the review, the Panel suggests that **Phase 2** should not take place any earlier than **September 2009**.
2. In summary, the following programme of work should be completed by CCAD for Phase 2 of Programmatic Review (with details contained in the individual recommendations above):
 - a. a review of the teaching load for all programmes
 - b. a review of CCAD's research capability
 - c. the production of a comprehensive strategy for external relationships *and* the formal establishment of at least some of these linkages
 - d. identification of key objectives and outline vision for a more distinct CCAD identity
 - e. written progress statements for the remaining issues to be addressed (including timescales for outstanding developments)

3. Following on from the Phase 1 panel sessions, the Panel would like to address the following issues in detail during Phase 2 of Programmatic Review:
 - a. the operation of Modularisation and Semesterisation on the programme level (with a particular focus on programme coherence, skills acquisition and benchmarks)
 - b. skills development (craft skills, professional skills, skills underpinning concept development)
 - c. feedback on student performance
 - d. the progress of the CCAD Strategic Plan (including timescale, reference to the Risk Register and relationship with CIT Strategic Plan)
 - e. the viability and future development of the Ceramics programme

APPENDIX: PHASE 1 PANEL TIMETABLE

Crawford College of Art and Design - Programmatic Review 2009

Phase 1: Faculty Review

Date: Tuesday 28 April

Venues: Jury's Hotel, Lancaster Quay, Cork and CCAD

Time	Event	Format / Topics	Venue	To Attend
8:45 AM	PRG assembles		Jury's Hotel	
9:00 - 10:00 AM	Initial Meeting of PRG	Introductions, main issues from documentation	Jury's Hotel	<i>Private Panel Meeting</i>
10:00 - 10:15 AM	Tea/Coffee Break			
10:15 - 11:30 AM	Meeting with Senior Institute Staff / Presentation on institutional context	CIT and CCAD, institutional / operational context, M&S, QA procedures	Jury's Hotel	President, Acting Registrar, Deputy Registrar, Head of Research, Head of Strategy, Module Moderator, Head of T&L, Acting Head of College
11:30 AM - 12:30 PM	Transfer to/ from CCAD and Tour of Facilities		CCAD	Acting Head of College, Heads of Department as appropriate, CCAD technical staff as appr.
12:30 - 1:30 PM	Lunch		Jury's Hotel	
1:30 - 3 PM	Meeting with CCAD Academic Management Staff / Chair of CCAD Board of Studies		Jury's Hotel	Acting Head of College, Heads of Department, Course Board Chairs / Representatives as appropriate
3 - 3:30 PM	Tea/Coffee Break		Jury's Hotel	
3:30 - 4:15 PM	Meeting with Students		Jury's Hotel	CCAD student representatives (taught / research programmes), SU representatives
4:15 - 5 PM	Meeting with External Stakeholders		Jury's Hotel	Ca. 5 - 8
5 - 5:15 PM	Tea/Coffee Break		Jury's Hotel	
5:15 - 6:15 PM	Private Panel Close-Out Meeting			<i>Private Panel Meeting</i>
6:15 - 6:45 PM	Initial Panel Feedback to CCAD Senior Staff			Acting Head of College, Heads of Department
6:45 - 8 PM	Private Time / Transfer to Restaurant			
8:00 PM	Panel Dinner		Fenn's Quay Restaurant	