



Professional Master of Education and Professional Master of Education
(Art and Design)
University Programme Approval Panel Meeting Report
Wednesday 31 July 2013

Chair: Dr Liam Marnane – Chair, Academic Development and Standards Committee (ADSC),

College Members: Dr Mike Cosgrave; Dr Feilim O’hadhmaill

Academic Council/Academic Board/Academic Development and Standards

Committee Representatives: Professor John Mee; Professor John Morrison

External Assessors: Professor Pamela Munn, School of Education, University of Edinburgh; Mr Eugene Toolan, St. Angela’s College Sligo; Mr Keith Walker, Faculty of Education, Manchester Metropolitan University

Academic Secretary: Mr Paul O’Donovan

Student Representative: Ms Niamh McAuliffe

College Manager Nominee: Ms Karen Coughlan

Partner Institution

Dr Stephen Cassidy, Dean of Academic Quality Enhancement, Cork Institute of Technology (CIT)

Secretary to Panel: Ms Clare Daly

Programme Team UCC: Dr Brian Murphy, Programme Coordinator, Professional Master of Education; Professor Kathy Hall; Ms Angela Desmond

Programme Team CIT Crawford College of Art and Design: Ms Susanna Broderick; Ms Janet Doolan; Ms Mark Ewart; Ms Orla Flynn,

Apologies: Mr Albert Walsh, Programme Coordinator, Professional Master of Education (Art and Design)

The event commenced with a private meeting of the panel where the Chair invited panel members to highlight areas of particular concern they wanted to be clarified or addressed in the course of the panel meeting.

Following the overview by the Programme Teams, the programmes were discussed under the following headings:

General overview and rationale - rationale for the programmes; alignment of programmes with industry needs;

Academic issues - clarity of programme aims and objectives; programme content and structure; teaching, learning and assessment strategies including the alignment of module and programme learning outcomes with assessment methods;

Student-centred aspects of the programme - admissions criteria and target student market; student recruitment and advertising strategy; student academic and pastoral support;

Resources and facilities - overall resourcing required for the programmes; facilities available to the programmes.

The University Programme Approval Panel congratulated the Programme Teams on the new flagship programmes, commending them in particular on their success in offering two programmes that meet Teaching Council requirements, but are also flexible and engaging within these boundaries. The 120 credit level 9 programmes provide students with an enhanced opportunity to develop as professionals, giving them the solid basis and skills to enable them to evolve as teachers and successfully respond to and engage in change within their profession throughout their careers. The CIT Crawford team in particular stated that the new structure allows space and time for the continued development of the teacher as an artist, and is something they have felt for some time should be offered. Graduates of the Art and Design programme and the Art and Design students on placement will be better equipped to develop, and reflect on, their own practice, as well as their teaching, which will have a positive impact on second level students and, in turn, on society as a whole.

The innovative way in which disciplines are taught together in some of the cross disciplinary modules was particularly welcomed, as well as the inclusion of special needs and multicultural education, and the cross curricular modules. It was noted that the limit of 20 credits of research was imposed by Teaching Council restrictions but also appropriate for a Professional Master's programme and the way in which research is infused right across both programmes was viewed positively.

The placements on the new programmes will be underpinned by a Memorandum of Understanding with schools, which will represent a significant change in the relationship between UCC and schools, compared with the arrangements for the Professional Diploma. While schools will have increasing demands placed upon them (such as nominating cooperating teachers to support students on placement), they are likely to benefit from the more experienced students on Year 2 of the programmes. The new programmes will offer students the opportunity to undertake contrasting placements in different schools in Year 1 and Year 2 and an additional requirement for Year 2 students to do some teaching practice at senior cycle will be introduced. CIT Crawford will be drawing up a tailored MOU for schools participating in the joint programme.

It was noted that both programmes received a draft report confirming accreditation from the Teaching Council on 25 July, along with very positive feedback. Finally, the UCC programme team confirmed that arrangements would be put in place for any repeat students on the Professional Diploma to repeat under the old curriculum.

The Panel **approved** the programmes subject to the fulfilment of conditions which must be met prior to opening the programme up for recruitment as follows:

- Finalisation of the Memorandum of Understanding and agreement on resources between UCC and CIT, with the appropriate resource statement signed off, for the joint programme.

Draft MOU (Consortium Agreement) prepared and issued to Registrar's Offices within both Institutions for review and approval. Copy of draft attached.

- Revision of the Programme Learning Outcomes to reflect more accurately the richness of both programmes. In particular the areas of advanced pedagogy and curriculum and assessment in schools are well covered within the modules offered, and should be reflected in the Programme Learning Outcomes.

These have been revised in the Programme Proposal document.

- Although the majority of module learning outcomes were appropriate to a level 9 programme, the panel requested that amendment of some of the module Learning Outcomes should be undertaken, as concern was expressed that they may be

closer to what is required on Level 8 programmes. In particular ED6320 was noted as a good example to reference when doing this, as well as some of the multi-disciplinary modules.

Please see changes (attached) to the Learning Outcomes for the following modules:

Year 1: ED6306, ED6323, ED6324

Year 2: ED6353

- The panel was generally concerned about the progression from Year 1 to Year 2, as reflected in module descriptors for the specialist subject areas, for example from ED6315 to ED6349 and also from ED6313 to ED6314. The panel asked the UCC Programme Team to revise the Year 2 modules to accurately reflect the more 'advanced' level of the modules, the progression that students will have made in their learning, and to distinguish them from the Year 1 modules.

The relevant Art & Design subject specialist modules (ED6323, ED6324 and ED6353) were rechecked in response to this stipulation regarding progression in the subject pedagogy electives between Years 1 & 2. It is fully reflected that Year 2 students will be expected to engage more with and understand issues pertaining to teaching their subject at the more advanced and specialist senior cycle of the post-primary school, reflecting their progression from merely dealing with more restricted pedagogical issues with respect to the Junior Cycle in Year 1. All modules also display the desire that the students will cover topics and issues, which will develop a deeper understanding of pedagogy. Thus the Year 2 modules seek that the students will implement deeper, more advanced and more creative and progressivist pedagogies at the advanced senior cycle level.

- Clarification to be provided for the panel in writing on the exact arrangements to be put in place in relation of the Memorandum of Understanding to be signed with individual schools. For example, is this to be signed with a number of schools in advance of students seeking placement, or are schools expected to sign up to it after a student has been offered a placement? Are all schools required to sign it, and if so, can enough placements be secured? If schools are asked to sign it in advance of offering placements, which schools are approached and is there a

risk of damaging relationships if some schools are not approached in advance? In particular the panel requested assurance that all students would be able to secure appropriate placements.

CIT Crawford College of Art & Design has formulated a draft MOU which is based very closely on the existing MOU developed by UCC and agreed with the cooperating post-primary schools. The next stage in this process is to circulate the draft to the co-operating post-primary schools explaining the proposed new arrangements for the joint programme and the context for the additional MOU.

- Inclusion of the Fitness to Practice information in the recruitment statements.
Included in Programme Proposal Document (using Track Changes).

- Revision of the Marks and Standards for both programmes to reflect the recently approved '*Regulations for the Submission and Examination of Dissertations in Taught Master's Programmes*'.
The Marks and Standards have been amended in the Programme Proposal Document.

- Revision of both sets of Marks and Standards to ensure wording is identical across them.
Amended.

- Inclusion of the requirement to satisfy Fitness to Practice requirements under the *Pass and Progression Standard (programme level)*, in both sets of Marks and Standards, rather than under the *Pass Standard (module level)*.
Amended in Programme Proposal Document (using Track Changes).

- Tidying up of the statements on page 3 of the Full Programme Proposal for the Professional Master of Education as follows:
 - The statement '*should have amounted to 30 per cent of the undergraduate course in terms of contact hours*', should be revised to refer to credits, rather than contact hours.
Not relevant for Art & Design PME

The statement '*all students are required to attend pedagogy courses to support the teaching of two subjects*' should be amended to clarify that students can now complete the programme with only one teaching subject.

Not relevant for Art & Design PME

- The statement '*students normally teach a second subject in which they have some recognised academic attainment*' should be made more specific so that it is clear how the student's level is deemed adequate. Is it subject to the approval of the Programme Director, for example?

Not relevant for Art & Design PME

The panel also agreed on the following suggested recommendations for improvement, which may be considered by the Programme Teams at their discretion, (and drew the teams' attention to the fact that these recommendations may be reviewed as part of programmatic review which is due to be implemented in UCC shortly):

- After considerable discussion, the panel agreed to strongly recommend that the programme team re-consider whether an exit award could be provided for after Year 1. It was acknowledged that, while there is no obligation to offer an exit award, in the interest of fairness to students who may be forced out of the programme due to financial circumstances, for example, it might be prudent to offer one. The panel acknowledged the possibility of confusion in the market place and suggested that a title such as a 'Postgraduate Diploma in Educational Studies' might be considered.

As per response for UCC PME.

- The panel suggested that assessment strategies should be considered, in particular to introduce more varied, innovative and creative methods, such as class presentation, viva, peer review, podcasting, blogging etc. so that students can experience the methods as learners during the programme and also use these methods themselves as teachers. It was, however, acknowledged that there is a need for flexibility in deciding how to assess and teach at this early stage in the development of the programmes and that the programme teams at the same time

needed to be careful not to have their ‘hands tied’ by module descriptors. It was suggested that ‘for example’ might be used in the assessment in relation to the use of on-line methods, for example, given that the programme team may struggle with limited resources to provide a more varied approach. It was also acknowledged that flexibility to cope with different subject specialisms had to be allowed for in the description of assessment methods in some modules.

As per response for UCC PME.

- The panel also discussed at length the requirement for an aggregate of 50% and above across ED6330 and ED6340 to be awarded honours. It was agreed to recommend that the programme teams consider allowing those who do not achieve the aggregate to be awarded a Second Class Honours, Grade 2.

Again the programme team considered this particular recommendation and it was the strong view that the requirement to have an aggregate of 50% across both Direct Teaching modules in order to be awarded honours in the PME programme (as in the previous PDE programme) was desirable, in order and should be definitely retained in the Marks and Standards for the new PME. Being a professional qualification for classroom teaching in schools, it is our strong conviction and that of our partner schools and of the student teachers themselves, that the professional practice modules of the programme should be centre stage and be weighted accordingly in determining the final award of honours in the overall programme.

Note that the relevant modules for the PME (Art & Design) are ED6322 and ED6352.

- It was strongly recommended that the programme teams consider offering a part-time option once the programmes are up and running. Given the logistical difficulties involved in delivering this, it was felt that this might be considered once the first cohort has graduated.

As per response for UCC PME.

- The panel noted that the programme teams are now teaching twice as many modules as they were when delivering the Professional Diploma and noted the Teaching Council’s concern in relation to the impact of limited resources on the

programmes. While there was nothing in the documentation before the panel to indicate that the required resources were not in place, the panel agreed that it is important that the quality of the programmes as approved by the panel are not seriously compromised by resourcing, and that this issue should be monitored.

CIT and UCC will be happy to bring this recommendation to the attention of the relevant university and institute authorities to support our on-going requests for additional funding and resources to meet our professional responsibilities in delivering a new and enhanced PME (Art & Design) programme.

- The programme teams were asked to consider the possibility of awarding marks for Part A of the Direct Teaching modules (and to possibly make use of the new ‘fail essential element’ judgement), or to consider using some mechanism to distinguish students who have performed very well, rather than the judgement of ‘satisfactory’ in Part A. Academic Programmes and Regulations agreed to advise the programme team on this as necessary.

As per response for UCC PME.