

PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW OF THE CIT CRAWFORD COLLEGE OF ART & DESIGN 2015/16

Phase 2: Programme Review

PHASE 1 FOLLOW-UP REPORT

DATE: 27 – 28 April 2016

OVERALL PHASE 2 PANEL MEMBERSHIP

- Mr Derek McGarry, Overall Phase 2 Chair (*and Chair, Fine Art & Applied Art Panel*), Head of Innovation & Engagement, NCAD, Dublin
- Ms Maria Finucane (*Chair, Arts in Health / Art Education Panel*), Programme Director MA in Art & Design Education, Limerick School of Art & Design, LIT
- Ms Justine Foster (*Arts in Health / Art Education Panel*), Education and Community Coordinator, West Cork Arts Centre, Skibbereen
- Ms Aiveen Kearney (*Arts in Health / Art Education Panel*), Head of School, CIT Cork School of Music (for CIT Registrar's Office)
- Ms Alma McQuade (*Arts in Health / Art Education Panel*), Chair of Irish Association of Creative Art Therapists, Dublin
- Ms Róisín de Builéar (*Fine Art & Applied Art Panel*), Visual Artist (Glass), Dublin
- Ms Katherine Keane (*Fine Art & Applied Art Panel*), Head of Department of Architecture, CIT (for CIT Registrar's Office)
- Ms Sarah Searson (*Fine Art & Applied Art Panel*), Director, The Dock Arts Centre, Carrick-on-Shannon / formerly Head of Department of Fine Art & Creative Industries, GMIT
- Mr Francis X Carty (*Journalism, PR & E-learning Panel*)
Former Course Director MA in Public Relations, School of Media, DIT (retired)
- Mr Tom O'Mara (*Journalism, PR & E-learning Panel*), Online Learning Project Manager, Office of the VP for Teaching and Learning, UCC
- Dr Susan O'Regan (*Journalism, PR & E-learning Panel*), Lecturer, Dep't of Musicianship & Academic Studies, CSM (for CIT Registrar's Office)
- Ms Jill O'Sullivan (*Chair, Journalism, PR & E-learning Panel*), Editor, Breaking News, Landmark Digital, Cork
- Ms Eva Juhl (*Media Design Panel*), Institutional Review Facilitator, Office of the Registrar & VP for Academic Affairs, CIT

Mr Con Kennedy (*Media Design Panel*), Programme Director MA in Interaction Design, IT Carlow /
Creative Director, Con Kennedy Visual Communications Ltd.
Mr Juan Miguel Mariño Camarasa (*Media Design Panel*), Lead UX Architect, Tyco, Cork
Ms Aisling Murphy (*Media Design Panel*), Creative Director, Ball & Socket Design Studio, Cork
Dr Brian Nolan (*Chair, Media Design Panel*), Head of School of Informatics & Engineering, IT
Blanchardstown

CIT CCAD REPRESENTATION

Programme Staff

Mr Gerard O'Donovan, Head of Faculty of Business & Humanities
Ms Catherine Fehily, Head of CIT Crawford College of Art & Design
Ms Trish Brennan, Head of Department of Fine Art & Applied Art
Mr Ed Kuczaj, Head of Department of Arts in Health & Community Practice
Ms Rose McGrath, Head of Department of Media Communications
Mr Albert Walsh, Head of Department of Art & Design Education

A. FOLLOW-UP ON PHASE 1 ISSUES

The Report on the Strategic Phase 1 of the CCAD Programmatic Review (June 4 – 5, 2015), the Phase 1 Panel presented a number of findings and recommendations on strategic and overarching issues which the Crawford College is asked to address, to the furthest extent possible, in the 5-year period to the next Programmatic Review.

In addition, the Panel raised two issues which CCAD and CIT were to follow up on in time for Phase 2 of the current review. These were the strategic commitment of the Institute to CCAD and the commencement of a benchmarking process with comparable art & design institutions.

Based on the presentations of Faculty senior staff and the subsequent discussions, the Phase 2 Panel arrived at a number of additional recommendations on issues of general strategic relevance to the College. These are presented in Section B of this report and complement the overarching findings and recommendations in the Phase 1 Report.

The recommendations of the Programme Review Panels to Academic Council on revalidation of the proposed programmes can be found in the individual Programme Review Reports, as can the meeting timetables.

B. PANEL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON OVERARCHING / STRATEGIC ISSUES

1. STRATEGIC INSTITUTE COMMITMENT TO CCAD

Following the Phase 1 discussions, the Panel concluded that it had not gained full clarity about CIT's strategic commitment to CCAD as a driver of the creative and cultural economy and the national GDP. In the Panel's view, CCAD has the potential to make a significant and sustainable contribution to the ongoing success of the Institute and the future University, and to the growth of the cultural and creative economy of the region and nationally.

Updates on developments since June 2015 and on plans for the embedding of CCAD within the evolving structures of the Institute/TU were provided by the Head of Faculty of Business & Humanities and the Head of CIT CCAD. The following developments were referred:

- Integration of the Crawford College of Art & Design into the Faculty of Business & Humanities from January 2016 onwards, in anticipation of further structural changes in the context of the establishment of the MTU;
- Acquisition of 46 Grand Parade, a four-story historic landmark building with 1,266 sqm of internal space in a prominent city centre location, adjacent to the proposed Events Centre and in close proximity to the Sullivan's Quay building currently in use by CCAD.

CCAD currently envisage that the relevant departments will move into the new Grand Parade building by January 2017 at the latest. The Panel also heard that CCAD has been prioritised on the CIT Masterplan. Planning for the future Technological University includes creation of a

dedicated Faculty of Creative Arts & Media, of which CCAD and the CIT Cork School of Music will form constituent parts.

The Panel acknowledges the significant measures taken by CIT since Phase 1 of Programmatic Review to secure a significant permanent city centre presence for CCAD, and is satisfied that the referred actions and plans demonstrate a sustained commitment of the Institute to its constituent Art & Design College.

2. PROGRESS ON BENCHMARKING

The Head of College outlined that CCAD had adopted a benchmarking approach that required each individual Department to determine an indicator or indicators of particular relevance to its own provision and accordingly to select and make contact with a suitable national or international comparator to start the benchmarking. On the basis of research into both national and UK/European institutions, the Departments chose the following comparators and indicators:

- Department of Fine Art & Applied Art – Comparator: Dublin School of Creative Art, DIT; Indicator: Facilities;
- Department of Media Communications – Comparator: Southampton Solent University; Indicator: Teaching & Learning;
- Department of Art & Design Education – Comparator: NCAD, Faculty of Education, CPD for Teachers; Indicator: Curriculum Content and Organisation;
- Department of Arts in Health & Community Practice – Comparator: Goldsmith’s College, London, MA in Art Psychotherapy; Indicators: Research Activity, Healthcare Focus.

In all cases, the relevant Department had already approached and in some cases visited the comparator institution and had commenced an exchange of information.

The Panel wishes to compliment the staff of all CCAD Departments on progress achieved in researching facilities across the UK and Europe and on commencing a benchmarking process. It encourages the Departments to nurture and grow the connections made into stable, long-term institutional relationships which will allow a regular data exchange to support and underpin further development in both institutions.

However, with regard to benchmarking facilities, the Panel cautions that creation of a facility wish list in the absence of clearly identified resources is not sufficiently useful. CCAD must learn from other forms of best practice to create impactful workable models to implement and deliver within their own infrastructure.

Recommendation: Given that CCAD staff recognise they will have spatial issues in delivering their 4th year Fine Art course next academic year it is incumbent on all staff to find appropriate and workable solutions. The Panel ***strongly recommends*** that more expansive benchmarking research and analysis is integrated into a new sustainable strategy for delivery of CCAD programmes for the next five years. This should be reviewed on a biannual basis.

3. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON ADDITIONAL STRATEGIC ISSUES

3.1. RECRUITMENT

Recruitment and retention were discussed by all panels. Recommendations relevant to specific programmes if any are captured in the relevant Programme Review Panel Reports.

Recommendation: Staff in the Art programmes especially expressed a desire to reduce rather than increase student numbers to improve the quality of teaching and learning at CCAD. The Panel **strongly recommend** that CCAD resist this. Its **recommends** that CCAD continue the benchmarking process to identify and implement new models of best practice that can facilitate larger student numbers. This will make all programmes less vulnerable and more robust.

Lessons should be learned from the success of *Uversity* model as a foreign student recruitment tool for CCAD.

3.2 NUMBER OF PROGRAMMES AND TEACHING RESOURCES

While staff expressed feelings of being “overstretched and under-resourced”, the Panel observes that, despite the programmes having been recently defined and redefined in preparation for this five-year review process, there was no evident move towards further course or programme consolidation.

3.3 EXTERNAL ENGAGEMENT – ART PROGRAMMES ESPECIALLY

Recommendation: Based on the discussions with programme staff as well as with stakeholders, the importance of local stakeholders in informing and supporting CCAD programmes is clearly evident, particularly in the small portfolio of external engagement partnership projects. To generate even greater impact, as well as to maximise best use of very limited resources, the Panel **reiterates the Phase 1 recommendation** that the CCAD external engagement portfolio should become much less extra-curricular and significantly more embedded in teaching and learning.

3.4 ACADEMIC RESEARCH

Recommendation: The current inability of CCAD to accept PhD students clearly hampers institutional progression and limits international appeal. Staff ambition to develop to Level 10 is not currently matched by the resources necessary to support them. The Panel **recommends** that CIT recognise and support the individual high-level research emanating from CCAD and address this situation immediately. (This complements a Phase 1 Recommendation on the CCAD Research Strategy, see 3.3.3 / 4.2 in the Phase 1 Report.)

3.5. CCAD / CIT IDENTITY & BRANDING (UNIQUE SELLING POINT)

It is a concern to the Review Panel that CCAD staff find it particularly difficult to articulate their institutional unique selling point (USP) to students, the CIT research community, wider research communities and potential employers. Not being able to express your value must greatly impact the opportunity for strategic growth and development.

CCAD appears to have a unique identity within the local and regional arts and cultural community, who feel strongly affiliated. There is an obvious sense of collegiality within the CCAD organisational structure and graduate community. CCAD alumni take great pride in the education they received and the foundation it provided for rewarding careers in art and design.

Recommendation: The Panel *reiterates its recommendation from Phase 1* that CCAD, together with CIT, address the question of identifying and better articulating its unique selling point and competitive advantage (see also Phase 1 Report, Sections 3.3.1 / 4.1).

3.6 CCAD ARTIST AND DESIGNER IN RESIDENCE PROGRAMMES

Recommendation: CCAD artist and designer in residence programmes evidently are popular and meaningful. The Panel *recommends* that CCAD develop more interdisciplinary residency opportunities within CIT and the broader research community. This will foster more integrated interdisciplinary research partnerships that create greater impact nationally and internationally.

- End -