

# Report of Validation Panel

---

**Date of Meeting:** 30<sup>th</sup> October 2012  
**Named Award:** Certificate  
**Programme Title:** Chemical and Biopharmaceutical Process Operations  
**Award Type:** Special Purpose Award  
**Award Class:** Minor  
**NFQ Level:** 6  
**Intakes Commencing:** January 2013  
**ECTS/ACCS Credits:** 60

## PANEL MEMBERS

Name
Dr Hugh McGlynn Head, School of Science and informatics, CIT - Chair
Ms. Helga Weston, Senior Project Engineer, PM Group Global
Dr Rosemary Rea, Lecturer, Department of Biological Sciences, CIT
Mr Daithi Fallon, Head of Department, Mechanical, Biomedical & Manufacturing Engineering , CIT

## PROPOSING TEAM MEMBERS

Name
Mr Ian O' Sullivan, Lecturer, Department of Process Energy & Transport Engineering
Mr Matt Cotterell, Head, School of Mechanical & Process Engineering

## BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSED PROGRAMME

The purpose of this validation panel is to consider the approval of a new Level 6 Special Purpose Award in Chemical and Biopharmaceutical Process Operations (60 credits)

## **FINDINGS OF THE PANEL**

### **1. General Findings**

The Panel commends the programme team on the programme presented and for the discussion during the validation meeting. Some updates to the program documentation will be required should this programme run in the future and the panel recommends the validation of this excellent programme.

### **2. Validation Criteria**

The Panel has considered the documentation provided and has discussed the programme with the proposers. The panel has concluded that the programme meets the required standards in the Chemical and Biopharmaceutical Process Operations field of study at Level 6 of the National Qualification Framework.

With regard to the CIT Validation Criteria:

#### **2.1 Is there a convincing need for the programme with a viable level of applications?**

**YES.** The programme was proposed to meet the changing needs of a local pharmaceutical companies. It is envisaged to start with a cohort of 10 students. At the time that the programme commenced the Department provided a springboard course in Chemical Engineering and a Good Manufacturing Practice course. The course team indicated that this proposed offering would not detract from intake to these courses and it would provide the complete portfolio of offerings to the Pharmaceutical Industry. It is envisaged that that students may upon completion be eligible for entry into other offerings within the Department subject to their elective choices.

**Recommendation(s):** None

**Requirement(s):** None

#### **2.2 Are the level and type of the proposed award appropriate?**

**YES.** This 60 credit, taught Level 6 programme is consistent with other Level 6 taught provisions across the Institute. All modules are at level 6 of the NQF Framework. This program aligns well with HETAC Level 6 descriptors. The panel was particularly impressed by the progression options available to the students upon completion of the programme

**Recommendation(s):** None

**Requirement(s):** None

#### **2.3 Is the learning experience of an appropriate level, standard and quality?**

**YES.** There is an appropriate balance between lectures, course work and practical work .

**Recommendation(s):** None.

**Requirement(s):** None

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

**YES.** The program consists of mandatory and elective modules. These modules are delivered across four semesters and as presented there are no barriers to progression between semesters. The modules offered cover all of the appropriate technical aspects of the subject area. Entry requirements are appropriate for an award of this type and the program corresponds with the CIT Modularisation and Semesterisation guidelines.

**Recommendation(s):**

1. A map of the progression options available to the students should be included within the documentation. Cognisance should also be given to the progression options available to the students depending upon which electives undertaken.

2. Consideration be given to the stated minimum entry requirements for admission to the programme.
3. Include programme outcomes within the submission proposal

**Requirement(s):** None

#### **2.5 Are the programme management structures adequate?**

**YES.** A Programme Board operated for this program, in line with the institutes QA system and will avail of existing external examiners from the GMP and Chemical Engineering programmes.

**Recommendation:** None

**Requirement:** None

#### **2.6 Are the resource requirements reasonable?**

**YES.** The panel has been assured by the proposers that the resource requirements for the programme are in line with CIT practice..

**Recommendation:** None

**Requirement:** None

#### **2.7 Will the impact of the programme on the Institute be positive?**

**YES.** This course aligns well with the institute's mission to deliver career-focused education and to foster engagement opportunities with industry partners.

**Recommendation:** None

**Requirement:** None

### **3. Conclusions**

The Panel recommends that the programme be validated with due regard to the recommendations made.

*NOTE: In this report, the term "Requirement" is used to indicate an action or amendment which in the view of the Panel **must** be undertaken prior to commencement of the Programme. The term "Recommendation" indicates an item to which the Institute/Academic Council/Course Board should give serious consideration for implementation at an early stage and which should be the subject of on-going monitoring.*