Programme Review Report

Higher Certificate in Arts in Culinary Arts

(Professional Cookery Practice) - TU608

Version of Report	*Author*	*Date*
Draft 1	AQA – Michael Keane	24th June 2025
Final	AQA – Michael Keane	7th July 2025

Approval	*Date*
Documentation for Review approved by Faculty Board	8th May 2025
Report of Programme Review Panel approved by AQAEC	Click or tap to enter a date.
New Programme Title approved by University Programmes Board (if applicable)	N/A

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: Full-time: 3 Yrs
Modalities of delivery	In-person, On-campus ✓ Blended ☐
	Online ☐ Hyflex ☐
Classification of award	Distinction; Merit Grade 1; Merit Grade 2; Pass
Discipline Programmes Board	N/A
Faculty Board	Faculty of Arts & Humanities
Schools involved in delivery	Culinary Arts & Food Technology
Delivery location	Grangegorman
Collaborative Partner (where applicable)	N/A
Date of Commencement of revised programme	Sept 2025

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 1; Merit Grade 2; Pass
Award Title	Diploma in Arts in Culinary Arts
Exit/Embedded	Exit ☒ Embedded ☐
NFQ Level	6
Award Class	Minor
ECTS Credits	80
Classification of award	Distinction; Merit Grade 1; Merit Grade 2; Pass
Exit Award Title	Certificate in Arts in Culinary Arts
Exit/Embedded	Exit ☒ Embedded ☐
NFQ Level	6
Award Class	Minor
ECTS Credits	40
Classification of award	Distinction; Merit Grade 1; Merit Grade 2; Pass

Section C - Programme Derogations (if required)

Derogations from Assessment Regulations/Marks and Standards, requiring approval by University Programmes Board	
No derogations were sought in advance of this programme validation however, during the module discussions at the review panel meeting it became apparent that certain modules and assessment components cannot be compensated. A list of same was requested, see condition of validation #2.	
University Programmes Board Approval	Date

Section D Review Process

Date of Programme Review	11th June 2025

Context for Programme Review
How was the programme review process instigated, by whom/via which process?
The School of Culinary Arts & Food Technology requested a full programme review, to include alignment with the University's Education Model, Graduate Attributes and Strategic Intent.

Please tick the type of programme review undertaken:

Full Programme Review ✓	Focused Programme Review ☐

Transitional arrangements
How will changes to revised programme be implemented, i.e. to be implemented with immediate effect in the next academic year of delivery, or phased in on a year-by-year basis.
The School of School of Culinary Arts & Food Technology wishes for the revised programme to be implemented with immediate effect for the next academic year of delivery i.e. 2025/26.

Panel Members

Name	Role	Affiliation
Dr Ciarán O'Leary	Chair	Assistant Head of Academic Affairs Learning, Teaching and Assessment TU Dublin
Alan Mc Cabe	External assessor	Department of Hospitality Studies Dundalk Institute of Technology
TJ O Connor	External assessor	Hotel, Culinary Arts and Tourism Department Munster Technological University
Eric Matthews	External assessor	Chef / Co-owner Kicky's Castlehouse Restaurants Ltd
Shaun Ferns	Internal assessor	University Education Model Lead TU Dublin
Michael Keane	Academic Quality Advisor & Secretary to the Panel	Academic Affairs TU Dublin

Documentation Reviewed by the Programme Review Panel
▪ Programme Self Evaluation Report (PSER) ▪ Programme Descriptors (Extracted from the Programme and Module Catalogue - PMC) ▪ Books of Modules (Extracted from the Programme and Module Catalogue - PMC) ▪ Annual Programme Enhancement Reports (2020/21, 2021/22, 2022/23) ▪ External Examiner Reports (2020/21, 2021/22, 2022/23) ▪ Exemplar Assessment Materials ▪ Legacy Programme Descriptors and Books of Modules ▪ TU Dublin Strategic Plan 2024-2028 ▪ Overview of the University Education Model

Schedule of Meetings

14.00 – 14.45	Private meeting of panel to discuss/provide initial feedback on the submission documentation and draw up an agenda of matters to be raised at subsequent meetings.	
14.45 – 17.00	Meeting of Panel with Head of School, Head of Discipline and staff teaching on the programme to discuss the PSER, revised programme, module syllabi (existing, revised and new), teaching, learning and assessment methods.	
	In attendance:	
	Dr. Denise O'Leary (Head of School)	James Murphy (Head of Discipline) Michael O'Connor (Head of Discipline)
	Diarmaid Murphy	Judith Boyle
	Lynsey White	Tony Cambell
	Warren McElhone	Dr Kathleen Farrell
	Niall Murphy	Frank Jacoby
	Dr Mark Farrell	James Sheridan
	James McCauley	Dermot Seberry
	Dr Karen Casey	James Fox
	Diarmuid Cawley	Dr Elaine Mahon
17.00 – 17.30	Meeting of Panel with current students and graduates.	
	In attendance:	
	Current Students	*Graduates*
	Gabriel Henrique da Conceicao	
17.30 – 18.00	Private meeting of Panel to discuss its findings.	
18.00	Oral Presentation of panel summary findings to Head of School of Culinary Arts & Food Technology, Head of Discipline and Programme Coordinator.	

Section E Programme Evaluation

Programme Review Process		
Was the programme review conducted in accordance with the Programme Review Process, i.e. were current students, graduates, employers, other appropriate stakeholders involved in the review process?	Yes ✓	No ☐

The review process was influenced by ongoing stakeholder feedback from external examiners, students, staff and industry captured in the Annual Programme Evaluation process (Q5's) and through meetings involving graduates, students, and staff organised specifically as part of the programme review process.

The above was informed by:

Stakeholder Collaboration
Collaboration with all partners – students, academics, and industry. Feedback was incorporated into the new design from data gleaned from student, graduate and employer surveys.

Governance & Management		
Does the programme align with the University's Strategic Plan and the principles of the University Education Model, and relevant policies?	Yes ✓	No ☐

The central focus of this Culinary Arts programme, as stated in the PSER, is that learners are grounded in the three components comprising the University Education Model (UEM): Learner Support, Learner Choice, and Learner Experience. By combining these three components, this programme helps learners to meet their potential as individuals and in relationships with others, thereby contributing positively to the wellbeing and productivity of society, the planet, and its inhabitants.

UEM Fundamental 1 - Module Duplication:
No evidence was provided in the PSER as to the review of modules to remove duplication across culinary arts programmes offered by the School.

UEM Fundamental 2 - Mode of Delivery:
Practical modules by necessity are delivered in-person. Culinary graduates must develop hands-on tactile skills, sensory analysis, use of equipment, safety working with culinary equipment and real time feedback in a busy live environment. The panel noted however, that modalities was not considered as part of this process at this time. Recommendation #11.

UEM Fundamental 3 - Progression opportunities from awards at lower levels of the NFQ to university programmes:
Access, transfer and progression pathways on to the programme were evident within the PSER.

UEM Fundamental 4 - Capacity to offer student choice:
No evidence of any commitment to consider the possibility of widening elective choice within the programme was provided in the PSER nor through panel discussions. The panel encourages the

programme team to consider introducing elective or free elective modules to enhance learner choice. Recommendation #4.

UEM Fundamental 5 – University Framework of Learner Experiences:
No evidence was provided. Recommendation #12.

UEM Fundamental 6 - Common pan-University modules:
No evidence was provided.

UEM Fundamental 7 - Learning outcomes related to sustainability are transparent:
The panel welcomed the programme team's aim of integrating applied sustainability into each module ensuring students will have the skills to understand key determinants such as resource efficiency and zero waste and leading sustainable food system innovations. While evident in the Programme Learning Outcomes and in some of the module descriptors, explicit integration across teaching, learning, and assessment would further support a more coherent and measurable approach to sustainability education. Recommendation #10.

Do the Programme Management and Quality Assurance arrangements align to TU Dublin Quality Framework processes?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Has the Annual Monitoring/Academic Quality Enhancement process been used to identify issues and actions that continually enhance the programme and student learning experience?	Yes ✓	No ☐

Student Data		
On consideration of student recruitment data, is there evidence that there continues to be a market demand for the programme and that the programme remains viable?	Yes ✓	No ☐
On consideration of student engagement, performance and progression data, are students engaging with their programme and performing as expected? If not, has this been acknowledged and addressed through the programme review process?	Yes ✓	No ☐
The panel noted what appeared to be low progression/retention figures for years 1 and 2 of the programme and that this was not addressed either in the documentation nor in the SWOT analysis. The panel recommended that the programme team undertake a year-on-year analysis and implement an action plan to address same. Recommendation #1. Also, the panel recommended that a strategic marketing plan be implemented to further support student recruitment. Recommendation #2.		
On consideration of graduate destination data, is there evidence that students are securing employment in the field or progressing to further study in the discipline?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Evidenced within the PSER and provided graduate profiles.		

Awards Standards		
Are the programme aims and learning outcomes clearly written using appropriate terminology?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Are the programme aims and learning outcomes aligned to the proposed level of the award on the NFQ in accordance with applicable Award Standards?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Will the curricula, teaching, learning and assessment methods enable students to reach the appropriate standard to qualify for the award(s)?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Having reviewed the syllabi 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 awards.		
Is ongoing programme development appropriately informed by internal and external stakeholder input (including industry/practice, professional/regulatory bodies, and community organisations)?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Does ongoing programme development take account of relevant external discipline benchmarks and Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements?	Yes ☐	No ☐
N/A		

Programme Design		
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?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Programme design was informed by: ▪ Surveys shared with graduates, student's and employers. ▪ Publication HEA: National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 (Dublin: HEA, 2011). ▪ National and Global practice and policy in Culinary Education to doctoral level. HEA: National Framework for Education (Dublin, HEA, 2015). ▪ Ongoing stakeholder feedback from external examiners, students, staff and industry) captured in the Annual Programme Evaluation process (Q5's) and through meetings involving graduates, students, and staff organised specifically as part of the programme review process. ▪ External examiners, strategic partners, promotion providers, sponsors and safety auditors provide ongoing critical information about best practice in education and food safety. ▪ Questionnaire circulated to past employers and industry to glean as much information as possible regarding their experience with students and possible feedback to enhance future training in our school.		
Is there a mechanism to ensure the input of external stakeholders in the ongoing development of the programme?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Is the programme curriculum well-structured with a logical progression of learning and development across the modules and stages?	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 through the programme. It was also clear to the panel how the standards of knowledge, skill and competence evolve throughout each of the individual modules within the revised programme.		
Are there appropriate opportunities for students to undertake work-based learning, through work placements or work-based projects or assignments?	Yes ✓	No ☐
To further enhance the learner experience and provide opportunity for students to gain applied learning in real world product development, the panel recommended that the programme team explore the possibility of students engaging with SME's in product design and development. Recommendation #13.		
Are work/practice placements appropriate and fit for purpose, having regard to the requirements of professional, regulatory, and associative bodies where applicable, in the context of student achievement of learning outcomes and in the overall student experience?	Yes ✓	No ☐
If applicable, have the relevant Blended Learning Checklists (i.e. Learning Experience Context & Programme Context) been fully completed and submitted to the Panel?	Yes ☐	No ☐
N/A		

Is the required programme and module information provided in the correct format?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Extracts from the PMC of both programme descriptor and book of modules were provided to the panel.		

Learning, Teaching & Assessment		
Is there an effective student-centred learning and teaching strategy that aligns with the University's strategies and guidelines in this regard?	Yes ✓	No ☐
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?	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. However, the panel recommended that the programme team revisit the programme assessment strategy and review module descriptors to ensure accurate representation/alignment with same. Also, to consider the volume of assessment whilst introducing more innovative forms of assessment throughout the programme. Recommendation #3.		
Do the learning outcomes and assessment strategy ensure that academic integrity can be maintained and attempted breaches of academic integrity are minimised/easily detected?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Is there a comprehensive mapping of assessment methods and module learning outcomes and between module learning outcomes and programme learning outcomes?	Yes ✓	No ☐
A comprehensive mapping is 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.		
Are there opportunities in all modules to provide students with timely and constructive feedback on their learning and development?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Do the teaching and assessment methods consider the diversity of the student cohort?	Yes ✓	No ☐

Student Supports & Learning Environment		
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?	Yes ✓	No ☐

Are there sufficient staff that are appropriately qualified and capable to support the programme delivery?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Are there appropriate arrangements in place to support the student experience and to monitor student performance?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Are the access, transfer and progression arrangements including RPL clearly defined and appropriate, and aligned to TU Dublin policy/strategy in this regard?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Do the student supports and learning environment cater for equality, diversity and inclusivity of students?	Yes ✓	No ☐
Is the relevant programme information clearly communicated to the students to ensure they are informed, guided and cared for?	Yes ✓	No ☐

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

Section F Overall Recommendation of the Panel

1.	**Recommend continuing approval of programme as submitted, without amendment**	☐
2.	**Recommend continuing 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 continuing 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 unless a response to the Review Report is submitted with revised programme documentation.	
4.	**Do not recommend continuing approval of programme.**	☐

Area for commendation	
	The panel commended the: ▪ Passion, skills and expertise of the programme teaching team.

Conditions of Approval	
1.	Programme schedules 2025/26 Provide a definitive programme schedule clearly outlining all mandatory/elective modules within each semester of delivery and update the programme descriptor on the PMC to accurately reflect same for 2025/26.
	A definitive programme schedule is provided in Appendix I and Akari has been updated to reflect same.

2.	Derogations from Current General Assessment Regulations Provide a definitive list of any derogations sought from the General Assessment Regulations in place in May 2025, in particular a listing of any modules or constituent assessment components where compensation does not apply.
	The school is seeking derogations under the new regulations which commence in Sept 2025, for thresholds levels on several modules across the school. The modules and the derogation sought are listed in Appendix II. The school is seeking derogations under the new regulations which come into effect in Sept 2025, for thresholds levels on several modules across the school. The modules and the derogation sought are listed in Appendix II. The school has not required derogations from the thresholds rules for any module on this programme under current General Assessment Regulations (GARs). This is because the City campus GARs in place in May 2025 state “The minimum pass mark for the various forms of student assessment shall normally be 40% of the maximum marks available. Any module specific requirements, such as component weightings and thresholds, shall be specified in the module descriptor and Student Handbook.”, thus including a threshold on a module

	did not require a derogation. The school has not requested any derogation from the pass-by-compensation rule as such a derogation has not been needed.

Recommendations	
1.	Retention Undertake a year-on-year analysis and implement an action plan to address low progression/retention figures for years 1 and 2.
	Response: Response: The school will develop a *SCAFT Retention/Progression Action Plan* which will include strategies to increase progression/ retention figures. The *SCAFT Retention/Progression Action Plan* will also, as recommended, place a particular focus on progression / retention figures for Years 1 and 2 of TU 608.
2.	Strategic Marketing Plan Implement a strategic marketing plan to further support student recruitment for the next 5 years.
	Response: A School Marketing and Engagement Committee was created in 2023 and a *SCAFT Marketing Strategy and Action Plan* was developed in 2024 with the aim of: • increasing student enrollments and applications • increasing awareness of the world-class School of Culinary Arts and Food Technology programmes and facilities at TU Dublin which build on a strong legacy of excellence and success at Cathal Brugha St, Grangegorman, Tallaght and Blanchardstown The plan contains a number of elements, and these are being actioned on an ongoing basis eg a number of social media marketing campaigns have been undertaken by the School.
3.	Programme Assessment Strategy Revisit the programme assessment strategy and review module descriptors to ensure accurate alignment with this strategy. In doing so, consideration should be given to the volume of assessment while introducing more innovative forms of assessment throughout the programme. In particular, the panel encourages the development of a more coherent and scaffolded approach to the use of portfolios.
	Response: The school welcomes the panel's recommendation on assessment strategies and lecturers have already begun to undertake module changes. Lecturers will continue to take panel feedback into account when making ongoing adjustments to modules. Particular attention will be paid to coherence and scaffolding in the use of portfolios.

4.	Electives The panel encourages the programme team to consider introducing elective or free elective modules to enhance learner choice and flexibility. This would also enable interdisciplinary learning by allowing students to engage with modules from other disciplines. Together, these changes would better support the achievement of the University's Graduate Attributes and align the programme with TU Dublin's strategic priorities.
	Response: The programme team will take this recommendation under consideration, with the aim of increasing elective choice on a phased basis
5.	Legacy Modules Review any legacy module descriptors not updated as part of this review process to ensure alignment with the University's strategic intent and assessment regulations.
	Response: The school welcomes this recommendation and the Heads of Discipline will work closely with module co-ordinators to ensure review and revision of school modules which were not updated within this Programmatic Review Process. During this process, recommendations provided by the panel will be taken into account.
6.	Internship / Work Placements On completion of internship / work placements include a presentation to peers on experiences/lessons learned as a form of assessment.
	Response: The school will take this recommendation under consideration for integration into Internship/Placement module(s) where practically possible.
7.	University Education Model Reflect on the School's intention in relation to the implementation of the University Education Model and consider how the fundamentals can be further incorporated in the programme design.
	Response: The school will identify additional areas to incorporate/implement the University Educational Model (UEM)'s 10 guiding principles across our programme curricula. This on-going development will help to deliver a brand new and unique educational experience which will meet the needs of our learners for the current and next generation.
8.	Gen AI Reflect on the Critical literacy, critical practices and ethical use of tools in the area of Gen AI throughout the delivery of the programme. In this regard, the School is referred to the recently approved 'Guidelines on the Responsible use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Teaching, Learning, Feedback and Assessment in TU Dublin'.
	Response: The school welcomes the panel's advice. Work towards meeting this objective has already begun with a number of school staff having undertaken recent AI training. Additionally, while waiting for TU Dublin Guidelines on GenAI to be issued, the school had already adopted an adapted version of the Perkins, Furze, Roe & MacVaugh (2024) AI Assessment Scale. The

	school management team has committed to organising Gen AI workshops early in Semester 1 next year to provide additional training and guidance to staff.
9.	Module Descriptors Review and update the module descriptors in relation to: ▪ Terminology and number of learning outcomes. ▪ Indicative syllabus; provide indicative content under all headings. ▪ Assessment of learning outcomes; remove instances of duplication of assessment in every assessment event. ▪ Hours per semester; review to ensure that what is stated accurately represents delivery in relation to lectures, tutorials, labs, self-directed learning etc. such that all stakeholders' expectations can be managed. ▪ Online resources, for example practical cookery through Boost[1]: Practical Cookery, 14th Edition: Boost | Content List | Resources | Courses | Teacher Dashboard | Boost Learning - Courses | Resources | Lessons | eBooks | Knowledge Tests
	Response: This work has already begun on existing modules. The programme team will explore each recommendation, and work will continue to update modules and the programme.
10.	Operationalising Sustainability at Module Level The programme team has made meaningful progress in integrating sustainability at programme level. The next step should focus on embedding sustainability outcomes more consistently within individual modules, using GreenComp as a guiding framework where appropriate. Explicit integration across teaching, learning, and assessment would support a coherent and measurable approach to sustainability education.
	Response**:** The school appreciates the panel's acknowledgement of the sustainability initiatives / activities currently integrated at programmatic level. Academic staff will continue to integrate sustainability at modular level and will explore GreenComp as a guiding framework for individual modules.

[1] https://eur05.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fboost-learning.com%2Fcourse%2Fresources%2Fcontents-list%2F9781398329072&data=05%7C02%7CMichael.Keane%40tudublin.ie%7Cd475b4fa76dd4474c23d08ddb59d8aa5%7C766317cbe9484e5f8cecdabc8e2fd5da%7C0%7C0%7C638866410502379472%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=6DvkYfZqp6gMF17eEPD9zeeOHAV9XabTWOCx6cHCCMs%3D&reserved=0

11.	Modalities The panel encourages the programme team to reflect on how delivery modalities might be diversified in future iterations of the programme to better support the diverse needs of learners. While maintaining the value of in-person engagement, the team is invited to consider validating modules in more than one delivery format where appropriate. This would offer greater flexibility for learners facing logistical or socio-economic barriers, while enhancing the programme's adaptability and resilience.
	Response: Because of the practical nature of a large number of modules on the programme, the face to face modality is most appropriate in many cases. Practical/timetabling limitations can also play a part. However, the School recognises the desire of the University to offer content in different modalities and post the programmatic-review-process, supports to address the strategic and appropriate use of modalities across all school modules were disseminated to academic staff and discussions were held. Accordingly, academic staff are updating modules, if appropriate. Additionally, the school intends to hold additional 'Modalities workshops' in the early Autumn to offer staff further assistance and support.
12.	Embedding UDL and Digital Capabilities The panel recommends that the programme team adopt a systematic approach to embedding Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles and digital capabilities across the curriculum. This should include ensuring consistent application of flexibility, learner choice, and barrier reduction in teaching, learning, and assessment practices. Alignment with TU Dublin's EDI principles is also recommended to strengthen inclusive, digital, and equity-focused curriculum design, ensuring these commitments are visible in programme and module documentation.
	Response: The school commits to adopting a systematic approach to embedding EDI principles, UDL principles and digital capabilities across the curriculum.
13.	Applied Learning with SME's Explore the possibility of students engaging with SME's to gain real world experience in product design and development.
	Response: The school will explore the creation of additional real world experiences between our students and our industry partners, with a special focus on engagement with SME's.
13.	Financial Literacy Identify opportunities to include more real-world financial situations and strengthen curriculum content on core business practices such as costings.
	Response: The relevant modules will be revised/updated to incorporate this recommendation.
14.	Food Safety Accreditation Consider providing students with the opportunity to acquire embedded food safety certifications prior to going on internships/work placements.

	Response: The school will take this recommendation under consideration for implementation within the programme, if practically possible.
14.	Programme Learning Outcomes Review the terminology of the programme learning outcomes to align more appropriately with NFQ level 6.
	Response: The programme chair will adjust the terminology to ensure appropriate alignment.

Other matters to be brought to the attention of Faculty Board and/or Academic Quality Assurance & Enhancement Committee
N/A

Section G Approvals

Review Report	
This Review Report has been agreed by the Review Panel and is signed on its behalf by the Panel Chair.	
Dr Ciarán O'Leary	
	Date: 8/7/25

School Response	
The response to the conditions and recommendations has been agreed by the School and is signed by the Head of School.	
Dr Denise O'Leary	
	Date: 31/07/2025

Faculty Board	
The report and response have been approved by Faculty Board	
Faculty Head of Teaching & Learning:	
Signed:	Date: 25/07/2025

List of Appendices

TU608 Higher Certificate in Arts in Culinary Arts (Professional Cookery Practice)

Appendix I: Definitive Programme Schedule

Part-time over 3 Years, 120 ECTS, 40 ECTS each Year

Year	Semester(s)	Module Code	Module Title	ECTS Credits	Status Mandatory/Elective
1	1	FOOD 1001	Hygiene and HACCP	5	Mandatory
1	1	TFCA 1000	Theory of Food and Kitchen Organisation 1	5	Mandatory
1	1	TFCA 1021	Professional Cookery 1	5	Mandatory
1	2	TFFT 1002	Meat Processing	5	Mandatory
1	2	BSMT 1002	Introduction to Business	5	Mandatory
1	2	TFCA 1025	Introduction to Professional Pastry	5	Mandatory
1	2	TFIN 1000	Industry Internship	10	Mandatory
2	1	FOOD 1003	Introduction to Nutrition and Diet Therapy	5	Mandatory
2	1	TFCA 1022	Professional Cookery 2	5	Mandatory
2	1	TFFC 2021	Cost Control and Purchasing	5	Mandatory
2	2	LERN 1002	Work-based Learning – Professional Cookery	10	Mandatory
2	2	TFCA 2032	Development of the Professional Pastry Chef	5	Mandatory
2	2	TFFB 2005	French Culinary terms and wine terminology	5	Mandatory
2	2	TFGS 1022	Gastronomy 1: Food in History	5	Mandatory
3	1	TFBS 1025	Wine Studies	5	Mandatory
3	1	TFCA 2023	Ethnic Cuisine	5	Mandatory
3	1	TFFT 2003	Meat Technology	5	Mandatory
3	1	TFGS 2022	Gastronomy 2: Sociology and Anthropology of Food	5	Mandatory
3	2	TFCA 2024	Food Production and Presentation	5	Mandatory
3	2	TFMS 1023	Culinary Management Principles	5	Mandatory
3	2	TFNT 2024	Culinary Operations Management	5	Mandatory
3	2	TFRS 2023	Food and Beverage Service	5	Mandatory

Appendix II – Derogations sought for modules offered across the school

Module code	Module Title	Derogation sought
TFBS 1025	Wine Studies	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.

TFBS 4021	Advanced Wine Studies	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
TFGS2022	Gastronomy 2: Sociology of Food	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
TFGS3024	Gastronomy 3: Food in Culture, Art and Media	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
TFGS4022	Gastronomy 4: Political Economy and Ecology of Food	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
TFNT0021	Introductory Nutrition	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
TFNT2023	Diet Health and Disease	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components. Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
TFNT4022	Sports and Exercise Nutrition	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components. Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
TFBC2022	Nutrition and Health Studies	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
TFNT9022	Lifecycle and Therapeutic Nutrition	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
TFNT0022	Lifecycle Nutrition and Health Promotion	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.
FOOD1003	Introduction to Nutrition and Diet Therapy	Seeking 25% threshold on both assessment components.