



SOUTH EAST TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

COURSE EVALUATION 3

ASSESSORS' REPORT TO ACADEMIC COUNCIL

COURSE EVALUATED: Master of Business Administration

SCHOOL: Business

DEPARTMENT: Graduate Business

INTRODUCTION

The following is a review report to Academic Council from the panel of assessors on the proposal from the School of Business at South East Technological University to change certain aspects of the Master of Business Administration through the University's Course Evaluation Stage 3 (CE3) process. 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:

- Dr Hazel Farrell, Academic Council Representative, South East Technological University (Chair)
- Michael Healy, OpEx Performance and Strategy Manager, Abbvie, Cork
- Dr Colin Hughes, Head of Graduate Business School, Technological University Dublin
- Dr Margaret Heffernan, Associate Professor of HRM, DCU Business School, Dublin City University
- Dr Colette Moloney, Assistant Registrar, South East Technological University

In accordance with the regulations set out in the aforementioned *Programme Quality Assurance Enhancement Policy and Procedures*, a review meeting took place on 10 June 2024. The review meeting was conducted virtually via Teams. The following members of the South East Technological University team were present:

- Dr Tom O'Toole, Head of School of Business, South East Technological University
- Prof. Denis Harrington, Head of Department of Graduate Business, South East Technological University
- Dr Sean Byrne, Lecturer, Department of Accounting and Economics, South East Technological University
- Dr Edward Dennehy, Lecturer, Department of Business, South East Technological University
- Dr Tom Egan, Lecturer, Department of Accounting and Economics, South East Technological University

- Dr Ray Griffin, Lecturer, Department of Management and Organisation, South East Technological University
- Aishling Hurley, Lecturer, Department of Lifelong Learning, South East Technological University
- Prof. Felicity Kelliher, Lecturer, Department of Management and Organisation, South East Technological University
- Darrin Taylor, Lecturer, Department of Management and Organisation, South East Technological University

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

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONDITIONS

2.1 General Remarks

The panel commends the School on proposing an impressive and innovative, university-wide programme to meet the needs of Business professionals. The panel **recommends approval of the changes proposed for the Master of Business Administration** until the next School Review in the School of Business. **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 inputted onto the SETU module catalogue and reviewed to ensure that the effort hours and grade classifications (First Honours *et cetera*) are in line with current SETU academic regulations.** There were a number of typographical errors noted and some reading lists appeared dated or were omitted. **The module descriptors should be reviewed to eliminate typographical errors and to verify**

that the reading lists have been completed and include current, relevant sources, and the most recent editions for same.

- While there are some excellent exemplars of module learning outcomes, **module learning outcomes, as a whole, should be reviewed to ensure that all are expressed in language appropriate to the level and use measurable verbs.** There was a lack of consistency across modules between the number of learning outcomes, volume of indicative content, and the credits attached. **The balance between content, expected learning outcomes and associated credit should be reviewed across modules to ensure consistency between workload and credits. The module learning outcomes should be mapped to the revised programme learning outcomes, and the latter to the relevant Awards Standards to ensure that a learner who successfully completes all modules will achieve the appropriate awards standard for the level.**
- In discussion with the panel, the team outlined the progression of topics and the relationship between modules on the programme and described an innovative approach to assignments and assessment. This detail would enhance the proposal document, if included, and provide a greater understanding of the nature of the programme content and assessment for learners, employers and professional bodies. **The School should provide a map or matrix in the proposal document which would outline the coverage of topics across the programme (e.g. change management, culture, innovation, digital marketing, business models *et cetera*). This discussion and matrix should indicate how modules on similar topics are building blocks to develop a learner's knowledge on the topic, rather than overlapping or repeating.** This map would ensure consistency of delivery from year to year, particularly as the teaching team changes. **Greater detail on the proposed assessment should be included on the module descriptors to fully capture the varied and innovative assessments proposed.**
- **The module 'Lean Organisational & Enterprise Excellence' should be proposed at 'Postgraduate', rather than 'Advanced' Level, given that this is a Masters programme. Given the current accessibility of artificial intelligence, the School should review how the assessment for this module, currently consisting solely of an individual academic essay, could be redesigned to prevent learners using artificial intelligence applications to complete the assignment.**

- Given that the delivery of this programme is hybrid in nature and will be taught across campuses, a consistent and uniform approach to programme documentation and learner communication is essential. **For consistency and clarity for learners, a single Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) should be employed and there should be a consistent look, feel, and layout across all module pages on the VLE.**

2.3 Recommendations

- **The School should keep the proposed fortnightly alteration of programme delivery between campuses under review and seek to amend the model, if necessary, based on learner feedback. Given the regular hybrid, in-person, and venue alternation, the School should consider providing learners with regular reminders on the type and location of delivery in a given week, particularly given that the cohort of learners on this programme will have busy employment and family commitments, and will also have to travel to attend the programme. Alternatively, the School might consider the possibility of alternating campus locations per semester rather than fortnightly.**
- There appears to be an imbalance in the workload between semesters, particularly the heavy weighting of credits in the final semester. **The School should keep the learner workload across semesters under review, including seeking learner input on same, and strive to better balance the workload/credits between semesters, if required.**
- The School indicated its intention to seek AMBA accreditation for the programme. **To better prepare the programme for AMBA review, the School should consider reducing the number of programme learning outcomes proposed.**
- **The School should review the volume of assessment proposed, particularly where a module learning outcome is assessed multiple times. The School should also differentiate between formative and summative assessment in this instance.**
- The International Management/‘Global Immersion Programme’ module should be reviewed for clarity. **Particularly, the overall learning approach should be detailed in the module to make it clear that learner preparation is required across the semester, rather than delivery being solely confined to one week. The payment requirement for the trip should be clarified in the module descriptor as there is currently some ambiguity, and the contingency plan to allow learners who for personal or work**

reasons cannot participate in the ‘Global Immersion Programme’ trip to successfully complete the programme, should be detailed.

Signed: *Hazel Farrell*
Dr Hazel Farrell (Chair)

Date: 1/07/2024