

Public Submission on the Implementation and Impact of the National Framework of Qualifications and Access, Transfer and Progression policies: 2008

Respondent's Details

Name:	Marie Scally
Position (if applicable):	Education Officer
Organisation (if applicable):	Crosscare DAP
Address:	The Red House, Clonliffe College, Clonliffe Road, Drumcondra, Dublin 3
Telephone:	8360911
Email:	marie@dap.ie
Date:	6/10/08

Is this response a personal view or is it made on behalf of your organisation?

Personal [] On behalf of organisation []

Submissions will be made public on the website of the National Qualifications Authority of Ireland and attributed to the author and/or their organisation unless you request otherwise.

Do you agree that your submission may be made public?

Yes [] No []

Public submissions on the Implementation and Impact of the National framework of Qualifications and Access, Transfer and Progression policies: 2008

The following themes are suggested as a guide in making your submission. Please feel free to make a free form submission if you wish. Submissions should not exceed 2000 words. The themes are:

- Expectations of the Framework
- Impact on learners
- Key strengths and key weaknesses of the Framework
- Impact on programmes and qualifications
 - standards, learning outcomes, assessment, quality assurance
- Access, transfer and progression
 - Expectations
 - Impact on learners
 - Key strengths and key weaknesses
- Relevance of the Framework to employment
- Use of the Framework in public funding
- Impact on the international recognition of qualifications

Thank you.

Please return your response to nfgstudy@nqai.ie or to

Dr. Anna Murphy
Secretary to the Framework Implementation and Impact Study Team
National Qualifications Authority of Ireland
5th Floor, Jervis House
Jervis Street
Dublin 1

My Submission:

- Expectations of the Framework:

That there would be clarity in regard to standards and qualifications across the board.

- Impact on learners:

I am not sure that students understand the framework or the notions of the different levels. As a consequence students are not clear of the value of one course over another.

I think this may be that time but essentially employers need to name the standard of a qualification rather than simply saying – primary degree required.

- Key strengths and key weaknesses of the Framework:

Absolutely the key value is that qualifications are standardised and that at a glance an employer or college can be assured of the standard of qualification.

People from other educational systems having their qualifications recognised.

Knowing the standard to which to teach and having quality assurance

- Impact on programmes and qualifications

– standards, learning outcomes, assessment, quality assurance

As much of my work is in a community setting there is a struggle to balance quality against community needs.

- Access, transfer and progression

- Expectations
- Impact on learners
- Key strengths and key weaknesses

As the framework is developing progression routes are a little unclear and the students' expectations of the systems are higher than I would have expected. I feel it is important that recognition of prior learning systems are uniform because in the sector I work within this is not the case.

- Relevance of the Framework to employment

Absolutely but employers need education about the NFQ.

- Use of the Framework in public funding

Again education about the NFQ. As I work outside the University System I am coming at this from a slightly different angle I see that the public sector is in some areas very much working and supporting the NFQ but in other ways not that aware. In some cases developing qualifications beyond the needs of staff or community to have a higher standard rather than developing accredited courses at the standard needed for the delivery of service.

- Impact on the international recognition of qualifications.

Still developing and one of the areas but I feel needs promotion.