



Programme Validation Report

Higher Certificate in Arts in Culinary Arts

(Professional Cookery Practice)

Version of Report	Author	Date
Draft	AQA – Michael Keane	28/06/2024
Final	AQA – Michael Keane	09/07/2024

Approval	Date
Programme Proposal approved by Faculty Board	18/06/2024
Programme Proposal approved by University Programmes Board	27/06/2024
Programme approved by Faculty Board	Click or tap to enter a date.
Programme approved by University Programmes Board	Click or tap to enter a date.

Section A - Programme Details

Title	Higher Certificate in Arts in Culinary Arts (Professional Cookery Practice)
NFQ Level	6
ECTS Credits	120
Mode of delivery	Part-time ☒ Full-time ☐
Duration	Part-time: 3 Years Full-time:
Mode of provision	Face-to-Face ☒ Blended ☐ Online ☐
Classification of award	Distinction; Merit, Grade One; Merit, Grade Two; Pass
Discipline Programmes Board	N/A
Faculty Board	Faculty of Arts & Humanities
Schools involved in delivery	Culinary Arts & Food Technology
Delivery location	Grangegorman and Tallaght
Collaborative Partner (where applicable)	N/A
Date of Commencement	Sept 2024

Section B - Awards

Award Title	Higher Certificate in Arts in Culinary Arts (Professional Cookery Practice)
NFQ Level	6
Award Class	Major
ECTS Credits	120
Classification of award	Distinction; Merit, Grade One; Merit, Grade Two; Pass

Exit Award (1) Title	Certificate in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice *
Exit/Embedded	Exit ☒ Embedded ☐
NFQ Level	6
Award Class	Minor
ECTS Credits	40
Classification of award	Distinction; Merit, Grade One; Merit, Grade Two; Pass
Exit Award (2) Title	Diploma in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice *
Exit/Embedded	Exit ☒ Embedded ☐
NFQ Level	6
Award Class	Minor
ECTS Credits	80
Classification of award	Distinction; Merit, Grade One; Merit, Grade Two; Pass

Section C - Programme Derogations (if required)

<i>Derogations from Assessment Regulations/Marks and Standards already approved by University Programmes Board</i>	
Given that this programme will be delivered on both the Grangegorman and Tallaght campus, each operating under different assessment regulations and marks and standards at this time, the School in their response have been asked by the validation panel to confirm that no derogations are sought as part of this programme validation. See conditions of validation.	
Date of University Programmes Board Approval	Click or tap to enter a date.

Section D Validation Process

Please tick the process that was followed:

Validation Panel ☒	AQEC Meeting ☐	AQEC Sub-Group ☐
Date: 25 th June 2024	Date:	Date:

* See conditions of validation

Panel Members

Name	Role	Affiliation
Dr. Muireann O'Keeffe	Chair	Faculty Head of Teaching and Learning, Faculty of Arts & Humanities.
Dr. Mary Ann Bolger	Internal Assessor	School of Media.
Mr. Michael McNamara	External Assessor	Dundalk Institute of Technology.
Mr Michael Keane	Academic Quality Advisor & Secretary to the Panel	Academic Affairs.

Section E - Programme Evaluation

Governance & Management		
<i>Is the programme designed in accordance with the University's Strategic Plan, Educational Model and Quality Framework?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐
This programme is an amalgamation of 3 existing validated programmes delivered on both the Grangegorman and Tallaght campus namely TU5155/ TU5153P (Stage 1, 40 ECTS credits), TU5156/ TU5157P (Stage 2, 40 ECTS credits) and TU038/ TU5187P (Stage 3, 40 ECTS credits) into one single programme retaining the existing structure and delivering the existing approved modules currently on each stage. As part of the School's planned programme review schedule this programme will be reviewed in 2024/25 when it will be further aligned to the University's Strategic Plan, Educational Model and Quality Framework. While the panel commended the flexible, student centred and industry focus of the programme the panel requested that the School in their response to the validation panel report clearly articulate how the current iteration specifically aligns to the UEM and how it may do so in the next iteration post programme review in 2024/25. See recommendation 3.		
<i>Will the proposed strategies for programme management and quality assurance ensure that the programme is well managed and continuously enhanced and is in accordance with the University's Quality Framework?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐
Evident and detailed within the submission document.		

Awards Standards		
<i>Are the programme aims and learning outcomes clearly written using appropriate terminology? (See TU Dublin Guidelines)</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐
However the panel requested that the programme learning outcomes be reviewed and revised to incorporate the University's strategic intent and align with sustainable development goals.		
<i>Are the programme aims and learning outcomes aligned to the proposed level of the award on the NFQ in accordance with applicable Award Standards?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐

Programme learning outcomes for each award were clearly mapped to the proposed level of the award on the NFQ in accordance with applicable award standards.		
<i>Will the curricula, teaching, learning and assessment methods enable students to reach the appropriate standard to qualify for the award(s)?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
Having reviewed the syllabus and assessment methods as proposed the panel was of the opinion that learners would be capable of attaining the standards of knowledge, skill or competence relevant for the award.		
<i>Was the programme development appropriately informed by internal and external stakeholder input (including industry/practice, professional/regulatory bodies, and community organisations)?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
The panel commended the School on what they found to be a flexible, student centred and industry focused programme.		
<i>Has the programme been benchmarked against similar programmes nationally and internationally?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
<i>Did the programme development take account of relevant external discipline benchmarks and Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements?</i>	Yes ☐	No ☐
N/A		

Programme Design		
<i>Is the programme design informed by current development in the discipline and associated subject areas, having taken into consideration current trends, stakeholder feedback and market analysis?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
The panel commended the School on what they found to be a flexible, student centred and industry focused programme.		
<i>Will there be opportunities for students to input into curriculum design decisions in the future?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
The TU Dublin Quality Assurance & Enhancement policies and procedures for all TU Dublin programmes include both a student feedback mechanism for individual modules and a requirement for student representation at all boards and committees governing the programme. Supports are also made available to both staff and students regarding ways in which the Student Voice can be used at all stages of programme design. https://www.tudublin.ie/explore/about-the-university/academic-affairs/our-student-voice/ .		

<i>Is there a mechanism to ensure the input of external stakeholders in the ongoing development of the programme?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐																
The panel was informed of how this programme offers regular site visits, guest speakers and onsite experiential learning experiences including interdisciplinary competitions and industry expert demonstrations throughout each year of study. In line with TU Dublin's Partnership pillar, the School of Culinary Arts and Food Technology continues to build upon the industry partnerships currently in place which include a variety of industry partners as outlined below: Strategic Partners <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Musgrave MarketPlace</td> <td>Callebaut</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Blenders</td> <td>Press Up Hospitality Group</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ballymaguire Foods/Country Crest</td> <td>Dawn Farms</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kepak</td> <td>Manor Farm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Silver Hill Duck</td> <td>Mars Ireland</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Diageo Ireland</td> <td>Gather & Gather</td> </tr> </table> INSPIRED Friends of Culinary Arts <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Robot Coupe</td> <td>Panelto</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Soaktech</td> <td>Freshways</td> </tr> </table>			Musgrave MarketPlace	Callebaut	Blenders	Press Up Hospitality Group	Ballymaguire Foods/Country Crest	Dawn Farms	Kepak	Manor Farm	Silver Hill Duck	Mars Ireland	Diageo Ireland	Gather & Gather	Robot Coupe	Panelto	Soaktech	Freshways
Musgrave MarketPlace	Callebaut																	
Blenders	Press Up Hospitality Group																	
Ballymaguire Foods/Country Crest	Dawn Farms																	
Kepak	Manor Farm																	
Silver Hill Duck	Mars Ireland																	
Diageo Ireland	Gather & Gather																	
Robot Coupe	Panelto																	
Soaktech	Freshways																	
<i>Is the programme curriculum well-structured with a logical progression of learning and development across the modules and stages?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐																
Evident within the module syllabi and through discussion with the programme team the panel was informed of the logical progression of learning and development as a student progresses from stage to stage. The panel found the programme to have an underlying unifying theme with modules bonded by linkages being either implicit or explicit. It was also clear to the panel how the standards of knowledge, skill and competence evolve throughout each of the individual modules of this programme.																		
<i>Are there appropriate opportunities for students to undertake work-based learning, through work placements or work-based projects or assignments?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐																
Professional Work Placement is a key element and an integral component of this programme taken by students in semester 2 of years 1 and 2.																		
<i>If applicable, have the relevant Blended Learning Checklists (i.e. Learning Experience Context & Programme Context) been fully completed and submitted to the Panel?</i>	Yes ☐	No ☐																
N/A																		
<i>Is the required programme and module information provided in the correct format?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐																

Extracts of the programme and module descriptors taken from the PMC were provided in the submission documentation reviewed by the panel.

Learning, Teaching & Assessment		
<i>Is there an effective student-centred teaching and learning strategy that aligns with the University's strategies and Education Model?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐
<i>Does the assessment strategy provide an appropriate mix of assessment types that will enable students to demonstrate that they have met the module and programme learning outcomes?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐
The panel concurred that the mix of assessment types was appropriate and that the assessment criteria and events as described within the submission documentation and through discussion at the panel meeting will enable students to demonstrate that they have met the module and programme learning outcomes.		
<i>Do the learning outcomes and assessment strategy ensure that academic integrity can be maintained and attempted breaches of academic integrity are minimised/easily detected?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐
<i>Is there a comprehensive mapping of assessment methods and module learning outcomes and between module learning outcomes and programme learning outcomes?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐
Evident within the assessment section of the module syllabi and tables mapping the module learning outcomes to the programme learning outcomes as provided within the submission documentation.		
<i>Are there opportunities in all modules to provide students with timely and constructive feedback on their learning and development?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐
<i>Do the teaching and assessment methods consider the diversity of the student cohort?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐

Student Supports & Learning Environment		
<i>Are there sufficient and appropriate resources (e.g. human, financial and physical) to support the proposed programme aims and objectives, to deliver the programme as specified?</i>	Yes ✓	No ☐

<i>Are there sufficient staff that are appropriately qualified and capable to support the programme delivery, from both context and pedagogy perspectives?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
<i>Are there appropriate arrangements in place to support the student experience and to monitor student performance?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
<i>Are the access, transfer and progression arrangements clearly defined and appropriate, and aligned to TU Dublin policy/strategy in this regard?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
The multiple access, exit and progression routes were referenced in the submission documentation however, following discussion at the panel meeting the panel recommended that further clarification be provided on the following: <u>Advanced entry</u> Clearly articulate the entry requirements for advanced entry to the programme at each stage for graduates of the legacy programmes. <u>RPL</u> Provide indicative entry criteria in relation to both prior experiential/certified learning to differentiate between advanced entry to Year 2 versus Year 3. See recommendation 1.		
<i>Do the student supports and learning environment cater for equality, diversity and inclusivity of students?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
<i>Is the relevant programme information clearly communicated to the students to ensure they are informed, guided and cared for?</i>	Yes ☒	No ☐
<i>Has the Checklist for First Year Student Success (where applicable) been fully completed and submitted to the Panel?</i>	Yes ☐	No ☐
N/A		

Collaborative Provision (if applicable)		
<i>Are the roles and responsibilities of each partner clearly defined?</i>	Yes ☐	No ☐
N/A		
<i>In the case of Joint or Multiple Awards, has due diligence on capacity of partner institution meeting the QA-QE requirements for the programme been undertaken?</i>	Yes ☐	No ☐
N/A		

--

Section F - Overall Recommendation

1.	Recommend approval of programme as submitted, without amendment	☐
2.	Recommend approval of programme, subject to minor amendments/editorial changes to be completed as soon as possible and with recommendations for consideration. Note: recommendations are attached where it is considered that the programme would benefit from particular changes, or from a review of certain aspects of the programme over a period of time, with changes made if required. While recommendations are advisory in nature, there is an expectation that all recommendations are responded to appropriately and acted upon as appropriate.	☐
3.	Recommend approval of programme subject to the fulfilment of conditions. Recommendations for consideration may also be attached. Note: conditions are attached where it is agreed that changes must be made to the programme / programme documentation prior to the commencement of the programme. Conditions must be set where issues are identified that relate directly to academic standards or to University regulations or procedures. It should be clear what is required in order to meet the conditions. A new programme cannot go forward to Faculty Board for consideration/approval unless a response to the Validation Report is submitted with revised programme documentation and the Academic Quality Enhancement Committee is satisfied that all conditions are met.	☒
4.	Do not recommend approval of programme.	☐

Areas for commendation

1.	Flexible, student centred and industry focus of the programme.
2.	Quality of the submission documentation.

Conditions of Approval

1.	Title of Exit Awards In line with the University's nomenclature policy the title of the Year 1 exit award will begin with 'Certificate' while the Year 2 exit award will begin with 'Diploma'. Remove suffixes (Stage 1, etc.) from titles. Suggested award titles as below: Exit award a student may apply for on successful completion of year 1 (Level 06, 40 ECTS credits) 'Certificate in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice'
----	---

	Exit award a student may apply for on successful completion of year 2 (Level 06, 80 ECTS credits) ‘Diploma in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice’
	Response: The school agrees with this condition and will incorporate the following: Year 1 - Certificate in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice Year 2 - Diploma in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice
2.	Calculation of Award Classification Clearly articulate the calculation of the award classification for the major award and the two minor exit awards. Response: The school agrees with this condition and will incorporate the following award classifications: For the Grangegorman campus Award Classifications Year 3 - Higher Certificate in Arts in Culinary Arts (Professional Cookery Practice). Award will be based on grades achieved in year 3 of the programme. ≥ 70% Distinction 60% - 69% Merit, Grade One 50% - 59% Merit, Grade Two 40% - 49% Pass Award Classifications Year 2 - Diploma in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice Award will be based on grades achieved in year 2 of the programme. ≥ 70% Distinction 60% - 69% Merit, Grade One 50% - 59% Merit, Grade Two 40% - 49% Pass Award Classifications Year 1 - Certificate in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice Award will be based on grades achieved in year 1 of the programme. ≥ 70% Distinction 60% - 69% Merit, Grade One 50% - 59% Merit, Grade Two

	40% - 49% Pass For the Tallaght Campus awards will be based on GPA as per the Marks and Standards Document: Award Classifications Year 3 - Higher Certificate in Arts in Culinary Arts (Professional Cookery Practice). ≥ 3.25 GPA Pass with Distinction 3.00 – 3.24 GPA Pass with Merit, Grade One 2.50- 3.00 GPA Pass with Merit, Grade Two 2.00- 2.49 GPA Pass Award Classifications Year 2 - Diploma in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice. ≥ 3.25 GPA Pass with Distinction 3.00 – 3.24 GPA Pass with Merit, Grade One 2.50- 3.00 GPA Pass with Merit, Grade Two 2.00- 2.49 GPA Pass Award Classifications Year 1 - Certificate in Arts in Professional Cookery Practice ≥ 3.25 GPA Pass with Distinction 3.00 – 3.24 GPA Pass with Merit, Grade One 2.50- 3.00 GPA Pass with Merit, Grade Two 2.00- 2.49 GPA Pass
3.	Derogation Given that this programme will be delivered on both the Grangegorman and Tallaght campus, each operating under different assessment regulations and marks and standards at this time, please confirm that no derogations are sought as part of this programme validation. Response: The school agrees with this condition and confirms that no derogations are sought as part of this programme validation.
4.	Module Learning Outcomes – FOOD 1001 Review and rephrase the module learning outcomes for 'FOOD 1001 Hygiene and HACCP' avoiding the use of words such as 'understand', 'knowledge' and 'ability' which are open to interpretation and thus are not truly measurable.

	Response: The school agrees with this condition and will review and rephrase the module learning outcomes for FOOD 1001.
5.	Programme Learning Outcomes Review and revise the programme learning outcomes to refer to strategic intent and align with sustainable development goals. Response: The school agrees with this condition and will review and revise the programme learning outcomes in addition to integrating sustainability into all programmes within the school, ensuring students will have the skills to understand key determinants such as resource efficiency and zero waste and leading sustainable food system innovations.

Recommendations	
1.	Advanced Entry / RPL Advanced entry Clearly articulate the entry requirements for advanced entry to the programme at each stage for graduates of the legacy programmes. RPL Provide indicative entry criteria to differentiate between advanced entry to Year 2 versus Year 3. Response: The school shall consider the above recommendation and have updated the following: Advanced Entry Entry requirements for advanced entry to the programme at each stage for graduates of the legacy programme are as follows: Graduates of TU5155/ TU5153P (Stage 1, 40 ECTS credits) can apply for advanced entry to year 2 of TU608. Graduates of TU5156/ TU5157P (Stage 2, 40 ECTS credits) can apply for advanced entry to year 3 of TU608. RPL The school will create a set of indicative entry criteria to differentiate between advanced entry into year 2 and year 3.
2.	Industrial Certification Consider offering students the opportunity of acquiring EHO certification / Food Safety recognition following the successful completion of the module 'FOOD 1001 Hygiene and HACCP'. Response: The school shall consider the above recommendation as part of the ongoing programme development

3.	UEM Clearly articulate how the current iteration specifically aligns to the UEM and how it may more fully do so in the next iteration post programme review in 2024/25.
	Response: The school/programme team shall consider the above recommendation as part of the ongoing programme development. This new programme sees the removal of 6 part-time programme codes in lieu of one new code.
4.	Future Development Learner Choice: Investigate the possibility of introducing elective choice to Year 3 of the programme. The panel suggested that adding elective choice might also offer an opportunity to further embrace internationalisation.
	Response: The school/programme team shall consider the above recommendation as part of the programme development.

Other matters to be brought to the attention of Faculty Board and/or University Programmes Board
--

N/A

Section G - Approvals

Validation Report

This report has been agreed by the Validation Panel and is signed on their behalf by the chairperson.

Chairperson: Dr Muireann O'Keeffe	
-----------------------------------	--

Signed: 	
---	--

Date: 09/07/2024

School Response

The response to the conditions and recommendations has been agreed by the School and is signed by the Head of School.

Head of School: Dr Denise O'Leary	
-----------------------------------	--

Signed: 	
---	--

Date: 11/07/2024

Faculty Board

The report and response have been approved by Faculty Board

Faculty Dean:	
---------------	--

Signed: 	
---	--

Date: 22/07/2024

University Programmes Board (Programmes of 30 ECTS or great)
--

The report and response have been approved by the University Programmes Board

Registrar:	
------------	--

Signed:	
---------	--

Date: Click or tap to enter a date.
