



School Response Differential Validation Panel

Date: 22nd September 2017

Named Award:	Postgraduate Diploma
Programme Title(s):	<i>Postgraduate Diploma in Business in Entrepreneurship and Marketing</i>
Exit Award(s):	n/a
Award Class:	Major
NFQ Level:	9
ECTS / ACCS Credits:	60
First Intake:	2017

Panel Members

Mr. David Denieffe	Chair	Registrar, IT Carlow
Dr. Teresa Hurley	Academic Expert	Head of School of Management, DIT
Mr. James Conlon	Industry Representative	Vodatrade
Dr. Breda Brennan	Secretary to Panel	Assistant Registrar, DkIT

Programme Development Team

Prof. Colette Henry, Head of School of Business and Humanities
Mr. Colin Cooney, Head of Department of Business Studies
Dr. Brian Boyd, Lecturer, Department of Business Studies

1 Introduction

The following report to Academic Council is a differential validation panel report from an expert panel of assessors on a proposal from the School of Business and Humanities at Dundalk Institute of Technology to design the following programme(s):

- Postgraduate Diploma in Business in Entrepreneurship and Marketing

The evaluators would like to thank the members of the development team for engaging generously and openly with the review process.

The report is divided into the following sections:

- Background to Proposed Programme
- General Findings of the Validation Panel
- Programme-Level Findings
- Module-Level Findings

2 Background to Proposed Programme

See programme submission for more detailed information.

3 General Findings of the Validation Panel

Having considered the documentation provided and discussed it with the programme development team, the validation panel recommends the following:

Postgraduate Diploma in Business in Entrepreneurship and Marketing

Accredited for the next five academic years or until the next programmatic review, whichever occurs sooner	
Accredited for one year (2017-2018) subject to conditions and/or recommendations	X
Re-designed and re-submitted to the same validation panel after additional developmental work	
Not Accredited	

Note:

Approval is conditional on the submission of a revised programme document that takes account of the conditions and recommendations outlined below and a response document describing the actions of the Department to address the conditions and recommendations made by the programme validation panel. In this report, the term Condition is used to indicate an action or amendment which in the view of the validation panel must be undertaken prior to the commencement of the programme. Conditions are mandatory if the programme is to be approved. The term Recommendation indicates an item to which the Programme Board should give serious consideration for implementation at an early stage and which should be the subject of on-going monitoring.

4 Programme-Level Findings

This section of the report addresses the following programme level considerations:

- Demand
- Award
- Institute strategy alignment
- Entry requirements
- Access, transfer and progression
- Standards and Outcomes
- Programme structure
- Teaching and Learning Strategies
- Assessment Strategy
- Resource requirements
- Quality Assurance.

4.1 Demand

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Is there a convincing need for the programme and has evidence been provided to support it?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	This has been outlined in brief.

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

4.2 Award

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Is the level and type of the award appropriate?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	The level and type of award are appropriate.

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

4.3 Institute Strategy Alignment

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Is the proposed programme aligned to the Institute's Strategy?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	The proposed programme appears to align to Institute Strategy.

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

4.4 Entry Requirements

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Are the entry requirements for the proposed programme clear and appropriate?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	Given the limited nature of the programme, the entry requirements are appropriate.

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

4.5 Access, Transfer and Progression

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Does the proposed programme incorporate the procedures for access, transfer and progression that have been established by the NQAI and does it accommodate a variety of access and entry requirements?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	N/A

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

4.6 Standards and Outcomes

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Does the proposed programme meet the required award standards for programmes at the proposed NFQ level (i.e. conform to QQI Award Standards)? For parent award? For exit award (if applicable)?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	

The awards standards requirements for programmes on the NFQ Framework can be found at <http://www.nfq-qqi.com/index.html>

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- The Programme Learning Outcomes should be more programme specific, while adhering to the requirements of the relevant QQI award standard.

School Response:

The programme learning outcomes have been amended accordingly. These will be revisited in the course of the School's forthcoming Programmatic Review (2018).

4.7 Programme Structure

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Is the programme structure logical and well designed and can the stated proposed programme outcomes in terms of employment skills and career opportunities be met by this programme?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	Yes

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- The programme should demonstrate a more applied approach to Entrepreneurship (in addition to Intrapreneurship) and include opportunities for the application of entrepreneurial skills.

School Response:

The programme will be revisited in the context of the forthcoming Programmatic Review and, if retained as part of the School's suite of Business programmes, special attention will be paid to the Entrepreneurship/Intrapreneurship components to ensure an appropriate balance between theoretical and applied dimensions.

4.8 Teaching and Learning Strategies

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Have appropriate teaching and learning strategies been provided for the proposed programme?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	Yes

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

4.9 Assessment Strategies

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Have appropriate programme assessment strategies been provided for the proposed programme (as outlined in the QOI Assessment and Standards)
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	Yes

Assessment strategies are required in line with QOI's Quality Assuring Assessment Guidelines and should form a substantial part of the documentation to be considered by the programme validation panel.

Accordingly the assessment strategy should address the following:

- Description and Rationale for the choice of assessment tasks, criteria and procedures. This should address fairness and consistency, specifically their validity, reliability and authenticity;
- Describe any special regulations;
- Regulate, build upon and integrate the module assessment strategies;
- Provide contingent strategy for cases where learners claim exemption from modules, including recognition of prior learning;
- Ensure the programme's continuous assessment workload is appropriately balanced;
- Relate to the teaching and learning strategy;
- Demonstrate how grading criteria will be developed to relate to the Institutional grading system.

The Institute Assessment and Learning Policy should also be consulted.

Condition(s):

- A Programme Assessment Strategy and Assessment Schedule should be shown in the programme document.

School Response:

An assessment strategy matrix and assessment schedule are now included in the revised programme document (see Appendix IV).

Recommendation(s):

- The assessment load needs to be consistent across modules reflecting the assigned credit values.

School Response:

The assessment load within and across modules will be revisited as part of our forthcoming Programmatic Review.

4.10 Resource Requirements

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Does the Institute possess the resources and facilities necessary to deliver the proposed programme?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	Yes

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

4.11 Quality Assurance

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Does the proposed programme demonstrate how the Institute's quality assurance procedures have been applied and that satisfactory procedures exist for the on-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	Yes

The Institute's Quality Assurance Procedures are published in the Academic Quality Assurance Manual available at: <https://www.dkit.ie/registrar/policies/academic-quality-manual> and include approved procedures for the on-going monitoring and periodic review of Programmes.

Condition(s):

- As the award involves a partner college in Heilbronn, the programme should be validated in accordance with the Institute's Policy on Collaborative Provision.

School Response:

While the original programme design included three optional modules available at Heilbronn University in Germany, to date, none of our students has availed of these. Therefore, there has been no off-site delivery or joint awarding. If, however, as part of our Programmatic Review, it is decided to retain the Heilbronn options moving forward, then the team will formally request that the Institute's Collaborative Provision policy is implemented. The Registrar's Office has been made aware of this, and initial discussions have been held in relation to a potential site inspection.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

4.12 Module-Level Findings

Condition(s):

- The module *Induction Workshop* should be re-titled to better reflect the content and learning outcomes (suggested titles are *Personal and Professional Development* or *Learning and Development*).

School Response:

Thank you for this valuable suggestion. We have now amended the title of this module to 'Learning and Development.'

Recommendation(s):

- All modules should be reviewed to ensure that Learning Outcomes, Content, Reference Lists and Assessment Methods are relevant and appropriate.

School Response:

All modules will be reviewed and updated in the context of our forthcoming Programmatic Review.

4.13 Assessment Strategies

<i>Validation Criterion:</i>	Have appropriate module assessment strategies been included in the proposed programme?
<i>Overall Finding:</i>	Yes

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

4.14 Other Findings

Condition(s)

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- The involvement of business and industry in programme and module design and revision should be articulated in the document.
- Further opportunities for validating Continuing Professional Development programmes as one-major awards should be explored (in addition to the recently validated Certificate in Business Strategy).

School Response:

The role and involvement of local business and industry will be incorporated into the revised programme as part of Programmatic Review.

Thank you for the valuable suggestion in relation to CPD. The team has already started to think about this and will further explore CPD opportunities in the context of our forthcoming Programmatic Review.

On behalf of the Programme Team, the School of Business & Humanities would like to thank the Panel Members for their valuable and constructive feedback. We are delighted that this Programme is recommended for validation.

I confirm that all changes (where appropriate) have been made in the programme management system (Akari Document) and in the Programme Document.

Validation Panel Report Approved By:**Signed:**

Prof. Colette Henry, Head of School of Business and Humanities

Date: 27th September 2017**Signed:**

Mr. David Denieffe, Registrar, IT Carlow.

Date: ~~<date>~~ 5.10.2017