



**SOUTH EAST TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

***COURSE EVALUATION 2***

**ASSESSORS' REPORT TO ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

**COURSE EVALUATED:** Certificate in Enhancing Life Skills  
(Special Purpose Award; Level 6; 20 Credits)

**SCHOOL:** Health Sciences

**DEPARTMENT:** Nursing

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The following is a review report to Academic Council from the panel of assessors on the proposal from the School of Health Sciences at South East Technological University to develop a Certificate in Enhancing Life Skills (Special Purpose Award; Level 6; 20 Credits). In accordance with the regulations governing the evaluation of new programme proposals, as set out in the South East Technological University *Programme Quality Assurance Enhancement Policy and Procedures*, the programme proposal was reviewed by a panel of assessors.

The panel of assessors who contributed to this report were:

- Ciaran Lynch, Former Development Manager, Limerick Institute of Technology (Chair)
- Eileen Brophy, Consultant, Advocate and Campaigner in the area of Intellectual Disability
- Dr Des Cawley, Head of Department of Nursing and Healthcare, Technological University of the Shannon, Midlands Midwest
- Dr Gerardina Hartnett, Head of Department of Nursing and Healthcare Sciences, Munster Technological University
- Eleanor Kent, Academic Council Representative, South East Technological University, Waterford
- Dr Colette Moloney, Assistant Registrar, South East Technological University, Waterford

In accordance with the regulations set out in the aforementioned *Programme Quality Assurance Enhancement Policy and Procedures*, a review meeting took place on 26 April 2024. The review meeting was conducted virtually via Teams. In the course of the meeting, the panel of assessors met with the programme development team. The following members of the South East Technological University team were present:

- Dr Sara Kennedy, Head of Department of Nursing and Healthcare, South East Technological University
- Dr Clare Power, Assistant Head of Department of Education, South East Technological University
- Louise Brady, Lecturer, Department of Nursing and Healthcare, South East Technological University
- Denise Coffey, Lecturer, Department of Nursing and Healthcare, South East Technological University

- Dr Catherine Kelly-Mason, Lecturer, Department of Nursing and Healthcare, South East Technological University
- Mary Moylan, Lecturer, Department of Nursing and Healthcare, South East Technological University
- James O'Halloran, Programme Supervisor, RehabCare, Vita Community Hub Waterford

The assessors wish to thank the members of the development team for engaging generously and openly with the review process.

## **2. SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONDITIONS**

### *2.1 General Remarks*

The panel commends the School on their comprehensive proposal which is well embedded in policy and is in line with the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion strategy. The panel thanks the team for the time and evident extensive thought process devoted to preparing the proposal and compliments them on their passion for the programme, their engagement with the sector and on sourcing funding for the project. The panel **recommends approval of the Certificate in Enhancing Life Skills** until the next School Review in the School of Health Sciences. **Approval is conditional on the submission of a revised programme document that takes account of the conditions and recommendations outlined below; and the submission of a summary document describing the responses and actions of the School to address the conditions and recommendations made by the review panel.**

Areas for attention have been emboldened in the text for convenience of reference. Action is required on items marked 'Conditions' and such action is mandatory if the programme is to be approved; action is highly recommended on items marked 'Recommendations'.

### *2.2 Conditions*

- **The module descriptors should be entered on the SETU Waterford module catalogue and the prefix of 'Module 1', 'Module 2' and 'Module 3' removed from the elective module titles on the catalogue and on the proposed programme schedule. The reference to placement as an option should be removed from the Special Regulations on the programme schedule as there is no bespoke placement module proposed.**

- The entry requirements are described across pages 13 and 15 of the proposal document. **The discussion on the entry requirements in the document should be reviewed to consolidate same into a singular location.** The standard SETU English Language Entry requirements are referenced on page 15 of the document. **Given the target cohort for this programme, which could include both verbal and non-verbal communicants, the School should consider if standard English Language Tests, such as IELTS, would be appropriate for all applicants or if English language communication skills could be assessed as part of the skills test/interview.** At the review meeting, the team provided a detailed description of the proposed entry assessment process including the accessible application form, the purpose of the interview and skills assessment, the support given to applicants in preparation for the interview and the feedback provided afterwards *et cetera*. **The School should revise the programme document to include more detail on the entry assessment particularly the rationale for the interview/skills test, and the support provided to applicants prior, during and post interview. Given the specialist nature of the programme, the composition of the proposed interview panel should be articulated i.e. the type of background, expertise or role of the proposed interviewers. Ideally, where there are more qualified candidates than places available, an indication should be given as to the basis on which places will be offered.**
- There were several of the proposed teaching team present at the review meeting and additional staff, particularly colleagues in other disciplines, were referenced by the team as potentially contributing to the delivery of the programme. The proposal document, however, did not sufficiently detail the teaching resources, both personnel and physical, which are available to deliver the programme and only the curriculum *vitae* for two staff were included. **The School should review the proposal document to include a comprehensive account of the teaching resources available to deliver the programme and include curriculum *vitae* for all staff who are associated with the programme. This should also include reference to the different Departments and their physical space and equipment resources which would be available for the delivery of the programme on the Waterford campus.**
- In discussion with the panel, the team described an imaginative and varied approach to teaching and learning, including the use of Lámh and other specialised communication tools. **The proposal document should be reviewed to capture the wide variety of**

**teaching methodologies to be employed in the delivery of the programme. In addition, greater clarity should be provided on the nature of, and rubrics for, the assessment types described as ‘participation’ and ‘in class assessment’, and a paragraph included to articulate what is envisioned by the learning mode ‘Guided Independent Learning’.**

### *2.3 Recommendations*

- The option of offering a placement opportunity to learners was mooted by the School team but the module location of same was not identified; the panel considered, however, if a placement option were to be available it would be a very worthwhile experience for learners. **The School should consider if undertaking a placement would benefit learners and where the option could be incorporated into the delivery and assessment of the proposed programme. If placement is proposed, then it must be clearly identified in the learning modes, assessment *et cetera* in the relevant module descriptor(s). If placement is envisaged as an activity that will be available in association with, but not part of the academic programme, then reference to that should be made in the body of the document. Consideration should also be given to the term ‘placement’ and to whether or not that is the correct term to describe what is envisaged.**
- In discussion with the panel, the School team identified that funding had been obtained for the initial delivery of the programme but that additional funding would have to be sought for future iterations of the programme. **The School should seek to have a 10-credit Special Purpose Award, based on Semesters 1 and 2 of the Certificate in Enhancing Life Skills, approved to allow students who opt to only complete one year of learning, or who can only be funded for one year, to achieve an award.**
- **The School should revisit the title of the proposed programme to ensure that the title is both relevant and contemporary.**
- The Programme Learning Outcomes were mapped to the Awards Standards in the proposal document. The panel, however, believe that the mapping may have been conservative and that a graduate of the programme would achieve a wider range of learning types. **The mapping of the Programme Learning Outcomes to the Awards Standards should be reviewed for comprehensiveness.**

- **The School should consider including drama as part of the ‘Communication through Art, Literacy, Music’ module.**
- **Given the practical emphasis in the delivery of the programme, the School should consider if ‘Lectures’ is an accurate description of the nature of the delivery proposed or if ‘Tutorials’ or ‘Practicals’ would be a more reflective terminology.** There is some ambiguity in the description of the programme delivery on page 15 of the document as it is not clear that the initial description of the typical contact for a 5-credit module does not refer to the proposed programme. **The first sentence in the ‘Programme Delivery’ section, page 15, should be deleted to remove any ambiguity.**

**Signed:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ciaran Lynch (Chair)

**Date:**

\_\_\_\_\_