GMIT

INSTITIÚID TEICNEOLAÍOCHTA NA GAILLIMHE-MAIGH EO
GALWAY-MAYO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Report of External Peer Review Group for the Programmatic Review of:

Named Award:	BB Culinary Arts Management, L7 (3years) L8 (+1 year) HC Culinary Arts, L6 (2 years – can progress to L7) BA in Culinary Arts (Flexible learning)
Programme Title(s):	BB Culinary Arts Management, L7 (3years) L8 (+1 year) HC Culinary Arts, L6 (2 years – can progress to L7) BA in Culinary Arts (Flexible learning)
Exit Award(s):	Higher Certificate in Culinary Arts, Level 6 (2 years – can progress to L7)
Award Type:	Higher Certificate, Degree and Honours Degree
Award Class:	Higher Certificate, Degree and Honours Degree
NFQ Level:	Level 6, 7 and 8
ECTS / ACCS Credits:	120, 180, 240
Minor Award(s):	None

Panel Members

Name	Position	Organisation
Dr John Mc Donagh	Chair	NUIG
Dermot O'Donovan	Secretary	GMIT
Dr Sean Duffy	IOT Member	Letterkenny IT
Wade Murphy	Commissioner General	Euro-toques
Ruth Hegarty	Professional Practitioner	General Euro-Toque
Kevin Ward	Institute Graduate	Exec Chef - Sheraton Hotel

Programme Board Team

Pat Conway	Francesco Noci	Tom Edwards
Louis Smith	Sadie Daveron	Tom Conlon
Mary Reid	Anne O'Leary	Noel Loughnane
Richard Nielsen	Lucia Cloonan	Sally Reidy
Clare Gilsenan	Gerry Talbot	Maria Conboy
Ann Flanagan Kelly	Michelle Glynn	Anne Brindley
Martin Ruffley	Deirdre Fahy	George Finnegan
Helen Scully Owens	Orla O'Doherty	Cait Noone
Sinead Lomas		

1 Introduction

The following report to Academic Council is a validation panel report from an expert panel of assessors on:

- BB Culinary Arts Management, L7 (3 years) L8 (+1 year)
- BA in Culinary Arts (flexible learning)
- HC Culinary Arts, L6 (2 years – can progress to L7)

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 Self Evaluation Report (SER) for more detailed information.

3 General Findings of the External Peer Review Group

3.1 The overall findings of the panel are that the current programmes have been approved with some recommendations.

- Two new proposed programmes were also presented to the panel. These were considered by the panel with the following findings: **SPA Certificate in Pastry and Baking**: this programme was approved with the condition that a full programme document be submitted outlining the entry requirements, rationale etc. as per GMIT quality assurance procedures
- **BA in Culinary Science** – the panel felt there was merit in this proposal in providing a defined progression route for the Higher Certificate. However, **this programme was not approved** at this meeting as it is required to go through the GMIT quality assurance process.

3.2 The panel felt that the Self Evaluation document was well presented. There was excellent engagement with the panel and questions were well considered and answered. The engagement with stakeholders and focus groups was also found to be very comprehensive.

3.3 The teaching and learning experience is considered very appropriate and highly engaging. The assessment methodology is diverse and very suitable to the discipline area with a good balance between training kitchens and restaurants, labs, field trips, studio work and theory.

3.4 The unique structure and support provided by the links office is - commendable.

3.5 Retention appears to be relatively strong. The programme team's awareness of and commitment to supporting first year students was commended.

3.6 The strength of expertise and commitment evident within the lecturing group was commended.

3.7 The work on student attendance tracking was noted as commendable.

3.8 The following are recommendations by the panel in relation to the programmes

3.8.1 The Programme Board should monitor the number of programmes to ensure efficiencies in their delivery (particularly if the BA in culinary science is approved) and that students fully understand their options when choosing a programme.

3.8.2 Ensure the Approved Programme Scheduling is consistent in the presentation of delivery periods for modules.

3.8.3 Review the structure of the programmes in terms of mapping of modules to demonstrate progression options. This should be in a logical format and used to assist students in programme selection. Consideration should be given to introducing more common modules across the programmes

3.8.4 Change the name of the module "Language for Foodies" to something more suited to industry professionals – one simple suggestion "French for Industry".

3.8.5 More attention needs to be given to the non-culinary modules like communication skills, problem solving and presentations skills etc., to help students see the benefit of taking such modules in terms of their overall career development.

3.8.6 Review the structure of the work placement modules as there appears to be a perceived gap between the needs of students and those of industry. The expectations of all stakeholders should be clarified in advance of undertaking the work placement module. It is recommended that work placement be thought of in the context of a 'training-mentoring' relationship.

3.8.7 All staff should use Moodle as the platform for delivery of their module.

3.8.8 Some other minor recommendations were suggested and these are outlined within this document.

3.9 Having considered the documentation provided and discussed it with the programme development team; the External Peer Review Group recommends the following:

Bachelor of Business Culinary Arts Management
Higher Certificate Culinary Arts
Bachelor of Arts in Culinary Arts (flexible learning)
SPA Certificate in Pastry and Baking

Place an x in the correct box.

Accredited for the next five academic years or until the next programmatic review, whichever occurs sooner	
Accredited subject to conditions and/or recommendations	x
Re-designed and re-submitted to the same External Peer Review Group 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 External Peer Review Group (EPRG). In this report, the term Condition is used to indicate an action or amendment which in the view of the EPRG 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:

- Evidence of reflection by the programme board to include, where relevant evidence of collaboration and engagement with other programmes from a similar discipline area within GMIT
- Demand
- Award
- Entry requirements
- Access, transfer and progression
- Retention
- Standards and Outcomes
- Programme structure
- Learning and Teaching Strategies
- Assessment Strategy
- Resource requirements
- Research Activity
- Quality Assurance
- Internationalisation
- Professional Practice (Work Experience / Internship etc)

4.1   Reflection, including internal and external engagement

Consideration for the panel:	Is there evidence of reflection in the SER of how the programme performed since the last programmatic review.
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
- Level of research activity is commendable.
- Excellent document, it is obvious from the report that the programme team have taken on board stakeholders/industry feedback.
- Links office is a very positive feature within the programme.

Conditions: None

Recommendations: None

4.2   Demand

Consideration for the panel:	Is there a need for the programme and has evidence been provided to support it?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
- None
Condition(s):
- None.

Recommendation(s):
- Some concerns were expressed in relation to the number of programmes on offer, particularly if the BA in Culinary Science is approved – Programme Board to review for effectiveness

4.3   Award

Consideration for the panel:	Is the level and type of the award appropriate?
Overall Finding:	Yes

4.4   Entry Requirements

Consideration for the panel:	Are the entry requirements for the proposed programme clear and appropriate? Is there a relationship with this programme and further education?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
- None
Condition(s):
- None.
Recommendation(s):
- Entry requirements appear clear; however it is suggested that a matrix be developed for students so they have a clearer idea of which modules are common. In addition it should be made very clear as to the type of candidate each course is aimed at.

4.5 Access, Transfer and Progression

Consideration for the panel:	Does the proposed programme incorporate the procedures for access, transfer and progression that have been established by the HEA and as contained in the Institute's Quality assurance Framework (QAF) COP No.4?
Overall Finding:	Yes

4.6 Retention

Consideration for the panel:	Does the proposed programme comply with the Institute norms for retention, both in first year and subsequent years? Are both elements of the First Year Experience {(i) Learning to Learn (now Learning and Skills Innovation) and (ii) PASS} embedded in this programme? Evidence of other retention initiatives?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
- Retention is relatively strong but attention should be paid to the number of students progressing to year 4 of the programme in BB in Culinary Arts Management
- The programme team ensure a very strong induction programme, with particular focus on the 3rd round offer students and getting to know their strengths and weaknesses. In addition to providing help in mentoring, an emergency fund is available for supports to help pay for uniforms etc.
- A pilot to track attendance is being run also.

Condition(s):
- None.

Recommendation(s):
- None.

Note:
- If an ab-initio programme was introduced the programme board believe that there would be greater retention of students.

4.7 Standards and Outcomes

Consideration for the panel:	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)? For Minor Award (if applicable)? For Special Purpose Award (if applicable)?

Overall Finding:	Yes

The awards standards requirements for programmes on the NFQ Framework can be found at http://www.hetac.ie/publications_pol01.htm

4.8   Programme Structure

Consideration for the panel:	Is the programme structure logical and well designed and can the stated programme intended learning outcomes in terms of employment skills and career opportunities be met by this programme?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
- None

Condition(s):
- None.

Recommendation(s):
- Ensure the Approved Programme Scheduling is consistent.
- Review the structure of the programmes in terms of mapping of modules to demonstrate progression options.
- More attention needs to be given to the benefits of the non-culinary modules like communication, leadership, problem solving and presentations skills etc., This is particularly relevant for the BA in Culinary Arts students as this course is primarily designed for chefs working in the industry. Those chefs who are progressing in the industry need skills like leadership and problem solving.

4.9   Learning and Teaching Strategies

Consideration for the panel:	Have appropriate learning and teaching strategies been provided for the proposed programme that support Student Centred Learning (SCL)? Evidence of consideration of flexible delivery methods including eLearning?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
- None

Condition(s):
- None.

Recommendation(s):
- Greater options for a flexible mode of delivery aimed at people in industry, would be beneficial.

4.10 Assessment Strategies

Consideration for the panel:	Have appropriate programme assessment strategies been provided for the proposed programme (as outlined in the QQI/HETAC Assessment and Guidelines, 2009)?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Assessment strategies are required in line with HETAC's Assessment and Standards and should be considered by the programme EPRG. See (HETAC (2009) Assessment and Standards, Section 4.6.1, page 33). Accordingly the assessment strategy should address the following (See (HETAC (2009) Assessment and Standards, Section 2.2.5, page 13) :

- 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 learning and teaching strategy;
- Demonstrate how grading criteria will be developed to relate to the Institutional grading system.

Commendation(s):
- None
Condition(s):
- None.
Recommendation(s):
- Ensure the Approved Programme Scheduling is consistent
- Review the structure of the programmes in terms of mapping of modules to demonstrate progression options.

4.11 Resource Requirements

Consideration for the panel:	Does the Institute possess the resources and facilities necessary to deliver the proposed programme?
Overall Finding:	Yes

4.12 Research Activity

Consideration for the panel:	Evidence that Learning & Teaching is informed by research? Number of staff engaged in institutional/pedagogical research?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
Level of research activity is commendable - Noted: A number of staff are completing PHD'S and peer reviewed papers. They are also in the process of proposing a research centre in the

College of Tourism and Arts, and there is also a link to Marine and Fresh Water Research Centre.

Condition(s):
* None.

Recommendation(s):
* None.

4.13 Quality Assurance

Consideration for the panel:	Does the proposed programme demonstrate how the Institute's quality assurance procedures (QAF) have been applied and that satisfactory procedures exist for the on-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes?
Overall Finding:	Yes

4.14 Internationalisation

Consideration for the panel:	Does the proposed programme demonstrate how the syllabi represent an international dimension? Is there evidence of approaches to induct international students?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
* The Links office manages the work placement activity for students in the College of Tourism and Arts, in Ireland and internationally. There is a good international perspective on the Work Placement module. The semesterised delivery enables the programme to be open to international applicants through Erasmus etc.

Condition(s):
* None.

Recommendation(s):
* None.

4.15 Professional Practice (Work Experience / Internships etc)

Consideration for the panel:	Does the proposed programme incorporate professional practice as per the Institute's policy on professional practice (PP)? If not, is there evidence that PP is under consideration by the programme board?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
* There are a number of modules dealing with Work Placement. These vary in duration and credit weighting. The Links Office manages the work placement activity for students in the College of Tourism and Arts, in Ireland and internationally.
* Students are also encouraged to get work experience after 1st year.

Condition(s):
- None.

Recommendation(s):
- Review the structure of the work placement in terms of student/employer expectations. It appears that more clarity on the collaboration may be needed between the college and the employer.

5.0 Module-Level Findings: General

Commendation(s):
- None

Condition(s):
- None.

Recommendation(s):
- In relation to the modules, the panel suggest that it might be worthwhile to consider introducing more common modules across the programmes, review some modules in terms of commonalities, and try to amalgamate where possible.
- Review the structure of the programmes in terms of mapping of modules to demonstrate progression options.

5.1 Module Assessment Strategies

Consideration for the panel:	Have appropriate module assessment strategies been included in each Module Descriptor?
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):
- None

Condition(s):
- None.

Recommendation(s):
- Review the module assessment strategies to ensure accurate inclusion in each Module Descriptor of the strategies.

5.2 Module Level-Findings: Specific Named Modules

Note:
- The renaming of certain modules shows that the programme team are in touch with industry change.
- In addition to feedback from industry and Fáilte Ireland research, the introduction of electives such as language, IT and financial accountancy / business maths was seen as a way of combining business and culinary science and helps make the transition easier for students who want to progress to the Bachelor Business Programme..

5.2.1 Module (International Cuisine and Modern classics)

Noted: Year 2 combined 10 credit modules.

5.2.2 Module (Learning and Skills Innovation)

Commendation(s):
• None
Condition(s):
• None.
Recommendation(s):
• **It is suggested to incorporate CV preparation into this.**

5.2.3 Module (Language for Foodies)

Commendation(s):
• None
Condition(s):
• None.
Recommendation(s):
• Change of name suggested.

6.0 Student Findings

Nine students from a mix of the three courses gave their feedback. The practical side of the course mainly attracted them to the programme. They felt that ideally students should have worked in a kitchen before they enter the course, and that the course outline could be improved. They all agreed however, that the course is very relevant to their current jobs, the basics which are hugely relevant are taught well, in addition to the theory behind the basics which is essential.

In relation to the Learning and Skills Innovation module, the skills developed on this were seen to be very beneficial for head chefs in their teachings to other chefs. Students also felt that in relation to the showcase in the final year that they were lacking skills in the areas of branding and marketing.

In relation to the work placement, the students felt that there should be more of a structure put in place and that this should be agreed in advance between the college and the work placement. Some of the placements they felt were disheartening and could have impacted on the numbers of students leaving the programme. Note: The students who found their own work placement and had agreed their expectations in advance tended to have a more positive experience.

Commendation(s):
• None
Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- Review the structure of the work placement in terms of student/employer expectations. It appears that more collaboration is needed between the college and the employer

7.0 Stakeholder Engagement

Commendation(s):

The level of stakeholder engagement and feedback was considered very thorough.

Condition(s):

- None.

Recommendation(s):

- None.

8.0 Future Plans

It is the intention of the programme board to implement the Special Purpose Award Certificate in Pastry and Baking, in addition to the BA in Culinary Science. There appears to be merit in this proposal as it is seen as a follow on from the Higher Certificate, although the programme board will need to ensure that resources and efficiencies are in place. The structure of the work placement will be reviewed.

Consideration for the panel:	Evidence that the programme board considered and identified opportunities and signalled proposals for related new programme and award development.
Overall Finding:	Yes

Commendation(s):

- Approval was given to the Special Purpose Award (SPA) – Certificate in Pastry and Baking.

Condition(s):

- The proposed BA in Culinary Science programme should be taken through the GMIT Quality assurance process.
-

Recommendation(s):

- Ensure resources and efficiencies are in place.

Validation Panel Report Approved By:

Signed:

Dr John McDonagh
Chairperson

Date: