Validation Report

**Bachelor of Arts
in Creative Music Production**

Programme Code: TBC
Banner Code: TBC

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to report on the findings of the peer review panel established to validate this proposed programme against the criteria for the validation of programmes as outlined in Section 3 of the IADT Quality Manual; *Procedures for Design and approval of New Programmes, Subjects and Modules*.

 http://www.iadt.ie/en/InformationAbout/IADTQualityManual/

Programme overview

The proposed BA in Creative Music Production is a 3 year full time programme leading to an award at NFQ level 7. It is anticipated the programme will take in the first cohort of students in September 2014.

Background

In 2012, staff in IADT and Sound Training Centre (STC) initiated discussions to explore the possibility of devising a collaborative programme in the area of creative music production, which would incorporate a
balance between academic content and 'real-world' experience.

In October 2013 the programme team submitted an outline proposal to IADT's Programme Validation Committee for the development of a new, three year programme. This proposal was approved by PVC. Parallel to this process, the MOU was also being prepared. Due diligence was conducted in respect of STC and the consortium was approved by IADT's Governing Body In November 2013 the programme document and draft MOU was approved by PVC. The programme will be signed off by Academic Council in June 2014.

Following an emerging model of partnership between industry and academia, the BA in Creative Music Production is the first collaborative programme delivered by IADT in conjunction with an external partner.

Structure of Programme

The proposed programme is a 180 credit, level 7programme taught over three years (60 credits per year).

Year 1 comprises 6 mandatory modules

1.	Sound Engineering 1	10 credits
2.	Audio Production 1	10 credits
3.	Music Theory 1	10 credits
4.	Broadcast	10 credits

| 5. Acoustics & Psychoacoustics | 10 credits |
| 6. Introduction to Music Technology | 10 credits |

Year 2 comprises 6 mandatory modules

1. Sound Engineering 2	10 credits
2. Advanced Audio 2	10 credits
3. Music Theory 2	10 credits
4. Electronics	10 credits
5. Critical Listening 1	10 credits
6. Creative Audio Programming	10 credits

Year 3 comprises 4 mandatory modules

1. Major Project	20 credits
2. Professional Practice	20 credits
3. Critical Listening 2	10 credits
4. Interactive Performance Systems	10 credits

Programme detail

Programme title   Bachelor of Arts in Creative Music Production

Award title   Bachelor of Arts

NFQ[I] level   7

ECTS[II] credits   180

Programme code   TBC

Banner code   TBC

Validation Date   20th May 2014

[I] National Framework of Qualifications
[II] European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

Panel members

Chairperson	Mr Michael Hannon
	Registrar
	Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology

Panel member 1	Ms Ruth Kennington
	Senior Lecturer
	Athlone Institute of Technology

Panel member 2	Dr Victor Lazzarini
	Senior Lecturer
	National University of Ireland, Maynooth

Panel member 3	Dr David Cairns
	QA Expert on Collaborative Provision
	UK

Panel member 4	Mr Donal Lunny
	Musician and Producer
	Ireland

Panel member 5	Ms Aisling Byrne
	Student on collaborative programme
	CIT/UCC
	Ireland

Programme Team
Dr Annie Doona, President, IADT
Dr Marian O'Sullivan, Registrar, IADT
Professor Peter Robertson, Head of Creative Engagement, IADT
Dr Andrew Power, Head of Faculty of Film, Art and Creative Technologies, IADT
Mr Liam Doona, Head of Department of Art and Design, IADT
Mr Geoffrey Perrin, Department of Film and Media, IADT
Mr Conor Brennan, Department of Film and Media, IADT
Dr Brian Carty, Principal Lecturer, Sound Training Centre
Mr David Christophers, Lecturer, Diploma Co-ordinator, STC
Mr Paddy Dunning, Director, STC
Mr Brendan Kearns, Financial Controller, STC
Mr Fergal Davis, Lecturer, STC
Dr Kevin Robinson, Lecturer, STC
Mr Ciaran Fortune, Lecturer, STC

Session I
Private meeting of panel to discuss observations, concerns and queries around the document content or programme structure

Session II
President/CEO and Senior Management of IADT/STC
- Rationale for partnership
- Rationale and demand for programme
- Commitment to programme
- Fit with Institute strategy/STC strategy
- Appropriate resources and facilities

Session III
Relationship Management Team + STC & IADT Senior Management
Consideration of the MOA according to the IADT policy criteria:
- General and academic considerations
- Quality assurance (internal and external)
- Legal & financial considerations

Session IV
Full Collaborative Programme Team from IADT and STC; including relevant heads of department
Consideration of programme according to IADT policy criteria:
- Structure, aims, objectives and learning outcomes of the programme
- Learner profile
- Entry requirements
- Career opportunities
- Programme curriculum and module content
- Module learning outcomes
- Assessment strategy and methodologies
- Programme delivery
- Staffing resources, expertise and pedagogical practice

Session V
Final meeting with panel and IADT/STC teams.
Feedback to President, Registrar, Faculty/Department Head and programme team (panel decision)

Panel general findings

In evaluating the appropriateness, quality and proposed operation of the programme the following criteria were considered:

Quality Assurance

IADT's Policy and Procedure for Quality Assurance of Collaborative Programmes was approved by Academic Council in September 2012, and the panel were satisfied the submission had been developed and approved in compliance with the policy. The business model for the programme was approved by the IADT Executive in January 2014.The panel noted the due diligence report should be updated; this was originally drafted in 2012. The panel reviewed both the Memorandum of Agreement between IADT and STC, and the programme document.

Strategic planning

The Institute vision and strategy is reflected in the aims of the BA in Creative Music Production, with the programme focusing on the following objectives:

- Inter-discipline collaboration
- Links with creative and cultural sectors
- Routes for student progression , into postgraduate programmes and on to professional practice
- The Creative Entrepreneurship agenda
- Industry / employability focus
- Collaboration between research and pedagogy
- Internationalisation
- Developing postgraduate programmes

Evidence of consultation

Letters of support from industry including Avid and Ableton, two of the main global audio software companies, two of Ireland's premier industry professionals as well as Universal Music, the leading record label were provided The unanimous strength of support for the programme illustrates its requirement.

Learner employment potential

Support from two of the most prominent music industry professionals working in Ireland today suggest the envisaged graduate profile is perfectly suited to the developing industry from a freelance viewpoint.

Support from record labels, being the traditional manager and indirect employer of audio engineers and producers, is provided from Universal Ireland.

The changing dynamic from an employer viewpoint is highlighted here; a fact that is very much considered in the content of the programme.

STC performed a study of alumni destinations from 2010 to 2012. The results were very positive given the national economic climate at the time. Alumni success rate is high and significantly career paths in music-related areas are common. It is anticipated that a degree level programme will increase this success (for example 67% of STC live sound engineers found music-related full-time employment in 2010/11, with a further 22% finding music-related part-time work). Freelance work is common; however several students successfully found full-time roles in broadcast (radio, TV), education and corporate (AV technical roles) sectors.

Protection of learners

The panel noted the protection of learners should be formalised in the programme document; there is a need for a contingency plan to allow the programme to continue should the relationship between STC and IADT be terminated.

Programme titles and award titles

The Panel were satisfied that the title of the programme is clear, accurate and fit for the purpose of informing prospective learners and other stakeholders.

Ethics

IADT has internal policies and procedures in place to ensure that all teaching, learning or research activity across the spectrum of NFQ levels is conducted and delivered in a manner that is both morally and professionally ethical, as outlined in the IADT Ethics Policy and the IADT Learning, Teaching & Assessment Strategy. Staff at STC will also adhere to this policy.

Standards of Knowledge, Skill and Competence

After discussion with the programme team, the Panel were satisfied that the programme and module learning outcomes reflect the criteria set out by the National Qualifications Authority of Ireland (NQAI) framework document and were of the opinion that learners would be capable of attaining the standards of knowledge, skill and competence relevant to this award.

Teaching and learning

The approach reflects IADT's Learning, Teaching and Assessment strategy which has three key aims: developing knowledge, skills and competencies, supporting student learning and preparing students for life after IADT.

Entry requirements

The Leaving Certificate Examination (or equivalent educational qualifications) with a minimum of Grade D (Ordinary Level) in five subjects, to include Mathematics and English. Mature students are welcomed, and the Institute's RPL Procedures (Recognition of Prior Learning) are used to assess applicants with experiential knowledge, as opposed to formal academic qualifications.

The collaborative programme shall be provided through the English language. If the prospective student's first language is not English, he/she must demonstrate to the satisfaction of IADT and STC that their command of written and spoken language is adequate for the programme which they intend to follow.

Learner assessment

The multiple modes of assessment are guided by the IADT Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy and are outlined in the submission document. These include project work, lectures, tutorials, seminars and demonstrations. Indicative assessments are also provided.

Access, transfer and progression

The programme provides opportunities for students to develop parity with professional standards, which will be ensured by in-depth and on-going engagement with industry practitioners.   On completion of the programme, students will have the necessary knowledge and skills to research, develop, and present creative production 'solutions' in both academic and industry environments.

Private meeting of Panel

1. The panel held a meeting in private to identify issues they wished to raise with the proposers.

Panel meeting with senior management of IADT/STC

The IADT President, Dr Annie Doona outlined the Institute's strategy in the context of recent changes in higher education; the 2011 Hunt Report, structural changes at the Institute in 2011 and the HEA Review of the Provision of Creative Arts Programmes in Dublin, 2013. IADT's position in this new landscape is augmented by the interdisciplinary portfolio of programmes, integrating the key disciplines of the arts, design, film, digital media, entrepreneurship, technology and applied psychology. These cross disciplinary activities in the creative and cultural sector represent the unique vision and mission of IADT. Dr Doona informed the panel there was a big demand for this programme, with two thirds of the applicants applying choosing it as first preference on the CAO system.

Dr Brian Carty, principal of STC outlined the advantages of the programme, with students working in a commercial and professional environment, being supported by a balance of academic and practitioner staff. The level 7 Award will allow for more flexible graduates, who will be capable of responding to a changing environment where technology is constantly being updated. STC see the future in collaborations and the formalised relationship between IADT and STC will augment academic and professional quality assurance around the programme. STC alumni are leading the way in industry, with many success stories. STC have previous experience of running courses with partners, such as FAS/Solas where 90% of students gained employment. This relation is moving from a level 3 to a level 6 and this is the first venture into higher education for the company. STC have also developed an online college supported by Enterprise Ireland.

Location of Students

In response to a query about the logistics of having students across two locations, Dr Andrew Power, Head of the Faculty of Film, Art & Creative Technologies, informed the panel that IADT has previous experience of this; students on the MA in Visual Arts Practices programme are located in Dublin city centre, and students on the undergraduate BA in Visual Arts Practice programme are located in Dun Laoghaire. IADT will run a First Year Matters induction programme, which has been very successful in past years. Students based at STC will enjoy all the entitlements students on other programmes do, they can also be elected class representatives.

Staffing for the programme

The panel were informed that STC employ two full time members of staff and three people on contract with specific expertise in the field. Mr David Christophers was recently made a full time staff member at STC and is up-skilling by completing an academic Masters programme.

Dr Carty is currently an external examiner in Trinity College Dublin and a graduate of University of Ireland, Maynooth.

IADT employ two full time members of staff. The programme co-ordinator is based at IADT and administrative supports are in place in both locations. In the event of any long term staff issues, the panel were informed that IADT have experience of back filling posts for other programmes, and other staff at IADT have many of the competencies required to teach the programme; it would be possible to recruit someone to bridge a gap. It is the intention to have IADT staff spending time in STC getting to know the specialist equipment there; in that sense additional IADT staff would 'shadow' STC key staff.

The panel indicated they would like to see a staffing plan. The panel also felt there is a risk of students getting lost on a collaborative programme such as this. From a logistics point of view it is important to have structured activities for 1st year, otherwise students are shuttling back and forward.

The team responded that the timetable will be structured, with 2 days at IADT and 3 days at STC. IADT already have students who travel from outside Dublin to attend programmes and it has not been an issue in the past.

The panel noted IADT is a public not for profit organisation and STC is a commercial enterprise. This difference could affect decisions around staffing; for example if more staff were needed, but the other party did not want to invest more money into the enterprise?

IADT's President referred the panel to the business plan for the programme. An issue was highlighted in the due diligence report regarding access to one building and the Director of STC provided a solution by taking out a long term lease on a building adjacent to STC which provides wheelchair access. This involved a financial investment on the part of STC, who also demonstrated their commitment to the programme by making a key member of the programme team a full time employee. The team also stressed the need to keep facilities in state of the art condition, as they are being used for other courses and by industry professionals.

Relationship Management Team + STC & IADT Senior Management

Dr Tara Ryan, Educational Partnerships & Student Services Manager at IADT, outlined the Memorandum of Agreement for the panel. This MOA referenced the criteria outlined in the IADT policy and procedures for quality assurance of collaborative programmes. This is the first collaborative offering by IADT in conjunction with a partner. The MOA outlines the collaborative relationship in relation to governance, transparency and delegation of responsibilities. The programme was two years in the planning stage; a due diligence report was done and an internal review carried out by IADT. There were meetings between STC and IADT for each step of the process. Since the due diligence report was completed in 2012, a risk assessment scoring process has been carried out on the programme. Delegated responsibilities have been tightened up in the MOA. The MOA was approved by the IADT Governing Body. It was noted IADT does not need QQI approval for this programme, as the Institute has delegated authority for collaborative provision.

Finances

The panel asked the team to outline the financial plan for the progamme.

Mr Brendan Kearns, Financial Controller for STC, detailed the division between the partners. STC provide 70% of the teaching staff. The recording studios and training facilities are split. TOD trades as a limited company, allowing STC to focus completely on education. The company has been trading for 25 years and is profitable.

From the IADT perspective Dr Doona informed the panel that the programme validation committee and the executive approved the business/financial plan for programmes. The IADT financial controller has signed off the business plan for this programme and it is in place.

The panel queried what finances would be reinvested and accruing to partners after a period of 3 years for example, with student numbers at full stretch and a full cohort for all 3 years in place?

Dr Doona responded that the initial try-out figure was a cohort of 30, but the ideal is 40.

Mr Kearns replied that for STC 18-20 students is the break-even level.

Dr Carty cited the numerous alumni success stories at STC, and indicated that this programme would provide more opportunities for students.

Programme level
The panel advised caution when projection opportunities for students; a student with a level 6 award won't take a job requiring a level 7 award.

In response the team indicated that IADT students don't simply work in Ireland, but access opportunities abroad; music students will access the global market also.

Programme governance
The panel noted this was an IADT programme but not one in which the Institute had all the services of a service provided on site. How would management and governance work?

The team replied that the situation was similar to where a service was bought for a programme but with a more committed partner. The relationship between STC and IADT developed over 2 years, and it was clear STC was committed to becoming a long term provided of education as opposed to being simply a trainer. STC staff have engaged with IADT regarding quality assurance, staff training etc. The core programme team have worked very closely together for the past year. The collaborative process had been worked through very carefully and is a true partnership. This is not a franchise arrangement

The panel commented this was reassuring to hear, as it was not so evident in the programme document.

The panel asked how the team could ensure the governance of this programme would ensure the programme would not fail. What is the line of responsibility?

The team replied that the programme board model applies as in all other IADT programmes. The programme board feeds into the partnership meetings. There will be a regular and transparent agenda. The programme board also reports to Academic Council, and the collaboration agreement will be reviewed in a year. A risk register has also been compiled. Initial problems will come to light at a programme board, where the Head of Department has responsibility for dealing with day to day issues. Any issues that cannot be resolved are passed to the Head of Creative Engagement and the IADT Executive. There is a partnership oversight committee in place, which operates like a collaborative programme board, with and additional remit on its agenda; it has the authority to look at issues from both sides. Reports from the relationship management team can be referred to Academic Council, and also to the Head of Creative Engagement who has responsibility for the partnership.

Staff training
The panel queried whether staff at STC would be able to make the transition to a higher education level of delivery by September 2014?

The team replied that this issue was faced at the beginning of each academic year with staff coming from jurisdictions and other practices. STC staff have already encountered issues and have assimilated with the IADT team in response to these. Quality assurance issues are being standardised to align with IADT, and the on the ground experience to date has been helpful.
A detailed plan is in place for STC staff to run over the summer, and will include;
- A seminar on the student life cycle
- First Year Matters seminar
- Staff have visited IADT to review the programme development process
- Staff have attended an IADT exam board
- Staff have participated in an Art question and answer session
- Staff will participate in a two day induction training session
- STC staff will be invited to staff development sessions and the Teaching & Learning & Research Showcase
- Staff will register for the level 9 Certificate in Teaching & Learning; this will be helpful as staff will study with colleagues from different disciplines and can learn from each other's experience.
- A seminar on retention for first year students will run

Memorandum of Agreement
The panel queried why it was necessary to have the MOA approved by the panel, separately from the programme document?

Dr Tara Ryan responded that this was not a standard programme, and was the first collaborative offering from IADT. The programme had two different types of collaborative partners involved, and the team were keen to invite insight into this particular relationship, a process they believed was good practice.

An observation was made by the panel that responsibility across the partnership was not clear. What are the levels? Who will lead reviews?

The Head of Faculty informed the panel that the programme was co-developed. Dr Carty met Dr Power to discuss ideas around higher education. Then the programme was designed, and no doubt had evolved differently in the intervening years in order to come to an agreement between STC and IADT, and to cater for what the market would bear and to meet the demand.

Dr Power outlined the two aspects of the level of responsibility for the programme;
   a) Issues around student experience/programme/grades etc. lie with the Head of Faculty and the team comprising Head of Department, programme coordinator and the counterparts in STC
   b) Financial and legal aspects will go to the partnership group, then to the Head of Creative Engagement and the IADT Executive

Reviews of programmes can work in different ways. A lecturer may have an idea and this will be scrutinised in terms of requirements around technology, resources, opportunities, industry demand etc. This process may lead to a programme being validated by IADT. The Registrar of IADT has ultimate responsibility for academic matters and programme development can be bottom up or top down, and will be investigated by the Institute programme validation committee. This is a rigorous process with final sign off by Academic Council.

The panel asked if students could make such recommendations.

The Registrar replied yes, all Institute committees have elected student representatives. There is also a Student Union Education Officer who works with the Registrar's Office on such issues.

The panel noted the degree of disclosure of information in the MOA and were of the opinion that this needed to be treated as sensitive detail. There seemed to be a greater potential for STC to be impacted by the new partnership, as the company was on a new path. Did the team anticipate any discussions to help STC realise some changes may not be comfortable – for example, a different staff complement – the STC Director was now a hybrid of entrepreneur and principal?

The IADT President replied this had been discussed at top level management, and STC were aware of the leap required over the next three years.

Dr Power added that Dr Carty and the STC team realise the changes and adjustment required. This has been manifest in the up-skilling and re-training of staff. There is an aspiration that the programme will grow, perhaps with an add-on provision in three years at level 8. This too would require further change in the development of STC strategy.

The Director of STC had indicated that making a profit is not the only motivation, there is also a commitment to education; STC work with the best in the industry and believe that a programme with an advanced level will produce the very graduates that STC seek to work with.

The panel commended the view, and indicated it would have been helpful to see this mentioned in the programme document. The obvious commitment of the team in the question and answer session augmented the view of the Director of STC.

Dr Carty informed the panel that when presenting the idea to the Director of STC they had considered different partners, but a crucial factor was the quality assurance aspect of any partnership, and the company also wanted longevity going forward; IADT was the choice.

The Chair of the panel commended the team on the learner protection aspect of the document; this was of crucial importance. It was the view of the panel that this should be elaborated in the document, confirming IADT are ultimately responsible for refunding students or providing a pathway for students to complete their studies, in the event of STC stepping away from the partnership.

Student Experience
The panel asked whether there was a potential for students to get lost in the system with the programme being at two locations? How is student progression tracked?

The team explained that programme boards are concerned with student retention. The board will look at reports from tutors on different modules. The boards are an opportunity for detailed feedback. Weekly meetings also highlight issues on a less formal basis. There is also a 1st and 2nd year tutor system. The programme coordinator plans to have start up meetings at IADT and STC, arrange field trips – the lunchtime series at the National Concert Hall, for example – and encourage students to attend Film School lectures at IADT. Formative assessments will create a support structure from the ground up. From a systems point of view, STC will be issued with an IADT e-mail address, and will have access to the virtual learning environment via Blackboard, Library etc.

Management structure

The panel asked who would act as 'enforcer' when dealing with the partnership. This partnership is different to the standard line of management.

Dr Carty confirmed it is an IADT programme, but feedback and suggestions will be acknowledged by both IADT and STC staff, who will work together. There will be regular meetings between Dr Carty, Mr Doona and Mr Perrin. Any issues on either side will be brought up at weekly meetings and will be dealt with; there is a clear understanding that responses are required.

Double marking is also planned; another indicator that STC take equal responsibility for delivering the programme.

Any issues around the more formal and legal aspects of the partnership will be dealt with by the Head of Creative Engagement. A large amount of time and effort was put into writing the document, and the teams are clear on delegation of responsibility.

Dr Ryan noted that there is a section in the MOA on dispute resolution. An important aspect to note is that the learner cohort are IADT students, who have a commitment by the Institute to make provisions for learner protection in the event of the partnership being terminated; students will be able to complete their studies on the programme.

In reviewing this session with the programme team the panel made the following observations:

- It would have been preferable to have the MOA aspect in a separate document. It is not good practice to look at the business arrangement of a programme alongside the programme document. The ideal is to hold two separate stages for each process. The panel acknowledged that this collaborative partnership is a learning process for IADT but the question of separate stages to review the MOA and programme document should be noted for future panels.

- The view of the partnership should be that the programme must not fail, and therefore a clear plan for learner protection needs to be outlined; this is more crucial than a simple refunding of fees. IADT must consider what they need to run out the programme alone and protect students' needs. This issue is mentioned but not fully addressed in the document. In practice there has to be some degree of discretion to be able to manage out the programme. What do IADT need in terms of STC facilities to be able to run out the programme, even if the possibility is remote of a break in the partnership? A contingency plan is necessary.

- A revision of the diligence report was recommended. Noting a risk assessment scoring mechanism has been carried out post the due diligence report, the panel would have expected to see these scores and also the indicative timetables as part of the pre panel package of information.

- The panel questioned the capacity of the IT infrastructure and were satisfied with the response.

Full Collaborative Programme Team from IADT and STC; including relevant Heads of Department

Programme level

The panel queried the reason for proposing a level 7 programme.

The team are of the opinion that it is a better investment in terms of standards at this stage, which is a probationary interim situation. This will be reviewed in a couple of years, with the possibility of a level 8 one year add-on degree offered. In general the IADT benchmark is level 8, but the initial level 7 is a chance to test the programme. The team are confident 3 years is enough to prepare students for industry, where they will be qualified to engage in a wide number of fields. The programme will be offered through the Central Applications Office (CAO)

Fit for purpose

The panel asked if the programme was fit for purpose.

The team replied yes; the cohort was of 30/40 students was appropriate, they had devised an indicative timetable and had taken out a long term lease on a new building. A 3 year timeframe is accessible. Students also have time to themselves, with 7 hours per week available for each year, when they can have access to software and computers.

Mature students may be offered a place in round zero, or through the normal route of the CAO process. The entry requirements are nationally agreed across the sector for level 7. There is a great interest in the programme and the team are confident they will achieve the maximum cohort. For the first year the team will fill the programme via the CAO, but may consider other entry routes in the future. The team will also consider the possibility of a portfolio requirement for future applicants. IADT will also accept applicants from international students who meet IADT's English language requirements.

Students do not require a background in music; composition is not a pre-requisite. Music theory will commence from a low level.

Modules

The panel asked if the team had looked at comparative programmes when devising module structures and learning outcomes.

Dr Carty replied they had looked at Tonmeister in Surrey (Music and Sound Recording BMus), Music Technology strands in TCD and NUIM, DKIT BA in Production of Music and Audio and Berkley's programmes were referenced as educational programmes during the initial programme development stages.

A lot of thought went into devising the modules; the team aspire to producing graduates who will work with the best in the industry. The module strands over the three years are a considered progression.

The panel wondered if the Final Project, which is very self-directed, is slightly aspirational for a level 7 programme.

The team replied that the modules complement each other, and the Final Project is a capstone module; this encapsulates the combined learning over the programme.

The panel noted the Music Theory 1 and 2 modules, and asked if there was any practical application to learn music.

The programme coordinator stressed the importance of mental comprehension, which is very important for proficiency as a sound engineer. Music Theory and Critical Listening modules augment a student's ability in this regard.

The panel noted there was a lot of content in Music Theory and wondered if there would be enough time to cover it all. The team should consider developing their own vocabulary for notation and not go the route of traditional music training, other students will be bored. It was suggested orchestration and contemporary techniques could be left until 2nd year. It was also suggested the team consider notation from a technical point of view; the rudiments could be taught this way. A wide range of music could be used.

Critical Listening could be moved to 1st year and Broadcast to 2nd year to make building blocks. The best training for listening is to train student ears to recognise chords and harmonies.

The panel acknowledged the Sound Engineering modules took care of industry needs, but wondered why the team did not start students with a creative synergy approach to engineering? A creative aspect of projects is important to maintain student engagement. Students can zone out if they are confronted with a barrage of technical jargon.

The team were of the opinion that students need to start with the nuts and bolts of engineering; using microphones, keyboards etc. The skills students develop will link into the Critical Listening module. Listening is a crucial aspect of sound engineering. Students can then move onto the more creative aspect of the work, and their assignments can of course have a creative element. Students work with musicians, not just equipment, and various acoustic instruments are introduced. An early lecture is how to listen as an engineer and this is linked to Acoustics and Critical Listening in 2nd year.

The team explained that creative sound engineering and pre-production techniques are interlined. Pre-production is essential for creative sound engineering and is an integral part of being a sound engineer or a producer. Pre-production involves time out of the studio – becoming acquainted with pedals, guitars, amplifiers etc. – these are all producer and sound engineer issues. In 2nd year students will work with a young act on pre-production, this is like a rehearsal before going into a professional studio. An element of trust develops between and engineer and an artist. This is an on-going process, and is part of the ethos of the course. Critical listening is almost a contract with the student to listen and learn to appreciate an artist's work.

The panel noted the level of soft skills described by the team as being an important aspect of student learning, and felt this should be referred to in the programme document.

For the Audio Production 2 module, the panel suggested the team re-consider the use of the word 'professional' in the module aims; these are the basic aims for 2nd year. This programme needs to be extremely critical and precise in the use of language.

The panel queried why Broadcast stopped in 1st year and why Electronics was taught in 2nd year but not 1st year.

The team replied there is a signal aspect in 1st year. There is a focus on how things work; audio connectors, soldering etc. These are practical skills with some theory. There is a dedicated lab available for this.

The team informed the panel that Critical Listening in 2nd year opens up possibilities for collaboration with Film students. The radio set up is analogue and the Television is the digital element. The new National Film School is completely digital. Students will be encouraged to visit the Film School. In the Audio Production module students will run a radio station for two weeks.

The panel noted the graduate profile information in the programme document referred to six graduates working in film, yet there is no module for film in the programme?

The programme coordinator explained that student acquire a combination of core skills. There is of course the possibility of considering a dedicated course on film sound and music. The team were keen for the programme to be expansive to increase employment opportunities.

The panel were of the opinion that it would be useful to illustrate in the document how students would depart the programme with a range of opportunities available to them.

The panel noted there are two 'fat' modules in 3rd year (Major Project and Professional Practice), and queried the consequences for assessment strategies. If a student fails a 20 credit module, there is double the risk with two large modules? It was also difficult to see the level 7 outcomes linked to the NFQ in qualitative terms.

The programme coordinator explained the two modules are linked. The modules went through an extensive process with several iterations of the models. The team acknowledged the linking may not be evident (page 37 of document).

The Major Project is the last stream of audio technology. A student deciding on a final project may work with a band and would incorporate Sound Engineering and Audio Production into the project. The Button Factory could be used as a venue for a performance based Major Project. Another venue for a project could be a music school. The creative aspect is not only about music but also about style.

In discussing the Industry Practice module, the panel noted that real world practical experience is the single most important factor.

The team informed the panel that while there is no work placement module on the programme, this will be provided if possible and an opportunity arises. Students are exposed to professionals talking about their own experience. The Major Project and Industry Practice are in parallel.

In relation to this last point the panel suggested the mapping structure around Major Project and Industry Practice could be more explicit.

There was a suggestion from the panel that the 20 credits for the Industry Practice could be used for something else; elective modules, for example. The team might like to think about this.

The team are keen to have a series of events that would inform a student's choice of Major Project; visits to galleries, recording companies etc. This should add gravitas and complement the Major Project.

The panel suggested the team might re-visit the basic concept of progression through the programme to develop a model to fit learning outcomes; for example 1st year at level 7 could be seen as unfair to students.
As the two 20 credits modules are in parallel it requires students to engage with the Major Project fairly fast. There could be a clearer link between the Major Project and Industry Practice.

The team replied there is front loaded preparation for this. Industry Practice is a traditional module of how industry works, with tutorials and guest lecturers. The Major Project has to be something substantial.

The panel questioned if entrepreneurial skills were part of the Industry Practice.

The team affirmed such skills fitted in with the expansive nature of the programme. There is a digital media incubation centre on the IADT campus, and there is also an Enterprise Students Society on the campus.
The panel queried the language of some of the module descriptors; for example, 'use standard industry hardware'. This may be appropriate for a technical course but the proposed programme is for the higher education sector. The panel concern is that the progression through the programme is not sufficiently apparent.

The team acknowledged that an assessment plan might help to address this concern.

Academic Calendar
The panel asked if the team had considered a semesterised model for the programme? Are all exams at the end of the year ideal?

The Institute had considered the issue of semesterisation, but after consultation and review by IADT staff the decision was taken to retain the current model. The programme will run for 27 weeks; the same model as other IADT programmes. Some assessments are broken up, such as Sound Engineering Students also have continuous assessments, which are balanced and not loaded towards the end of the year.

Exit Award

The Chair noted that there is different practice in the sector around exiting an award early. It is possible to structure a level 7 programme with level 6 learning outcomes in the 1st and 2nd year. Noting IADT has structured learning outcomes at level 7 for all 3 years, the panel asked what level of award a student would receive on exiting the programme early.

The Registrar of IADT replied that this issue was being reviewed for the impending programmatic review process, due to start in spring 2015 at the Institute. While some programmes at IADT had an exit award built in, it was not mandatory for all programmes; this is the current Institute policy.

The modules are progressively linked and the student's learning would be incomplete. While Broadcast and Acoustics & Psychoacoustics are stand-alone modules, the award is designed as a whole. Modules build on each other and skills are developed and complement earlier learning.

The panel thanked the programme team for their engagement and the meeting came to a conclusion.

Decision of the panel

The panel recommended (subject to the conditions below) the validation of the proposed programme to IADT Academic Council, namely:

Code		Description	Credits
DLTBC		BA in Creative Music Production	180
Validation Date		Tuesday 20th May 2014	

Conditions

This validation of the programme is subject to the following conditions:
1. The panel approve the MOA between IADT and STC on condition the learner protection section of the document addresses the concerns raised by the panel.
2. Staffing plan for the 3 years of the programme to be sent to the panel Chair for verification.
3. Rolling finance plan to be provided in confidence to the panel Chair.

4. A revised programme document reflecting all the changes to be submitted to the panel Chair.
5. Review, reconsider and represent the learning outcomes of the modules.
6. Review the credit distribution in 3rd year regarding the Major Project and Industry Practice. Industry Practice is deemed to be too heavily weighted in credits.
7. There is a need for a contingency plan to allow the programme continue should the relationship with STC breakdown – to be submitted to the panel Chair.
8. The module descriptors need to better reflect soft skills development.

Panel Recommendations

The panel made the following series of recommendations for the consideration of the programme team:

1. Develop a series of scenarios to illustrate how students might progress through the programme following different streams.
2. Consider the programme structure re inclusion of an add-on year level 8.
3. Consider the option of restricted entry due to the perceived high demand for this programme.
4. The two institutions consider what additional infrastructural needs are required vis-à-vis computer networks.
5. The ethos and underpinning approach to the programme and individual modules needs to be better future proofed in relation to technology.
6. Consider adding an option re sound and film in the final year.
7. Review the graduate destinations in considering module options/electives.
8. Consider how entrepreneurship can more visibly suffuse the programme.
9. Consider how the partners will facilitate placements.
10. Re the Memorandum of Agreement:
    - STC might stipulate that IADT be designated as a preferred creditor.
11. Re Music Theory:
    - Review the language of the indicative content and bibliography.
12. Re Broadcast module:
    - Incorporate reference to industry standards, such as BAI.
    - Include reference to internet radio.
13. Re Creative Sound Engineering
    - Suggest changing title to Creative Sound Engineering and Production

In summing up, the panel commended:
- A really dynamic team across the two Institutions
- The positive and innovative development of the programme and the panel wish the collaboration well with this venture.

The Panel were happy to recommend the programme and the MOA for approval to the Academic Council of IADT, subject to the conditions outlined above.

Panel signatures

Chairperson

Michael Hannon

Mr Michael Hannon   Date _____

Registrar

Dr Marian O'Sullivan   _____   Date _____

Response to Collaborative Programme Validation Panel – for the attention of the Chair

Hereunder is a table of the findings of the IADT STC Collaborative Programme Validation Panel, along with the response of the partners. Attached in Appendix One is a revised Collaborative Programme document and a revised MOA.

A - Findings of the Panel	B - How/where they have been done
Conditions	

1. The panel approve the MOA between IADT and STC on condition the learner protection section of the document addresses the concerns raised by the panel.	**Currently the MOA states:**
	
	"*Learner Protection*
	
	1. *As indicated in paragraph 58, where a cohort of students commences the collaborative programme, the parties agree that programme shall be taught-out in full in light of any or all eventualities where possible. Below are some indicative instances. This is not a complete list:*
	    a. *Numbers on the programme falling below the 'break-even' threshold in years 2 or 3*
	    b. *The loss of staff*
	    c. *The loss of equipment*
	    d. *Breakdown in the relationship*
	2. *Where it is not possible to teach-out the collaborative programme the parties shall endeavour to place students in an equivalent programme in Dublin and shall share any additional costs accruing to students associated with such registration in a 2/3 STC:1/3 IADT proportion.*
	3. *Where an equivalent programme, as referred to in paragraph 93 is not available, it is agreed that all fees paid by students shall be refunded in full in a 2/3 STC:1/3 IADT proportion.*"
	
	In the event that all of the above fails, IADT will cover costs associated with teaching out or refunding students.
	
	As a contingency a portion of money will be set aside in the Institute budget to cater for this.

2.	Staffing plan for the 3 years of the programme to be sent to the panel Chair for verification	Creative Music Production 3 year staffing Plan The collaborative programme is based in the department of Design and Visual Arts, but is staffed by colleagues within all three departments of the faculty and employees of Sound Training Centre. The core staff for the next three year period will be: *For IADT* Geoffrey Perrin – Co-ordinator (providing 6 hours per week) Tony Mc Guinness (providing 3 hours per week) Conor Brennan (providing 3 hours per week) *For STC* Brian Carty David Christopher Other members of the STC staff team will additionally teach on the programme as laid out in the programme document. In order to preserve academic integrity and quality assurance requirements, in the event of unforeseen circumstances affecting the ability or availability of any member of the team to teach on the programme they will be replaced using IADT or STC standard processes, depending on the employer of the staff members.
3.	Rolling finance plan to be provided in confidence to the panel Chair	The Memorandum of Agreement between IADT and STC states the following: ***Financial Calculations*** *1. IADT and STC have agreed a cost sharing model for the collaborative*

provision of the programme.

2. *Income shall be distributed between IADT and STC on a 1/3:2/3 basis, i.e. In the academic year 2014/15 IADT shall normally receive €1,000 and STC shall normally receive €2,000 per registered student, subject to the paragraphs above.*

3. *Expenditure shall be made by the respective parties as indicated in Table 1.*

Table 1 Annual Expenditure	*IADT Responsible*	*STC Responsible*
VLE (Blackboard) Licencing	√	
Management & Monitoring Costs and other Quality Assurance activities	√	
Library Resources	√	
Guest Lecturer costs	√	
Student Insurance costs	√	
Validation Costs	√	
External Examiner Costs	√	

Equipment	√		
Training costs	√	√	
Teaching	√	√	
Marketing & Promotion Costs	√	√	

In monetary terms this is as follows:

	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18
Student Numbers	30	60	90	90
Income STC	€60K	€120K	€160K	€160K
Income IADT	€30K	€60K	€120K	€120K

4. A revised programme document reflecting all the changes to be submitted to the panel Chair	Attached is a revised collaborative programme document.
5. Review, reconsider and represent the learning outcomes of the modules.	We have reviewed and reconsidered our learning outcomes and have adjusted them based on the feedback during the panel visit and the Report of the panel. Example: Major Project additional learning outcome.

	"Understand, develop and present a creative brief" See Page 88.
6. Review the credit distribution in 3rd year regarding the Major Project and Industry Practice. Industry Practice is deemed to be too heavily weighted in credits.	The credit allocation has been reviewed and it was decided to reduce the industry practice module to 10 credits and increase the major project to 30 credits. See Pages 88 and 9.1
7. There is a need for a contingency plan to allow the programme continue should the relationship with STC breakdown – to be submitted to the panel Chair	See response to condition 1.
8. The module descriptors need to better reflect soft skills development.	Several of the modules descriptors have been revised as well as an additional paragraph (6.4.1) which helps to describe the soft skills the team described during the panel visit but was not previously evident in the document. See page 29. Selected module aims have been updated to include soft skills. See page 61, 64, 75, 77, 88.
<center>**Recommendations**</center>	
1. Develop a series of scenarios to illustrate how students might progress through the programme following different streams.	The Institute agrees with this. As the collaborative programme evolves these will be developed.
2. Consider the programme structure re inclusion of an add-on year level 8.	This recommendation will be considered by the Executive, the Faculty and the Collaborative Programme team as the collaborative programme is being "rolled out" and its implementation can be monitored and reviewed following the successful completion of at least one full cohort.

3.	Consider the option of restricted entry due to the perceived high demand for this programme.	We are finalising details of interview based on submission of an audio artefact for next year.
4.	The two institutions consider what additional infrastructural needs are required vis-à-vis computer networks.	Planning for the additional infrastructure has begun about how to share student information. The members of the Relationship Management Team are in regular contact.
5.	The ethos and underpinning approach to the programme and individual modules needs to be better future proofed in relation to technology.	There is a constant review of the technology required in light of the current financial circumstances. The aim is to have the best possible equipment.
6.	Consider adding an option re sound and film in the final year.	This would be added to the possible level 8 programme.
7.	Review the graduate destinations in considering module options/electives.	Career Pathways The Creative Music Production modules will give an extensive range of skills, knowledge, understanding, and creative awareness of audio and music production. The modules cover a broad range of technical aspects from electronics and basic maintenance to the use of highly complex studio equipment , and all modules are will share the Programme ethos of soft learning in relation to understanding client and artist needs and facilitating the creative endeavour. A student whose major project was involved an audio installation in a gallery's space could choose a career is a technical assistant and consultant, specialising in media and corporate facilities.

	A student whose final project is the recording, mixing and mastering of an album may choose to specialise as a studio engineer. A student whose final project is the pre-production, recording, editing and mixing of a film soundtrack or radio production may embark on a career in Film or Radio.
8. Consider how entrepreneurship can more visibly suffuse the programme.	This has been considered in the context of the increased focus on the Final Project. See page 88.
9. Consider how the partners will facilitate placements.	Although the programme does not operate a formal system of placement for students it does facilitate such experiences during non-term time through its extensive network of practitioners. Additionally the programme is substantially rooted in a practical approach to learning which means students are regularly in learning situations which simulate professional practice either in the recording studio or live venues. Also the students' final project may include collaborations with external artists and other organisations effectively enhancing and testing their understanding of the workplace.
10. Re the Memorandum of Agreement: STC might stipulate that IADT be designated as a preferred creditor.	This is under discussion and a decision will be reached shortly.
11. Re Music Theory: Review the language of the indicative content and bibliography.	This has been carefully reviewed and the collaborative programme team decided not to make any revisions.
12. Re Broadcast module: a. Incorporate reference to industry standards, such as BAI. b. Include reference to internet radio.	These changes have been incorporated into the document. See page 68.
13. Re Creative Sound Engineering: Suggest	This has been carefully reviewed by the collaborative programme team

changing title to Creative Sound Engineering and Production.	and it was decided not to make the suggested change.