UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND, CORK

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE

PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT

(ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT)

HUMAN RESOURCES

…………………
ACADEMIC YEAR 2013

Date 26th June 2013

PEER REVIEW GROUP MEMBERS

Name	Affiliation	Role
Ian Black	University of Glasgow	Director of Human Resources
Michael McDonnell	Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development	Managing Director
Helen Whelton	University College Cork	Vice-Head of College of Medicine and Health
Jennifer Murphy	University College Cork	Admissions Officer

TIMETABLE OF THE SITE VISIT

(See Appendix A).

The Review Group agree that the timetable provided a great opportunity to meet with large numbers of individuals and groups who represented a wide spectrum of staff, clients, and stakeholders of the university. However the schedule was quite intensive for both days. Any overrun created time pressure problems, and the schedule allowed little time for reflection, and for writing up of the report. A significant amount of input from the PRG, therefore, was required in the weeks following the review to finalise the report.

PEER REVIEW

Methodology

The Group appointed Ian Black as the Chair of the Peer Review Group. The Group acted as a single group throughout the site visit and agreed all the findings and recommendations. It was informed by the material provided by Human Resources (HR) and the evidence it gained from meeting HR staff, clients and stakeholders of the University.

Site Visit – tour of facilities

The site was scheduled for the first day of the review, but due to an overrun with the various meetings, the PRG requested that the visit be rescheduled for the afternoon of the second day of the review. The site visit was guided by one of the HR Managers. During the site visit the PRG were shown the two floors of office space occupied by the HR unit; this space comprises open plan offices on each floor, meeting rooms on each floor, a printing room on each floor, and kitchen facilities on each floor. It was notable that the upper floor is mainly used to

accommodate the HR Managers, and the lower floor is used primarily for non-managerial HR staff.

Peer Review Group Report

All members of the PRG took shared responsibility for asking questions during the meetings with HR staff and their stakeholders. The PRG shared responsibility for drafting sections of the report.

A first draft of the PRG report was compiled during the evening following the second full day of meetings with HR staff and their stakeholders. Over the following three weeks, the PRG worked simultaneously on finalising the report. Email communications and use of Google docs facilitated the collaboration. All findings and recommendations presented in the report were agreed by the PRG.

OVERALL ANALYSIS

Self-Assessment Report

The HR Unit provided a detailed self-assessment report which included an extensive account of the way in which the HR unit has evolved in UCC since 1998. While the report showed some repetition, the level of detailed information presented ensured that the PRG had a very good understanding of the context in which the HR Unit operates.

The report provided a brief outline of the role of each of the five HR subdivisions: Central Services; HR Business; Employee Relations; Staff Welfare and Development; and HR Strategy & Organisational Development. The PRG found this information useful in understanding the full range of services provided by the HR Unit.

The self-assessment report referred to a number of strategic plans and review reports, which led to some confusion for the PRG. One strategic plan is dated 2012-2014; another was 2013-2017. There were also a number of reviews referred to and it was not altogether clear to what extent reference to these reports was context setting, and to what extent the earlier plans are still influencing operations.

The presentation and analysis of the findings from the surveys of UCC staff and stakeholders revealed a number of positive attributes of the HR Unit. It also revealed a range of issues that need to be addressed. However the response rate of the university wide survey of 10.5 percent was very low and therefore the outcome cannot be generalised. It would have been helpful to

frame the interpretation of the survey in the context that there may be an over-representation of people with HR related issues.

The honest reflections of the HR staff in response to the HR staff survey is to be commended. The PRG felt that these responses were indicative of a team that clearly recognises it faces challenges, and that is looking forward to changes that will enable greater collegiality, professionalism, teamwork, trust, respect, and structure to their work. Feedback from the survey was very helpful for the PRG in framing some of the key questions for the individual and group meetings.

The appendices to the self-assessment report provided a greater depth of information on many aspects of the HR unit. Further detail of the self-assessment exercise were presented and a number of previous HR review reports were included. This level of detailed information greatly facilitated the PRG's understanding of the structure and organisation of the centre and the context within which it operates. It facilitated a clear insight into the perceptions of the HR staff, the wider university community and external stakeholders of the HR Unit. It also facilitated our understanding of the challenges ahead and more importantly the future potential of the HR Unit.

The report included fifty-seven recommendations, some of which appeared to be rather operational and in some cases reactionary to the survey feedback as opposed to being embedded in any overarching strategic vision. The PRG felt that many of the recommendations were overlapping and could have benefited from being merged. Furthermore it was noted that the recommendations lacked quantifiable metrics. The self-assessment report would have benefited from prioritisation of recommendations presented.

SWOT Analysis

The SWOT analysis exercise was useful insofar as it provided a series of bullet points of strengths and of weaknesses. The HR Unit also undertook a PESTLE analysis. The key points arising from the SWOT and PESTLE were presented as a series of bullet points under a range of headings. This section would have benefited from a greater analysis of the exercise and a stronger commitment to the actions arising. It was noted by the PRG that the exercise placed very little emphasis on opportunities and threats, and had this exercise's report included these last two sections, perhaps a clearer way forward might have been discerned by its authors.

Benchmarking

The HR Unit selected four external institutions to engage in their benchmarking exercise. It was clear that an effort was made to get a good representative sample of universities, and public sector institutions. The PRG noted that the list of questions asked to the four chosen institutions was comprehensive, but not particularly strategic. The questions were transactional and not sufficiently customer orientated. No questions on quality assurance were evident.

The benchmarking exercise was useful insofar as it identified some areas of accomplishment of the UCC HR Unit, and also identified areas that will benefit from enhancement. However the PRG noted that the recommendations arising from this exercise were more process orientated than outcome focused, and would have benefitted from a more strategic, fundamental approach.

FINDINGS OF THE PEER REVIEW GROUP

The PRG commented that overall the staff in HR were clearly competent and professional. Many of those interviewed commented on their appreciation of individuals within HR and many of the HR services were praised highly. There was a clear enthusiasm among staff of HR to use the review as a catalyst for improvement in all areas, and it is in the spirit of enabling enhancements that this report is written.

The PRG noted that whilst considerable progress has been made in recent years, some of the key findings and recommendations of the current review were made in the previous PRG report of 2003 and in the Strike review of 2008. In particular the PRG noted the lack of development and improvement in relation to the seven main areas identified in the Strike report of 2008.

Findings of Strike report 2008	PRG Comment
The need for greater clarity of purpose of the HRM function, which is clearly and consistently communicated and acted upon.	The PRG noted that the HR vision and mission as outlined in their strategic plan, is not as inspiring as it might be in bringing clarity of purpose, and ambition, to the Unit. By further developing its professionalism, leadership and influencing capability the HR Unit in UCC would have the capacity to deliver outstanding strategic HR insights and services for the university.
The need for greater emphasis on organisational development and leadership and management capability building.	Progress has been made in the development of leadership programmes; further progress is required to increase participation in, and impact of, these programmes. The focus of the HR Unit needs to have a better balance

	between enabling and compliance, and between transformational and transactional functions.
The need for a greater service culture in the delivery of HRM.	Implementation of the full CORE HRIS system, and generation of service metrics aligned with the operational plan to deliver on identified strategic priorities is required. Such a plan should incorporate greater clarity of individual roles and responsibilities. Accountability for performance against service metrics should be shared across the HR team, and be used with clients to demonstrate and evidence service improvements.
An over emphasis on procedures and written processes versus the perceived inconsistent application of those same policies and procedures	The review revealed that this perception still applies. Development of the service culture, as suggested above, will address the balance.
The perceived lack of internal consistency within the HR Department resulting in the lack of ownership of the task or problem being presented by the user	Again, the review revealed that this perception still applies. Development of the service culture, as suggested above, will address the balance.
The perception by managers that they have no choice but to accept HR's advice and that they are not partners in the process of decision making	The PRG noted that there appeared to be a lack of understanding on both the sides of the client and HR management regarding decision making authority. This lack of understanding is generating tension on both sides. The sense of HR that "Decision making authority is not the gift of HR Central to devolve" leaves managers on the client side with the perception that HR have a veto on their decisions where compliance with legislation is concerned. It will be necessary for UMTO to clarify where the responsibility and authority lie in terms of decision making on HR related matters. Clarity on the consequences of accepting this authority will need to be explicit.
The implementation of the National Social Partnerships Agreement (Toward 2016) has resulted in the feeling that both the union and HR are barriers to change rather than an effective partnership operating within clearly defined boundaries.	The successors to the National Social Partnerships Agreement are still an issue, as is the *perception* of HR being a barrier to change. This issue will be resolved when there is clarity on the locus of authority for decision making on HR related matters.

The template for this review report has specifically asked the PRG to focus on the following topics: Governance, Services, Staffing, Accommodation, Financing, Communications, and Implementation of recommendations for improvement made in Peer Review Group Report arising from last quality review. The PRG added a heading of Vision and Mission.

Vision and Mission

By further developing its professionalism, leadership and influencing capability the HR Unit in UCC will have the capacity to deliver outstanding strategic HR insights and services for the university. This is best achieved through an inspiring Purpose, Vision and set of Values.

The PRG felt that the stated vision *"to be a trusted and respected HR function capable of responsible delivery at an optimal level to support staff and the university's strategic ambitions"* lacked ambition and inspiration. The HR Unit should look at the vision statements of other similar HR departments and develop a more inspiring vision for themselves.

The mission and vision as currently articulated do not reflect the unique contribution that HR could make to the success of UCC. The Vision needs to be realistic, focused but also inspiring to HR staff, and be credible to its clients. It's an articulation of where the UCC HR Unit wants to be in five years' time. The HR Vision Statement must be better supported by a unit development plan that addresses the needs of HR staff.

How HR makes a difference in the way it behaves and interacts with HR colleagues and the wider university should be articulated as UCC HR Values within the strategic plan.

Governance

The department has been through turbulent times in recent years in terms of changes in leadership, structure and accommodation, and in a context of an economic downturn. In 2011, the current Director of HR extended his remit from the Corporate Secretary position to include leadership of HR at the request of the President. The review highlighted the major contribution of the current Director of HR and the appreciation of the staff for his leadership of the HR Unit at a difficult time. It appears that the alignment of the HR function with the function of the Corporate Secretary and OCLA has had many benefits in stabilising the department. Notwithstanding the significant progress that has been made in recent years, the review revealed strong demand for the appointment of a full-time professional HR Director to lead the department into its next stage of development. Staff from across the university acknowledged and respected the contribution of the Corporate Secretary to the Department of Human Resources, but there was pervasive concern at the lack of a full-time professional HR Director in an organisation the size of UCC where people and services are at the centre of its function.

The HR department is currently well represented at senior management level by the Corporate Secretary/ Director of HR. Any newly appointed Director of HR should also join the management team to continue this high-level representation.

The working relationship between HR and a range of cognate university committees was not clear to the PRG. The linkages, terms of reference, and roles & responsibilities of HR in relation to the committees need to be decided, clarified, and communicated. A review of the role of the HR representative on committees currently serviced by HR would help to clarify the nature of future service and whether the best value can be attained through administrative support, executive input, or both. Clarity of roles and a sharing of understanding of these roles with relevant committees are essential to the management of HR input to university committees and to supporting the efficient and effective administration of the University.

Services

Overall, there were many commendations from clients about the services the HR function delivers e.g. researcher career structure, the leadership and development programme and other training and development interventions, the recent strengthening of the welfare service, UCC staff recognition awards, pensions, etc. Many of the clients praised the efforts and support of the Business Partners, and in general clients wanted the concept to continue.

The HR Unit has seven managers; three of these are in the role of Business Partners serving the four Colleges, and Central Administration. Some issues arose around the business partner model: it appeared that the Business Partner (BP) approach had been described to some as a "one-stop shop" for all HR services at the College level. This approach is welcomed by clients but there is a mismatch between expectations and what clients believe is being delivered. The PRG met some members of staff whose perceptions were that the "central HR" frustrated the promises the BPs made, and were not always supportive of their clients. From the central viewpoint, the BPs might be seen as being forced into making promises which were almost impossible to deliver by the central experts, or they might be seen as deliberately finding ways around the central experts to meet the clients' demands. The HR Unit might consider means of managing expectations in this regard.

The net results are a sometimes disunited HR service, the risk of divided loyalties within HR, suboptimal personal relations on occasion, and a poorer service to the University at a time when all Irish Higher Education Institutions are under unprecedented external pressures which impact immediately on the internal workings.

The nature of the constraints of current legislation is unclear to some clients. In a devolved structure there needs to be a shared understanding of the legal and financial frameworks within which the HEI's operate. It seemed to the PRG that few opportunities had been taken to discuss the constraints openly with clients, and that communications were channelled almost exclusively

through the BPs. Recruitment and Employee Relations issues were to the fore: there were also some clients' perceptions that the central teams were not empowered to exploit/maximise the opportunities and potential easements actually available under the current central controls, and particularly within the Employment Control Framework. The reality of these claims could not be tested: however better internal communications within HR and directly between clients and central staff (facilitated by the BPs) would go some way towards addressing the reality of the situations. This would require some clarification of roles and responsibilities within HR, a re-launch to the client community, and a more sophisticated understanding of working and managing in a matrix.

There appeared to be no service level agreements within HR. Issues could be seen as "disappearing into a black hole", and feedback taking a long time to emerge. Many of the issues the BPs cannot handle are complex, driven by the timetables of external parties, and may result in answers the client was not hoping for: these compound the negative perceptions. Some basic service standards on response times and regular updating when issues are delayed coupled with regular publication of the actual standards achieved would allow clients to see progress, and might well help to identify the real bottlenecks which HR could control. This would benefit the whole service.

Moreover, if the BPs were supported by dedicated teams in HR central services they could act as a conduit for the range of expertise based in the HR department. The PRG was told that the structure within HR central services to support the BPs was variable. The terms "grace" and "favour" were used frequently in relation to the functional support of the BPs work.

To complete the devolved model, decision making, and accountability should be devolved to Colleges, with the support of the BP. Colleges should be entrusted with the management of their own headcount ceilings, and should bear the consequences of non-compliance. This level of devolution appears to be currently operating successfully in the management of the university's finances. We recommend holding 10% of vacancies for decision making centrally as a safety net to ensure the ability of the university to make strategic appointments, but devolving as much as possible of the remainder to Colleges and University Central Support Services.

The PRG was of the opinion that, in keeping with the Strike report, the HRIS system needs upgrading. This appears to be a question of implementation of CORE applications which were purchased almost three years ago. Many of these have been implemented but are not yet used to their full potential. This is a circular problem - there are not enough resources to develop the system, but the absence of the system precludes measurement and systematic Business Process Improvement. The urgent need for development of performance and service metrics was noted by the PRG. The development and wider use of CORE will be a critical success factor in the development and implementation of these metrics. There is a necessity to prioritise the on-going development and upgrading of the functionality of the CORE system

The under-utilisation of the CORE system may compound the problems in HR: paper based processes are usually less subject to regular scrutiny and improvement, and require more specialist knowledge, thus hampering staff sharing. Paper based systems are also slower, more prone to error, and inhibit the use of metrics. The amount of paper files in the work area contributes to some of the environmental issues in the office area: the absence of automation must inhibit the service quality HR can deliver. Many UK HEIs experience of maximising the use of HR systems is that service standards improve, and HR staff are able to do higher value work rather than remain confined to lower level processing.

The HRTG anticipated full implementation of the new CORE modules by the end of 2011 and suggested the deferral of the generation of service standards for each area of HR and OD (as recommended in the Strike Review) until these modules were up and running and generating information for performance metrics. These developments are still awaited as is the generation of service standards and performance metrics.

The PRG recommends that a designated senior manager takes dedicated responsibility for developing and fully implementing the CORE system. The anticipated outcome of the implementation will be beneficial for HR staff and clients; for staff, examples include, more streamlined work flow, less low value work for HR administrators (e.g. photocopying, recording sick leave etc.), greater availability of staff to do work that is higher on the value chain, improved job satisfaction; for clients, examples include: greater transparency in processes, ability to track workflow, ability to recover personally relevant information, automated transactions and records and reporting. Overall these improvements will lead to a better quality service.

Universities are competitors, but are also uniquely prepared to share good practice: there are also common links to lobby and possibly influence policymakers. UCC's HR function may benefit from maximising existing links with other Irish HEIs to learn from each other (e.g. what could be done differently so that fewer cases involve third parties?), to maximise the usage of any opportunities to flex the constraints, and to gain access to expertise they may not have. In the UK, the Russell Group Universities compete robustly for staff, students and research funds: that does not stop them from working closely together in Finance and HR to develop and share best practice. Such access can also reduce any sense of isolation a specialist service may develop when under pressure to deliver in a very difficult environment.

Staffing

Overall the staff in HR were found to have a high level of experience and professionalism. There was an obvious shared enthusiasm to use the review as a catalyst for improvement in all areas.

The new HR recruitment structure was put in place in a different economic context. It appeared to the PRG that there had been little detailed examination of the structures needed for the very different circumstances in operation today. The reduction in traditional appointments and the

increase in focus on contract research appointments necessitate a task-based approach rather than a job-based approach and requires flexibility in order to ensure that recruitment of whatever nature is carried out efficiently. Integration between recruitment processes and the different contractual opportunities developed more recently could be improved. Against the background of restricted recruitment overall in Academic areas, HR should clarify its position on support of recruitment of research staff, particularly given the success of UCC in recent research funding applications. This will be particularly important to the facilitation of the research mission and alignment with the university's strategic objective to increase research income.

Whilst the effort in the past may have concentrated on transactions, as recruitment levels have fallen with the ECF the nature of the work is likely to have changed allowing greater focus on strategic recruitment, organisational development and management of performance. This change of emphasis has different structural needs within the overall framework of the Department. Within the HR central service, the impression was given of an emphasis on specialisation, and less emphasis on broadening the cross-functional approach. There are clearly areas of specialist expertise which cannot be known by all staff: however over-emphasis on separate teams can lead to a silo approach. Workloads vary between teams over the year, but the impression was given that teams did not often share staff to even out peaks and troughs in workloads. In addition to improving the effectiveness of the function overall, sharing staff, if well managed, can also lead to broader skills for individuals and in some cases to greater job satisfaction. Cross functional teamwork also often improves.

The way that the new HR structure was introduced following the Strike Review may also have left a legacy. The implementation of the recommendations of the Strike Review was undertaken by the HRTG which apparently declined to consult with the staff. This lack of consultation was seen by the PRG to be a source of dissatisfaction within the HR function. It appeared to the PRG that only part of the Strike recommendations had been implemented, and this may have in some ways contributed to the tensions referred to above. However, this was a few years ago, and ways should be examined to build on the progress that has been made since the 2008 review and develop a shared understanding of the role of HR with common goals across the function.

It emerged during the process of interviews that a source of stress amongst the HR staff was the regular reluctance of senior managers to accept some of the limitations imposed from outside (e.g. ECF, HEA) or agreed at the UMTO. Reluctance by managers external to HR to acknowledge the constraints within which HR staff operate has a negative impact on HR staff confidence when they are unable to meet demands. Staff commented that they rarely receive recognition or affirmation. HR has a very difficult role in such a challenging regulatory environment and a mechanism to provide enhanced support and affirmation is required.

Equality and Welfare functions
Many of those interviewed commented on their appreciation of the welfare function in UCC, including the EAP and the UCC staff advantage scheme. During the review, it became apparent

that there would be merit in making the Equality and Welfare functions independent of HR to ensure an even distribution of support to staff inside and outside HR.

Accommodation

The HR team occupies two floors of recently renovated office space in the Biosciences building. The floor space is maximised with each floor including open plan office spaces, meeting rooms, a printing room, and kitchen facilities.

The accommodation is bright, receives plenty of natural light, has several windows, and is equipped with air conditioning.

The Group had heard of a number of concerns from staff about the offices - problems of working in open plan areas, heating and ventilation, and different groups on different levels.

The PRG suggest that issues of heating, ventilation, and acoustics should be referred to the Building and Estates Office. The PRG felt that phone technology could be investigated to ensure the easy transfer of calls from open-plan desks to the private office spaces when necessary.

Many members of the HR team had previously been accommodated in more private office spaces, and their transition to working in an open office environment has brought challenges. It is understandable that such a big change in accommodation arrangements brings challenges as it requires a change in work processes, relationships and essentially in office culture. The issue of reduced privacy is a logical concern for many staff members, and this may also be addressed by the Buildings and Estates Office through raising of some desk partitions as appropriate. Additionally coordinated planning of meetings and appointments and the use of a booking system for the shared meeting rooms will ensure privacy for any scheduled meetings. Many of the other issues raised are best resolved through efforts at enhancing collegial relationships between individuals and teams. Although whole team meetings have not been found to be very productive in the past, there may be merit in organising an annual staff away day to engage in teamwork exercises where each can gain a greater appreciation for the others perspectives and working preferences.

Financing

There was little time to explore the adequacy of the budget fully: on the surface it did not appear to be a major constraint overall, given the size of the University. What may be more relevant is how the budget is distributed: some concerns were raised about budget distribution but this could be addressed by a review of the alignment of the budget allocation with current needs, demands and strategic priorities, if this has not already been completed.

The non-pay budget is in excess of €600,000 and the PRG did not get a sense of how this budget is disbursed. The PRG supports the suggestion made in the SAR, to review the manner in which the budget is allocated. The PRG further suggests that budget be allocated by the Director of HR to HR managers in line with strategic universities priorities. Budget should be predicated on the submission and approval of annual budget plans for each unit of the HR department.

Communications

Three following levels of communication are considered:

> 1) internal communication within the HR team
>
> 2) communication with the wider university including communication from management to the HR team and communication of the HR team with university staff and
>
> 3) communication of HR staff with external stakeholders (community outside the university) e.g. HEA and other universities.

It was clear to the PRG that communication at all three levels was less than satisfactory and that there was a strong desire to address it by all HR staff.

1. Internal communication within the HR team

Deficiencies in internal communication pointed out in the SAR were confirmed during interviews. It emerged that the main communication gaps internally was between management and other staff and between Business Partners and central staff.

The SAR reported that some sections do not have team meetings whilst others do. Full team meetings have proved unproductive in the past and have been abandoned. During the quality review many of those interviewed reported a somewhat uneasy working environment with communication gaps and also dissatisfaction regarding space and facilities. The PRG were of the impression that these sources of dissatisfaction were linked and that addressing the workplace culture and working atmosphere in the office might improve matters.

Social behaviour was identified in the SAR as a challenge within the HR team, and interestingly it was also identified as an inhibitor of change in the Strike (2008) Report which made the following observation:

> "*The Department, given a lack of present stable leadership and low morale, was perceived to have lost a sense of importance, team belonging and purpose. The demarcation between the offices and the silo mentality was perceived to be a by-product of the absence of any clear top level mandate (HR Strategic Plan), tactical plan (operational priorities) or short term goals (objectives). So horizontally, the sections within HR are viewed as acting independently, fire-fighting, passing problems between offices, blaming each other, lacking social interaction and shared communications structures.*

Five years later the same types of challenges persist and continue to affect the functioning of the department. The Strike Report continued with the observation:

> "*Vertically, a status divide seems to exist between the Officers and the Assistants which further hinders communication and team working. It is seen as a Department internally divided, resenting unfair work distribution and distressed by temporary and acting roles*"

Both the SAR and the PRG recognised a divide between the business partners and central services in terms of communication. Resolution of divergence of understanding of roles and authority is essential to the future success of this model. Better communication is fundamental to making the devolved structure work. The Business Partner needs to be supported by a team which shares their goals and translates their plans (developed in conjunction with the Colleges) into action. In contrast the current process appeared to inhibit rather than support progress. External perceptions (within UCC, but outside HR) need to be addressed at the same time (see below).

To address these challenges the Strike report recommended

> "*Communication and team working behaviours, departmental briefings, including opportunities for both formal and social interaction, are required as part of (re-) instilling value and purpose to this group of staff.*"

At the recommendation of the Strike Report a Human Resources Transformation Group (HRTG) was established in 2008. The group made considerable progress on the implementation of a number of the recommendations of the review report:

- Appointment of a HR Director
- Establishment of the Business Partner model
- Some upgrading of HRIS
- New accommodation for HR and OD Department

Credit is due to the HRTG in considering and taking forward recommendations from the Strike report and in making such progress; in reviewing the impact of the changes implemented it is clear that insufficient progress has been made on the communications aspects and the upgrading of HRIS. Albeit the business partner model has improved communications between the Colleges and the BP, it appears that communications between the BP and central services and the support of central services to the BP need further development.

2. Communication with wider University

The phrase 'Black Hole' was mentioned by a broad range of groups in relation to the recruitment processes: specifically there was a feeling of powerlessness once the process for a specific appointment went into HR. Accountability for head count was an issue and there was lack of clarity regarding where the responsibility lay for keeping within head count. Some representation from the Colleges expressed the opinion that accountability should be within the Colleges; however there was a contrary opinion that from a strategic perspective, flexibility was needed across Colleges to ensure that key posts could be filled and that a University wide perspective was essential to the maintenance of the integrity of the key staff profile. This issue was a source of considerable dissatisfaction. Staff reported that decisions made by senior managers and UMT were countermanded once they went into HR, that approved appointments 'didn't happen'

as a result of HR actions. Delays in getting information about posts were also a source of discontent. Some in HR felt that some UMT decisions were not always fully supported once out of that meeting, and this compounded the problems – HR was faced with delivering two sometimes conflicting outcomes.

As a matter of urgency HR need to develop an effective and sustainable external Communications Strategy so the wider university begins to understand and appreciate what HR does. The current lack of appreciation of what HR does (or has the potential to do) seriously impacts its effectiveness and credibility in the university.

3. External Communication

The PRG found little evidence of strategic relationship building with the stakeholders in the external environment. The PRG recommends a targeted approach with devolution of responsibility to named senior managers to develop relationships with the HEA, other Universities, IoTs, and other relevant stakeholders, so that the team can have a direct conduit for information and communications.

Implementation of recommendations for improvement made in Peer Review Group Report arising from last quality review

The previous quality review report recommendations were made in the academic year 2002/03. The report included nine external recommendations and two internal recommendations.

The internal recommendations related to staff workloads and to internal communication in the department. The follow-up report of 2004 indicated that the staff workloads issue had been addressed, that individual priorities, role descriptions and workloads had been agreed for teams and individuals. While this issue may have been addressed relatively recently, it was evident to the PRG that the HR team would benefit from a further exercise in role and responsibility clarification. The challenges of the current environment will necessarily require greater flexibility in role definitions for team members. It was apparent that some inequity in workloads still exists. With regard to internal communication the follow-up report of 2004 made a commitment to take all staff offsite at least once annually. It also made reference to implementation of the HRIS system. While some progress has been made it was apparent that further work is required to enhance internal communication in the HR department.

The first two external recommendations relate to enhancing relationship building and communications. The follow-up report of 2004 indicates that some progress was made in these areas. The PRG noted that considerable further progress is required in these areas and recommendations in this regard are made in this report.

The third and fourth recommendations relate to staff welfare. The development of internal support structures to complement the EAP was recommended, and a review of the Bullying and Harassment policy and procedures was suggested. In the process of the review it was evident to the PRG that considerable progress had been made in relation to the Staff Welfare function, and that the HR Unit has a commitment to prioritise Staff Welfare. The wider community would benefit from hearing about the roles and services provided by the two new posts.

The fifth recommendation relates to the review of the administrative staff grading process. It became apparent during the review that this process has been suspended. There was some confusion among the HR clients as to the rationale for continuing the suspension of the grading process. Better external communication regarding the rationale for such decision making is necessary. The PRG suggests that the staff grading processes will need to be reinstated in light of the changing higher education landscape and there needs to be a shared understanding on the rationale for any decisions taken.

The sixth and seventh recommendations relates to the role of the HR Committee and that of the HR Users Committee. It would appear that these committees are no longer in place.

The eighth recommendation relates to the academic promotion process. Some progress has been made on this item since 2003. The embargo on academic promotions undoubtedly inhibited progress in this regard, although the PRG welcomes the fact that the academic promotion process is now again in cycle. Similarly to the administrative staff grading process, there needs to be a shared understanding on the rationale for any decisions taken with regard to limitations set on academic promotions.

Some notable progress has been made in relation to the ninth and final external recommendation made by the PRG in 2003, which relates to the issue of inequitable terms and conditions for temporary staff. During the course of the review several of the internal stakeholders recognised the excellent work being done by HR in relation to the establishment of a research employment and career management structure. The PRG learned that these efforts have resulted in the university being awarded the European Commission's award of HR Excellence in Research.

While much progress has been made it became clear during the PRG review that there is much frustration in relation to the on-going issue of perceived inequitable terms and conditions for staff of the Tyndall National Institute. The group noted the HR strategic goal of extending its service to the Tyndall National Institute.

The review also revealed that there would be merit in reviewing the contracts for non-permanent staff, other than researchers; it was suggested that the wording used within such contracts should be reviewed.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

In considering its own recommendations the PRG first considered very carefully the recommendations for improvement made in the self-assessment report and have commented briefly on each one below. Consideration of the HR Unit's recommendations is followed by a summary of the PRG's recommendations.

Recommendations in the SAR	PRG Comment
STRUCTURE	
That the Human Resources Department organise internal workshops to clarify and agree to the greatest extent possible, the role of HR within the University, followed by briefing sessions to the University community to communicate the role of HR.	Agree in principle and in addition discussion should be informed by HR's understanding of the needs of key stakeholders. The establishment of an agreed Objective for the HR Function supported by a clear articulation of "Purpose Vision and Values" is an essential early step in devising a workable structure. The organisation of the proposed workshops may well benefit from high quality external facilitation to ensure all stakeholders are wholly engaged and lasting solutions are developed.
That the HR structure be independently assessed for effectiveness when a reasonable period of implementation has passed – likely 2014	The PRG suggest that it would be too early to have such an assessment in 2014 if a real change is going to be implemented
That the relationship between the University and Tyndall be clarified further and that HR in Tyndall be included as part of the central HR Department, UCC as part of the enhancement and clarification of the relationship	Agree
PLANNING	
Generate a 'HR Impact' set of metrics. Disseminate relevant metrics information to key budget holders / UMT	The review group note that the KPI's in the strategic plan (2013-2017) are process indicators. Outcome indicators should be developed, informed by performance

	measures and people metrics examples of which are outlined in tables 1 and 3 of the Strike report. These should be agreed by UMTO, reported annually and updated as required. Full implementation of CORE will aid this process.
Review HR top priority areas for currency.	Agree that the recommendations presented in the SAR be reduced and prioritised. The revised priorities may benefit from UMTO support.
COMMUNICATION	
That an internal communication policy be developed for the University which should include aspects of the HR Communication Strategy. The latter should fit within the University policy and be subsidiary to it. The University Communication policy should include control of mass email systems such as All Exchange Users and separate electronic mechanisms for staff interaction and discussion. A Working Group should be established to develop the policy and to monitor its implementation once approved.	An effective internal and external communications policy needs to be developed as a priority. Please refer to recommendations made under the Communications section of the main report.
That a thorough review is undertaken of the HR Website and of the resources made available to staff on-line in terms of access, content, relevance and structure.	Full implementation of the HRIS CORE modules could dramatically increase the resources available to staff on-line. This should be done prior to the review of the HR website.
That the Communication Plan required in the HR Strategy is completed as a matter of urgency in conjunction with the Media and Communications function and that the Staff Bulletin Board be enhanced and awareness of it promoted.	These four recommendations can be merged. The review group agrees that a Communications Plan is required as a matter of urgency.
That consultation is undertaken within the HR Department on the most appropriate structure for staff meetings both Departmental and sectional to enable better two-way communication without undue impact on	

Departmental Business	
That an Internal Communication Plan for the HR Department be developed linked to the revised staff meeting structure but also involving the use of email updates to all HR staff – See Number 5 above also	
That an internal [to HR] briefing take place on significant policy changes in advance of policy dissemination – possible as part of revised staff meeting arrangements	
That summary information on the budget be made available to all staff on a quarterly basis	It is the role of the Director of HR to allocate the budgets to the specific HR managers and to decide on who requires access to information on these budgets.
Optimise the channelling of communications/ feedback into HR from Colleges/ Areas via the HR Business Manager structure.	Agree. The communication needs between the central functions and the Business Partners should be agreed and facilitated.
Establish a staff surveying schedule as part of a HR Communications Plan on a 3 year cycle resulting in a Staff Response Plan	The review team agrees. See recommendations in main report.
POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND COMPLIANCE	
That the work already undertaken on policy updating and revision should continue with appropriate deadlines to ensure a University HR Policy structure that is fit for purpose	Clear timetable on policy updating is necessary but the emphasis should be on communication and facilitation of their implementation.
Establish an internal HR Policy Development Working Group to review, communicate and oversee policy development and dissemination.	The PRG team would suggest that it may be inappropriate for a single group to provide the expertise for all policy development and implementation.
Fully implement the 'return to work' meetings as part of the Sick Leave Management Policy to support line managers in the implementation of the Absence Management Policy.	Agree
Propose to OCLA that a framework is developed indicating the process for policy	Process of policy development and approval

development and that the level of sign-off required for each policy type is indicated in the University's Signing Authority and Approval Policy	to be clarified.
Examine the type of data beyond CSO, HEA requirements which would generate visibility for the equality agenda.	Agree – these data should be developed as part of the overall development of metrics and KPI's
STAFF WELFARE / TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT/PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	
Develop a UCC 'Values' Programme targeted at staff at all levels.	The PRG are not aware of such a development programme and suggest review of this recommendation.
Launch Great Places to Work within the next academic year.	Agree
That the HR Department examine the supports available to individual staff members as part of the implementation of its staff welfare plan with a view to enhancing those supports where necessary and as part of the Communication Plan ensuring that staff are aware of the supports available	Agree that the communication of supports available to staff need to be incorporated into the communications plan. It would be beneficial to carry out a gap analysis of available supports.
That the training and development of all staff in the HR Dept. is given increased focus as part of a revised PDRS system in the University and that opportunities for skill development and job rotation are pursued actively within the Department as highlighted in that process.	The Review Group would strongly support this recommendation and would encourage particularly the idea of job rotation, flexible team sizes, and planned secondments. There should be a 3 or 4 year plan which includes the BPs. The HR Department should undertake a skills audit as the basis of devising a CPD Programme for all HR staff.
Develop a Programme to support University staff through change.	The PRG suggest that it would be preferable to develop a programme to enable Managers to implement change, in such a way that staff can support it.
Embed competency based approach to performance management within the revised PDRS process.	Suggest that focus be placed on further embedding of the PDRS system with a primary focus on performance. Ensure that the

	PDRS system is fully aligned to university objectives.
Create a stronger link in the communication of development needs between PDRS and L&D.	Agreed
Themes from the PDRS – non-personalised reports – should be communicated to Heads	Agreed
Engage in tailored programme for performance enhancement support to Academic Units/ Areas in consultation with OD, L&D and HR Business	Develop tailored programmes for performance enhancement support to line managers in Academic Units/ Areas.
Monitor workloads arising from the AWDM first post pilot cycle	It is not clear to the PRG whether or not this is a HR responsibility.
Examine alternative costing models for staff training and OD intervention delivery.	Agree; Cost efficiency should be an overall unit objective. Clear Return on Investment information will help university managers recognise the value of development and its long term benefits.
Staff Welfare and Development and HR Strategy and OD to engage with Heads in discussion on performance needs and enhancement.	The PRG suggest that HR should clarify where their activities should be focused.
Analyse Risk Register for training needs.	The review group suggest that the HR unit needs to develop an effective L&D strategy. An effective L&D strategy would identify training needs from a range of sources and indeed would incorporate many of the specific operational items included within this thematic area.
Develop an e-learning plan for targeted courses in L&D – possible use of Blackboard	Please clarify.
Conduct a formal examination of the support of 'Sponsor' activities within HR with the view to rationalising involvement in activities.	Agreed
Establish a coaching support panel using existing HR and university expertise – qualified personnel.	This is an excellent idea and strongly supported by the Review Group as a priority area.

RESEARCH	
Complete researcher alignment with UCC Researcher Career Structure and ensure compliance with the Structure across the University	The Review Group fully support this.
Develop a communications strategy targeted specifically at researchers and Principal Investigators	This should be included as part of the overall communications strategy which the Review Group would suggest be urgently addressed.
TEAMWORKING	
That an internal Charter for the HR Department be developed to improve team-working, customer service including follow through by HR staff	These two recommendations can be merged. The PRG suggest that a new style of working must be created within the HR department to which all staff subscribe based on role clarity, a clear understanding of internal (i.e. within HR) customer/supplier relations and obligations, team work, collaboration, responsibility, accountability, and mutual respect.
That additional analysis be undertaken of the dynamics and interpersonal behaviours involved in open plan working with a view to feeding into the Internal Staff Charter in HR to improve the working environment and to provide clarity to all staff on acceptable and unacceptable behaviours generally, thus contributing to a more respectful and trusting working environment	
That an examination of workloads be undertaken with a view to ensuring balance and equity and also responsiveness to the needs of the rapidly changing University context and staffing level s within the Department.	These four recommendations can be merged. It is necessary to establish more effective cross functional team working to respond to peaks and lulls of work as they arise.
That increased cross-functional participation is ensured in project implementation including participation by staff at all levels	
That more flexible working and cover arrangements are developed with a view to staff development and service delivery improvement	
That a mechanism be established within HR to allow staff who have an interest in another HR area to come forward to volunteer for cross	

functional training to enhance staff development and to enable information sharing and advice-giving	
FACILITIES	
That an examination of the open plan layout is carried out by appropriately qualified external reviewers with a view to any enhancements that would improve the working environment	In response to these three recommendations, the Review Group would suggest that the HR unit contact the Buildings and Estates Office with a view to exploring reasonable solutions to the range of accommodation issues identified.
That as part of the examination of the layout of the physical space and facilities recommendations are made for potential improvements which can be implemented within budgetary constraints	
That external advice is sought in relation to air conditioning , ventilation and temperature control within the HR facilities	
RECRUITMENT	
Examine alternative means of identifying exceptional talent within regulatory constraints as part of a revised recruitment strategy.	To support this, the PRG suggest that HR make greater use of the existing facility to use the "special case" mechanism via the HEA. Benchmark with other leading universities.
Introduce e-Recruitment as projected by CORE Steering Group Plan	Agreed; this should be done as a matter of priority.
Where appropriate use relevant psychometric assessment to support recruitment to senior posts.	An effective recruitment strategy should be developed; the specific tools to be used are outside the scope of this review.
As part of Phase 2 review of the Recruitment Regulations review the role of HR Representative within the recruitment process.	Consider as part of the clarification of the HR Role.
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION	
Utilise on campus trained mediators and external mediators in ADR activity.	Agreed
HRIS	
That the HRIS implementation is accelerated and the system potential maximised in line	These three recommendations relate to the further development of CORE modules. The

with the Steering Committees plans and the needs of the Department and the University.	Review Group strongly agree, and suggest that this needs to be prioritised. It may be that the supplier is able to offer more help than previously, and the necessity of CORE upgrading the product to meet ever rising specifications from universities outside Ireland may have resulted in a product which is now better suited to the HE environment.
Extend the ESS currently being introduced to further areas of information and access	
Fully enable self – reporting on HR/OD data for appropriate level of management.	
RECORDS MANAGEMENT	
That a thorough review of records management policy takes place within the HR Department which should include the possibility of electronic storage	These two recommendations also relate to the further development of CORE modules. The Review Group strongly agree, and suggest that this needs to be prioritised.
As part of the HR Records Management Project: Review Personnel file management and security access Audit environment in which files stored for risk Identify appropriate and secure storage mechanism for sensitive material	

Recommendations for improvement made by the Peer Review Group

The following recommendations for improvement are made by the PRG in addition to the recommendations for improvement (discussed above) made by the HR Unit.

The PRG recommends that:

- Full implementation of the CORE system be prioritised. This action will allow greater effectiveness, efficiency, and streamlining of work processes. When implemented it will remove the necessity for much of the paperwork, filing, archiving, external queries etc.

and will allow the HR team to focus on work of greater value to the institution. The accurate data and reports through the CORE system will also enable the generation of performance and service metrics and will increase efficiency for the wider university community.

- The vision and mission as outlined in the strategic plan should be revised to be more focused, inspiring, and ambitious.

- The appointment of a full-time professional HR Director should be addressed. The new HR Director should be included as a member of the UMT.

- The HR Department should undertake a skills audit as the basis of devising a CPD Programme for HR staff. The CPD programme should incorporate team building exercises for the unit.

- The linkages, terms of reference, and roles & responsibilities of HR, whether executive or administrative, in relation to relevant university committees needs to be decided, clarified, and communicated.

- The position of HR with regard to support of recruitment of research staff needs to be clarified.

- To complete the devolved model, more accountability regarding HR related decisions, including appointment within headcount, should be devolved to Colleges. We recommend holding 10% of vacancies for decision making centrally as a safety net to ensure the ability of the university to make strategic appointments, but devolving as much as possible of the remainder to Colleges and to University Support Services.

- Further to the Strike report, UMTO should clarify to senior management the extent to which they have responsibility and authority in decision making on HR related matters. Specifically, having been advised on HR related matters, the ultimate decision making authority lies with the College Leader/Manager or the HR advisor. UMTO should also make explicit that those accepting responsibility and authority for decision making must also accept the consequences of their decisions.

- To increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the current model, BPs should be better supported by dedicated teams in HR central services to enable them to act as a conduit for the range of expertise based in the HR department.

- To ensure an even distribution of support to staff inside and outside HR the Equality and Welfare functions should be made independent of HR.

HUMAN RESOURCES

PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT
TIMETABLE

In Summary

Tuesday 14 May: The Peer Review Group (PRG) arrives at the River Lee Hotel for a briefing, followed by an informal meeting with staff members.

Wednesday 15 May: The PRG considers the Self-Assessment Report and meets with staff and stakeholder representatives. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG.

Thursday 16 May: The PRG meets with relevant officers of UCC. An exit presentation is given by the PRG to all staff members of Human Resources. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG in order to finalise the report. This is the final evening of the review.

Friday 17 May: External PRG members depart.

Tuesday 14 May 2013	
16.00 – 18.00	Meeting of members of the Peer Review Group. Briefing by: to be confirmed. Group agrees final work schedule and assignment of tasks for the following 2 days. Views are exchanged and areas to be clarified or explored are identified. **Venue: Tower Room, River Lee Hotel, Western Road**
19.00	Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group, the Head of Human Resources and members of the Co-ordinating Committee: Ms. Gillian Aughney, Executive Assistant Mr. Kieran Creedon, HR Advisor (Employee Relations) Ms. Maeve Doyle, HR Advisor (Contracts & Recruitments) Mr. Michael Farrell, Director of Human Resources Ms. Helen O'Donoghue, HR Business Manager Ms. Angela O'Donovan, Manager (HR Strategy & Organisational Development) Ms. Veronica O'Connell, Personal Assistant to the Director **Venue: Jacobs on the Mall, South Mall, Cork**

Wednesday 15 May 2013		
	Venue: Tower Room 1, North Wing, Main Quadrangle UCC	
	(unless otherwise specified)	
08.30 – 08.45	Convening of Peer Review Group	
08.45 – 09.30	Mr. Michael Farrell, Head of Human Resources	
09.30 – 10.30	Group meeting with all staff **Venue: Council Room, North Wing, Main Quadrangle**	
10.30 – 11.00	Tea/coffee	
11.00 – 13.00	**Private meetings with individual staff members** Group 1 11.00: Mr. Paul Ryan 11.15: Ms. Susan O'Callaghan 11.30: Ms. Veronica O'Connell 11.45: Alison O'Connell & Anne O'Sullivan 12.00-12.15: Ms. Orla O'Kelly & Sinead Hackett 12.30-12.45: Tracy Eagles & Laura McSweeney **Venue: Tower Room 1, Main Quad**	**Private meetings with individual staff members** Group 2 11.00: Ms. Maeve Doyle 11.15: Ms. Gillian Aughney 11.30: Ms. Maeve Lankford 11.45: Ms. Angela O'Donovan 12.00-12.15: Kieran Creedon & Catherine Murphy 12.30-12.45: Pat Kenny, Grace Conway, Kathy O'Connell & Sylvia Curran **Venue: Tower Room 2, Main Quad.**
13.00 – 13.50	Working lunch	
14.00 – 14.40	Human Resources Managers Ms. Susan O'Callaghan, Manager Central Services; Ms. Helen O'Donoghue, Manager College of SEFS, Registrars, VP Teaching & Learning and Student Experience; Ms. Mary Ward, Manager, College of Medicine & Health, President's Office, VP External Relations, Finance Office, Corporate & Legal Affairs, Buildings & Estates; Ms. Anne Gannon, Manager, College of ACSSS, B&L, VP Research & Library and Information Services; Ms. Maeve Lankford, Manager, Staff Welfare & Development; Ms. Angela O'Donovan, Manager, HR Strategy & Organisational Development; Mr. Paul Ryan, Manager, Employee Relations; **Venue: HR Board Room, ground floor, Block E, Food Science Building**	
14.40 – 15.20	Human Resources Business Managers Ms. Anne Gannon, Manager, College of ACSSS, B&L, VP Research & Library	

	and Information Services; Ms. Helen O'Donoghue, Manager College of SEFS, Registrars, VP Teaching & Learning and Student Experience; Ms. Mary Ward, Manager, College of Medicine & Health, President's Office, VP External Relations, Finance Office, Corporate & Legal Affairs, Buildings & Estates
15.30 – 16.00	<u>Heads of Colleges or their nominees</u> Ms. Majella O'Sullivan, School Manager, College of Arts, Celtic Studies & Social Sciences Professor Ursula Kilkelly, Interim Head, College of Business & Law Dr. Tanya Mulcahy, School Manager, College of Science, Engineering & Food Science **Venue: Tower Room 1, Main Quad**
16.05 – 16.25	Mr. Diarmuid Collins – Bursar
16.25 – 16.45	Reflection by the Peer Review Group
16.45 – 17.00	Ms. Louise O'Byrne - Arthur Cox Teleconference call ph: 087 2575146.
17.00 – 18.00	<u>Representatives of stakeholders and employers</u> Ms. Jennifer Cashman, Ronan Daly Jermyn Mr. Fraser Robertson, Managing Director and Senior Instructor at Fistral Training and Consultancy Mr. John McGarry – Price Waterhouse Coopers Mr. Martin Hogan – Employment Health Advisors **Venue: Staff Common Room, North Wing, Main Quadrangle**
19.00	Meeting of Peer Review Group to identify remaining aspects to be clarified and to finalise tasks for the following day, a followed by a working private dinner. **Venue: Tower Room, River Lee Hotel, Western Road**

Thursday, 16th May, 2013 **Venue: Tower Room 1, North Wing, Main Quadrangle UCC** *(unless otherwise specified)*

08.30 – 09.00	Convening of Peer Review Group
09.00 – 09.20	Professor Anita Maguire – Vice President for Research & Innovation

Time	Activity
09.30 – 09.50	Dr Michael Murphy, President Teleconference call
09.50 – 10.10	Professor Frédéric Adam – Chair of the Governing Body Committee on Staff
10.15 – 10.30	Visit to core facilities of Human Resources, escorted by Mr. Michael Farrell
10.30 – 11.00	Tea/coffee
11.00 – 11.45	<u>Selection of UCC Staff</u> Professor Geraldine Boylan – Dept. of Paediatrics & Child Health Mr. Jerry Buckley – Computer Centre Ms. Angela Desmond, School Manager, School of Education Ms. Niamh McGettrick Cronin, School Manager, School of Applied Psychology Ms. Mary McNulty – Career Services **Venue: Tower Room 1**	<u>Selection of UCC Staff</u> Ms. Kate O'Brien, School Manager of BEES and (Governor elected by staff) Mr. Paul O'Donovan – Academic Secretary Professor Paddy O'Donovan - Vice-Head (Research), College of Arts, Celtic Studies & Social Sciences Mr. Colman Quain, College of Business of Law Dr. Aine Ryall, Chair, Staff Recognition Awards **Venue: Tower Room 2**
11.45 – 12.10	<u>Staff Ombudsman</u> Ms. Mary Steele, Staff Ombudsman Dr. Liz Gebruers, Staff Ombudsman *Professor Robert Devoy, Student Ombudsman*
12.10 – 12.30	<u>Representatives from the Unions in UCC</u> Mr. Michael Delargey, IFUT Ms. Angela Flynn, Head Inter Union Group Mr. Dermot Houston, Chairman, SIPTU representative group Mr. Gary Hurley, Union Representative
12.30 – 13.30	Working lunch
13.30 – 14.00	<u>UMTS Members</u> Mr. Ronan Ó Dubhghaill, Director of Strategic Planning and Institutional Research Mr. John Fitzgerald – Director of Information Services & University Librarian Dr. Bettie Higgs – Deputising for the Vice President for Teaching & Learning Mr. Mark Poland, Director of Office of Buildings & Estates
14.00 – 14.30	Professor Paul Giller, Registrar and Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs
14.30 – 16.15	Preparation of first draft of final report

16.15 – 16.45	Head of Human Resources
17.00 – 17.30	Exit presentation to all staff, to be made by the Chair of the Peer Review Group or other member of Peer Review Group as agreed, summarising the principal findings of the Peer Review Group. This presentation is <u>not</u> for discussion at this time. **Venue: Council Room, North Wing, Main Quadrangle.**
19.00	Working private dinner for members of the Peer Review Group to complete drafting of report and finalisation of arrangements for completion and submission of final report. **Venue: Tower Room, River Lee Hotel, Western Road**