Quality at
Dun Laoghaire Institute of Art, Design and Technology

Policy for

the Periodic Review of Programmes
Programmatic Review

Document Reference and Version No	Policy for the Periodic Review of Programmes – Programmatic Review Draft Quality Policy V2.2
Purpose	To explain the nature and purpose of the periodic review of programmes
Commencement Date	Version 1 November 2009 Version 2 September 2014 Version 3 October 2015 awaiting approval
Date of Next Review	2017
Who needs to know about this document	Registrar, Heads of Faculty, Heads of Department, Programme Co-ordinators, all academic staff, all students
Revision History	Revision of initial Quality Manual of 2005
Policy Author	Registrar
Policy Owner	Academic Council

Policy for
the Review of Programmes at Regular Intervals
Programmatic Review

1. Introduction

The periodic review of a programme refers to a process which is conducted at particular time intervals to consider the development of the programme over the previous period, with particular regard to the achievement and improvement of educational quality. In addition to reflecting on the objectives of ongoing monitoring activities (*ensuring that a course of study is being provided effectively, maintaining academic standards and offering students a fair and reasonable opportunity to engage with the intended learning in a stimulating education environment*) it is an opportunity to assure the learning outcomes reflect up to date knowledge in the community of practice; that the curriculum design and structure is effective; that contemporary best practice in student-centred learning is reflected in the teaching and assessment practices; that there remains a demand for the programme; that graduates are able to secure employment in their field of qualification; and that the programme remains viable. In order to investigate a programme thoroughly and consider these dimensions IADT employs a complementary model of self-study and an evaluation by independent peer evaluators. The programme review process is very similar to the process for the validation of new programmes.

2. Objectives of Programmatic Review

The key objective in reviewing a programme is to enable the revalidation or cessation of a programme. In order to arrive at a view in respect of revalidation the following are undertaken:

- Analyse the effectiveness and the efficiency of each of the programmes approved, through consideration of a range of data and stakeholder feedback
- Review the development of a programme or suite of programmes having regard to the views of education interests, employers, professional bodies, needs of Irish society and global development.
- Evaluate the student feedback mechanisms and the process for acting upon student feedback, and communicating to students the Institute response to feedback.
- Evaluate the appropriateness of the physical facilities and resources supporting the provision of the programmes.
- Review the Institute's research activities and projections in the area of study under review and how research dimensions are incorporated into all undergraduate programmes.
- Evaluate the Faculty/Department flexibility in responding to market requirements and educational developments.
- Evaluate the formal links the Institute has established with industry/business and the wider community in order to maintain the relevance of its programmes.
- Evaluate the Institute's projections for the succeeding five years in specific areas.

3. Steps in the Review Process

- Agree timelines with the Office of the Registrar. A review may occur after three years, but no later than seven years, and typically every five years.
- The Faculty establishes a programmatic review team and which carries out a self-evaluation process, culminating in a report of its self-reflection, analysis and arising proposals. Typically it may take a full academic year to conduct a thorough process of self-review.
- The self-evaluation report is submitted to the Registrar who reviews it to ensure it addresses the objectives and criteria for the review of programmes
- Self-evaluation report sent to Academic Council for review for similar consideration
- An independent external expert panel is appointed
- The panel reviews the self-evaluation report, makes a site visit, meets with those providing the programme and prepares a peer evaluation report considering the reviewed programme(s) against the specific evaluation criteria and making recommendations to the Institute on future actions around the programme(s) including revalidation
- On receipt of the Panel report, the programme review team makes a response, usually within 6 weeks of receiving the report.
- The Registrar brings to Academic Council the self-evaluation report and the expert evaluation report and make recommendations to Academic Council on whether to revalidate the programmes or not
- Academic Council makes a decision on revalidation and any related programme improvements

4. Programmatic Review Criteria, including Programme Revalidation Criteria

The Programme Review Team and separately the independent expert panellists evaluate the reviewed programme to assess how it meets the following key revalidation criteria[1]:

- *Strategic Mission*: Does the programme align to the current strategic plan and objectives of the Institute?

- *Access/Entry* Standard: Does the *prerequisite learning* for participation in the programme and any other assumptions relating to the programme's *target learners* remain explicit?

- *Outcome Standard*: Do the *minimum intended programme learning outcomes* remain consistent with the relevant *awards standards* and the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) *award-type descriptors*?

- Learning: Is there evidence that the programme

---

[1] Drawn and adapted from QQI *Validation Policy* 2013

- o enabled its *learners* to attain the *minimum intended programme learning outcomes*[2] through

    - a student-centred learning environment which reflects best pedagogical practice

    - reliable, diverse and innovative assessment

    - the provision of appropriate learning supports and a comprehensive effective academic policy infrastructure

  - o workload was fair and accurately reflected in ECTS weightings

  - o provided a stimulating learning environment, cognisant of diverse learner needs

  - o provided graduates with fair employment in their field of qualification

  - o learning outcomes reflect up to date knowledge in the community of practice

  - o curriculum design and structure is effective

- Social impact: Is there evidence that

  - o there remains a demand for the programme

  - o the programme makes a contribution to society

  - o that the programme remains viable

---

[2] The concept of minimum intended programme learning outcomes and its relation to teaching, learning and assessment are explained in QQI's *Assessment and Standards 2013*.