Tamhlacht - Tallaght

TALLAGHT

EXTERNAL VALIDATION REPORT FOR

Higher Diploma in Science in (Bio)Pharmaceutical and Medical Device Manufacturing

LEVEL 8

School of: Science and Computing

Department of: Science

Panel Meeting date:	11/06/2018	
Decision: *tick one only*	Recommended	
	Recommended subject to modification	Yes
	Not recommended	

Proposed Commencement Date:	August 2018
Period of Validation:	5 Years

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL REPORT

PART 1:

1.1 GENERAL INFORMATION

School	Science and Computing
Department	Science
Date of panel visit	11/06/2018
Programme evaluated	Yes
NFQ Level	8
Programme approved title	1. Higher Diploma in Science in (Bio)Pharmaceutical and Medical Device Manufacturing
Delivery Mode(s)	Provider based, Outreach Centre, On-line, E-learning platform. FT, PT, ACCS
Panel	Chair: 1. Jeremy Bird IT Sligo 2. Paul Blunnie Industry Representative 3. Seamus Lennon GMIT John Behan Head of Science Department IT Tallaght
	Secretary: Sinead O'Neill replaced by Karen Scattergood
	Minutes by: Karen Scattergood

1.2 INSTITUTE STAFF

Name	**Grade / Responsibility**
Ed Carey	Lecturer
Finbarr Sheehy	Lecturer
Orla Callan	Lecturer
Luke Kiernan	Lecturer
Paula Kearney	Lecturer

Janis Kelly	Lecturer
Ann Ryan	Lecturer
Denise Egan	Lecturer
Hani Toma	Lecturer

PART II COMMENDATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & CONDITIONS

The External Review panel recommends the validation of the programmes:

Higher Diploma in Science in (Bio)Pharmaceutical and Medical Device Manufacturing

for the purpose of the award of:

Level 8

Subject to the conditions and recommendations set out below:

2.1 Commendations:

Points of note commended by the panel. The Panel commends Staff and the collaboration that has taken place.

2.2 Conditions:

The evaluation panel requires that the Programme Development Team should take note of the following conditions and that a satisfactory response to those conditions shall be received before the validation is considered by Academic Council of the Institute.

Conditions:

1. Amend the Schedules
2. Amend the Contact Hours

2.3 Recommendations:

Recommendations are suggestions made by the Programme Evaluation Panel in the spirit of improving the proposed programme. While these are not binding, the reasons for not incorporating a recommendation have to be clearly stated by the Programme Development Team in its response to the Evaluation Report.

Recommendations:

1. To Clarify details of major assessments
2. To put 30% on Schedules
3. Include attendance details on schedules.

4. If the schedule has a practical they must have achieved 30% and have no failed element for CA Theory.
5. Use an anti-plagiarism package.
6. Insert a column on level 8 schedule – 3 semester schedules insert modifications e.g. full-time, work placements

PART III FINDINGS OF THE VALIDATION PANEL

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Comment:

The panel was welcomed to the Institute by John Behan. The programme documentation was provided to the panel members prior to the meeting. The panel used the external review template as per the Quality Assurance Manual to assist in their deliberations. The panel met in advance of the meeting to discuss the submission document and plan for the meeting with management and staff of the department.

3.2 MEETING WITH MANAGEMENT AND STAFF

Comment on the discussions that took place:

The discussions were open and informative and focused on the level teaching involved and the qualifications of the lecturers, the relevance of the programme and the student profile, qualifications and facilities for the student. It also covered the nature of the modules and hours of lectures and practicals.

3.3 Higher Diploma in Science in (Bio)Pharmaceutical and Medical Device Manufacturing

Comment: The panel was satisfied that the title of the programme is clear, accurate and fit for the purpose of informing prospective learners and other stakeholders. The panel was also satisfied that the proposed title of the programme also encompasses the related named award title.

3.4 Justification for the Programme

Comment: The justification for the proposed programme was discussed and the panel was satisfied that there was a market for graduates of the proposed programme. This level was created to upgrade the educational level and workplace skills. This level 8 is more technical and specialised. The medical device industry in Ireland is investing more of its resources in high value manufacturing and R&D to maintain its leading position in the industry. This increases the requirement for better qualified, more highly skilled employees. There is a continuous progression of levels from Level 6 GMP, Level 7, Level 8 (This one) and Level 9 Pharma Technology Masters.

3.5 Conformance with Institute's Mission and Strategy

Comment: The panel was satisfied that the proposed programme conformed to the Institute's mission of providing learners with flexible higher education opportunities which are of the highest quality.

3.6 Access, Transfer and Progression Arrangements

Comment: The panel where satisfied with the arrangements stated for access and progression but recommended that these should be documented in more detail.

3.7 Programme Structure and Design

Comment: The programme structure and design were well documented and the panel was satisfied with the information supplied. The Module exists already students have to register. Some complete Springboard it is 8 evenings and 2 Saturdays. The programme will utilize 4 Innopharma lecturers and they have taken part in CeLT activities.

3.8 Programme Learning Outcomes and Award Standards.

Comment: The panel was satisfied that the learning outcomes of the programme were compliant with the Award Standard for the *Higher Diploma in Science in (Bio)Pharmaceutical and Medical Device Manufacturing.*

3.9 Teaching and Learning Strategy

Comment: The proposed approaches to teaching and learning were indicated and justified. We need to design Full-time schedule or two 10 credit electives or drop another module and put work placement in there. The Teaching method allows for 'Go-To Training' (online training) which involves student interaction. Attendance in class and online interaction. Student interaction is good and technology is stable. Attendance at training is recorded. Teamwork is another method of learning which teaches the skills necessary for creating a good working environment. Continuous Assessment is part of the teaching strategy. We simulate a real problem, learners are coming from all different backgrounds and many skills are brought to the table and used to solve the problem.

3.10 Learner Assessment

Comment: The learner assessment methods were very clearly documented. Repeat opportunities for those missing continuous assessment was discussed. The panel recommended that this be documented for learners to ensure they were aware of the repeat opportunities available to them. The profile of the Graduates are people who want to be trained in the industry across all sectors and are looking for good Job opportunities. The Springboard is open to people in employment as well as unemployed. This programme is suitable for learners already working in the industry.

3.11 Quality Assurance

Comment: The procedures in developing the programme were outlined to the panel as per the Institute's quality assurance procedures. The panel was satisfied with the procedures that were applied to the development of the proposed programme and that the quality assurance mechanisms are in place to ensure its provision, monitoring and review. There is a QA procedure for students to follow in IT Tallaght. There is a class rep for any queries they give feedback to lecturers at end of programme meetings. Staff get regular feedback

from students and Saturday sessions are available. Any issues that arise are dealt with. Students are aware that there is a process for complaints/issues.

3.12 Information Provision

Comment: The panel was satisfied with the proposed information that would be available to learners and potential learners. Information is available online and at lectures and during continuous assessments.

3.13 Library and Physical Facilities / Resources

Comment: The panel was satisfied that the staffing and physical resources were available to deliver the proposed programme. Students have automatic access to library facilities as soon as they become a student here. There is access for students with disabilities. The library service provides both books in print on the programme and E-Journals. Online databases and Remote Access is also available. There is Moodle online student services and documentation is available online to download.

3.14 Learner Support Services

Comment: Students are given an induction handbook, they have access to medical services, counselling services and complaint procedures. They are given this as part of the QA process. The following support services are available to learners: Admissions/Registration/Examinations, Academic regulations, Student Records, Grants. The Centre for Learning and Teaching (CeLT) provide academic support for students including drop-in workshops, study silks and advice. CeLT also co-ordinates workshops for staff in a variety of topics.

3.15 Academic Staff and Qualifications

Comment: The panel was satisfied that the lecturing and support staff is available within the Institute to deliver the content of this programme. This programme will be run with Full-time and associate staff, if run Part-time it will have associate staff or Innopharma staff. If run Full-time it will need to be resourced e.g. CP1 or CP2.

Staff have been lecturing here for years. Some have been working in the industry in the past. They are highly qualified and totally engaged in teaching the students at the highest level thus enabling the student to get the desired qualifications and employment.

Ann Ryan lectures in Industry, Customise training and Professional development.

Janice Kelly lectures at Innopharma in Food Science and is a Paramedic.

Paula Kearney lectures at Innopharma in Pharmaceutical Technology has worked in MSD and Allergan.

Luke Kiernan lectures in a technical role and process development and PAT Q.

Denise lectures at Innopharma in Pharmacology and the Fundamentals of Science and Aseptic.

Hani Toma lectures in Inorganic Chemistry and Process Chemistry.

Staff are trained on Gradebook. Ideas are shared and this works well. They are externally assessed also.

PART IV: PROGRAMME SCHEDULES

Amended Programme Schedules for each stage of each programme to incorporate the conditions and recommendations set out in under points 2.2 and 2.3, and all Programme Abstracts, must be submitted with the Response to this Panel Evaluation Report.

Insert Full-time schedule over 2 semesters.

Enter specific hours and total number of hours per week for a student, also what the full hours of content are.

Confirm Credits and hours.

Need to have a full-time and preparation work dropped from full-time schedule.

Template for External Review Panel Report

Evaluation Criteria	Yes	No	Met With Reservations	Explanatory Note
Does the proposed course accord with the Institute's Mission Statement and Strategic Plan? Will it have a positive impact on the host department(s) and the Institute?				
Does the proposal make a strong case that there is an identified need for the course? Is this backed up by evidence of structured consultation with industry, students and social partners?				
Will the course meet the identified need, in terms of level of qualification, curriculum, learning experience and throughput? What is the likely employment potential for graduates?				
Is the course structure logical and well designed, in terms of programme schedules, syllabi, teaching and learning strategies and assessment methodologies?				
Are the entry mechanisms, modes of study and progression mechanisms clear and appropriate for the programme?				
Are the entry mechanisms designed to facilitate access, transfer and progression?				
Are course management arrangements and quality assurance arrangements in place? Will they ensure the proper management and operation of the programme?				
Is there a sufficient number of appropriately qualified staff to support the expected number of students to be recruited?				
Is the course proposal documentation suitable to proceed to external evaluation?				
Overall Comment:				
Signed:				

Part V: Approval

Programme Evaluation Report Approved by:

Signature:		*Signature*:
Print name:		*Print name*:
Chairperson to Panel		**Secretary to Panel**
Title:		*Title*:
Date:		Date: