

**UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK  
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND, CORK**

**QUALITY IMPROVEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

*SCHOOL OF EDUCATION*

.....

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2012-13**

08/04/2013

## PEER REVIEW GROUP MEMBERS

Name	Affiliation	Role
1. Ms Aine Lawlor	Former CEO, Teaching Council	CEO
2. Dr Andrew Green	Brunel University	Senior Lecturer, Education
3. Prof Maria Helena Pedrosa-de-Jesus	University of Aveiro	Associate Professor, Education
4. Prof Jonathan Stock	UCC	Head of Music
5. Mr Paul Moriarty	UCC	Head of Student Counselling & Development

**The PRG would like to begin its report by stating that our visit to the School of Education in UCC was very productive. The PRG is of the opinion that the work of the School of Education is to be seen in a very positive light, and our overall impressions are of a School that is effectively managed, collegial in its modus operandi and supportive of the work of all students and staff. This is reflected in our positive findings throughout the report. We also make a number of recommendations in the interest of assisting the School.**

### 1. TIMETABLE OF THE SITE VISIT

- 1.1 Timetable of the site visit
- 1.2 Suitability and adequacy of the timetable.
  - 1.2.1 Given the time allocated for the review and the range of people the PRG needed to see, the timetable allowed suitable opportunities for the gathering of information.
  - 1.2.2 Suitable time was allowed for visits to the facilities of the School, the University, the Library, etc.
  - 1.2.3 Evening sessions provided a suitable opportunity for reflection on materials and information gathered during the day and useful time to develop on-going focuses for the review.

### 2. PEER REVIEW

#### 2.1 Methodology

- Members of the Peer Review Group:
  - Áine Lawlor (Chair)
  - Andrew Green (Rapporteur)
  - Maria Helena Pedrosa-de-Jesus
  - Jonathan Stock
  - Paul Moriarty.
- the PRG represented a wide range of experience, which enabled the effective conduct of the review;
- Regrettably, owing to a bereavement, one of the PRG members was unable to participate on the final day of the review.

## **2.2 Site Visit**

- 2.2.1 The PRG appreciated the hospitality of University College Cork and the welcome extended to us by all members of the staff and students we met.
- 2.2.2 Meeting room facilities in UCC's Tower Rooms were well arranged in order to allow the PRG to carry out its duties, and provided a welcome private space on campus for its work. Other venues, such as the Senior Common Room, the Council Chamber and meeting rooms in the Library and elsewhere were all well equipped for the PRG's purposes.
- 2.2.3 Catering was of excellent quality throughout the week and was much appreciated by the PRG.
- 2.2.4 Transport arrangements were efficiently organized as and when required.
- 2.2.5 Accommodation at the River Lee Hotel was very comfortable, providing an excellent base near to the University. The quality of the facilities was welcomed by the PRG.
- 2.2.6 Throughout the process of the review the PRG was provided with access to a wide range of relevant members of the administrative staff, the academic staff, the management body and the student body of the University. It was made possible for the PRG to speak with one additional member of staff we wished to meet.
- 2.2.7 In future reviews, it would be helpful if examples of staff research and other publications to demonstrate the quality of staff engagement in research were available for the PRG to consider. It would also be useful for questionnaire data from student questionnaires to be presented alongside the SAR. These were provided to the PRG, at the request of the Chair, after the site visit.

## **2.3 Construction of Peer Review Group Report**

- 2.3.1 Initial findings from the PRG review visit were established and circulated on the final day of the PRG visit.
- 2.3.2 Individual PRG members took responsibility for writing up in fuller form responses in agreed identified areas.
- 2.3.3 The draft first version of the report was collated by the Rapporteur and circulated to the PRG for review, revision and comment.
- 2.3.4 A second draft, taking account of the above stage, was collated and circulated by the Rapporteur.
- 2.3.5 In light of final comments by the PRG members, a final version of the report was submitted to the Quality Promotion Unit of the UCC.

## **3. OVERALL ANALYSIS**

### **3.1 Self-Assessment Report**

- 3.1.1 The PRG appreciates the amount of work that has gone into the production of the SAR and related Appendices and would like to thank the team within the School who prepared this documentation.
- 3.1.2 The SAR document covered the areas set out in the UCC guidelines for the initial academic review, including the completion of a SWOT analysis of the School's current position and a benchmarking exercise. There was a clear attempt to set the work of the School in a comprehensive context. The PRG notes, however:

- 3.1.2.1 that the relationship of this SAR to the previous SAR and emergent recommendations for action could have been made more explicit;
- 3.1.2.2 that there were some moments when essential explanations were presented only in the Appendices and not in the SAR. Nevertheless, the PRG was in almost every case able to gain the necessary understanding of the School's processes and practices by consulting the Appendices;
- 3.1.2.3 that issues highlighted in the UCC Strategic Plan could have been more explicitly addressed within the SAR. Perhaps these development areas could have been used to structure some sections of the SAR in order to illustrate the School's engagement with and response to target areas emerging from the UCC Strategic Plan. This would have provided a useful insight into how work within the School relates to wider institutional imperatives and concerns in UCC. An example of this is the section outlining Targets for 2012;
- 3.1.2.4 that some elements of the SAR – e.g. the benchmarking exercise and the Aims and Actions sections – could have been presented in table form in order to clarify key issues and connections. The gathering together of information that appears in disparate places and in long bulleted lists would have assisted reading, enhanced clarity of the documentation, and could have been used to highlight key issues of good practice, critical reflection and action planning;
- 3.1.2.5 that responses to the student questionnaires are not supplied in the Appendices. Nor is analysis of student responses to the questionnaires supplied. These were provided subsequent to the completion of the site visit.

## **3.2 SWOT Analysis**

- 3.2.1 The PRG noted that 29/35 of all Education staff in all areas attended the SWOT 'away day'. Those unable to attend were circulated with the results and given the opportunity to add further points. The PRG was satisfied that efforts had been taken to gather as wide a range of staff viewpoints as practicable.
- 3.2.2 The PRG felt that the 15 point list of outcomes of the SWOT analysis in the SAR (pp.13-15) could usefully have been presented in a more economical and prioritised form within the 4 categories of the analysis. Some points raised in this list came to the fore as clear priorities for the immediate moment; others (for instance no. 2, on social justice), while interesting, were barely raised elsewhere in the School's documentation or in staff presentations at meetings.
- 3.2.3 Instead of separating the SWOT outcomes from analysis, the PRG would have found it helpful to see planned actions and implications placed alongside key outcomes such that thinking about forward planning was entirely transparent.
- 3.2.4 The PRG noted the School's claims to have a vibrant research culture but the evidence provided did not fully support this claim. It would have been useful and interesting, as observed at 2.2.7, to see examples of staff publications. The PRG noted that information relating to research outputs was shown in summary form on staff CVs, and could identify members of staff who are making an effective contribution to international-quality research. There was less explicit evidence as to how these individual energies and successes translate into a collective research culture within the School – e.g. research environment, research collaborations, development of research group identity, etc.

### **3.3 Benchmarking**

- 3.3.1 The PRG found much of value and interest within the data from the benchmarking exercise. It would have been useful to find a brief Executive Summary in the SAR as an introduction to the detailed discussion of outcomes of the exercise.
- 3.3.2 The PRG observed that the benefits of each comparator location were clearly identified but there was no explicit rationale given for the choice of these particular institutions as opposed to other potential comparators. The PRG suggests that the selection of a more varied set of comparator institutions might have produced even more illuminating findings or that selection of the most immediate competitors might reveal the most direct threats/opportunities.

## **4. FINDINGS OF THE PEER REVIEW GROUP**

### **4.1 Department/School Details**

- 4.1.1 All relevant details were included in the SAR.

### **4.2 Department/School Organisation & Planning**

- 4.2.1 The PRG wishes to acknowledge that overall there was strong commendation on the quality of, and support for, leadership within the School. School management structures appear to be clearly defined and well developed.
- 4.2.2 The PRG notes and agrees with the School's identification of issues regarding succession planning for leadership at School level.
- 4.2.3 The PRG affirms the value of the sharing of course leadership responsibilities and the opportunities this represents for individual career development.
- 4.2.4 The PRG was surprised at the high staff-student ratios within the School, which compromise the ability of the School to sustain and develop its work.

### **4.3 Teaching & Learning**

- 4.3.1 The PRG notes the generally high quality of Teaching and Learning that takes place within the School:
- 4.3.1.1 students from across the full suite of academic programmes, past graduates and external stakeholders (including school personnel) all commented on the quality of work in this regard;
  - 4.3.1.2 it is evident from discussions with students that some aspects of the provision in School are of outstanding quality;
- 4.3.2 There is a clear sense of respect amongst staff for each other's practice and the recognition that collegial support lies at the heart of the effective working of the School, in terms both of academic and administrative functions.
- 4.3.3 Move to two-year PDE programme - the PRG felt that this proposed development offers an opportunity to really strengthen the teacher education provision of the School:

- 4.3.3.1 this move will open up the possibilities of contrasting school placement experiences, which will both broaden and deepen students' experiences and understanding of teaching in a range of contexts;
- 4.3.3.2 it is the School's intention to extend students' academic assessment to Masters level. This will serve two useful purposes: firstly, it will extend the students' professional depth of understanding, helping them to locate their professional practice within a more extended academic background; secondly, it has the potential to feed naturally into the School's regular Masters level programme, thus increasing potential numbers on the MEd and helping students to see a natural career progression for themselves through the academic pathway from PDE ⇒ MEd ⇒ PhD.
- 4.3.4 The PRG notes that semesterisation will be initiated with effect from 2014-15, and it is expected that this will assist in the formal development of effective assessment of programmes.
- 4.3.5 Students following the EYCS programme felt the absence of a clearly defined path from their programme into Masters level work and onwards to doctoral level. This concern was echoed by School staff. The PRG notes and highlights this issue, as the large number of students graduating from this programme represents a significant potential on-going market for the School.
- 4.3.6 A particular focus emerging from the SAR is the School's strategy for developing new teaching and learning forums, especially to utilise blended and on-line learning. The PRG noted varied enthusiasm for this project amongst School staff but feels that such forums for learning represent a significant area of opportunity.
- 4.3.7 The development of international opportunities and collaborations within both Research and Teaching and Learning were identified as major issues. Whilst the PRG notes certain significant individual contributions in this regard, appetite for such developments was rather varied. The PRG believes that this issue should be given careful consideration, as the international student market represents a significant area of opportunity for the University.
- 4.3.8 Assessment emerged as a major and problematic theme during this academic review:
- 4.3.8.1 on the basis of the evidence provided, the PRG notes that there is scope for greater use of the full range of grades to reflect the variety of student performance in assessments; the very best work does not always achieve recognition as such;
- 4.3.8.2 with a few specific exceptions, there appear to be major issues across programmes from the students' perspective with regard to feedback; these relate firstly to the time lapse between submission and return of assignments – in the worst cases the reported gap was an entire academic year during which the students were given no assessment of their work; secondly, feedback was often confined to a brief comment received too late for formative purposes – this left students uncertain about the quality of their work and added to a feeling of stress as they were unsure about how effectively they were progressing, and in some cases whether they would achieve a pass result/grade for their course. This is clearly unsatisfactory in terms of the School's practice;
- 4.3.8.3 the PRG was surprised to note the level of acceptance amongst staff that the above issue met with, suggesting that this is an institutional issue; it is apparent that this needs to be addressed as a matter of some urgency not only at School level;
- 4.3.8.4 transparency of assessment of students on school placement arose as an issue in the PRG's meeting with external stakeholders. The PRG notes the Head of School's identification of procedures relating to assessment of students. However, School

Senior Managers from secondary schools expressed the desire to support the PDE students more effectively. In order to do this, and to understand the ways in which students are assessed, they would welcome information regarding the criteria against which students are assessed by the University and guidelines regarding levels of performance. They also felt this information could be used at targeted points for earlier identification of students who are deemed to be failing or who are proving to be a cause for concern so that appropriate supporting measures can be put in place. As observed above, the School of Education later confirmed that it has such measures in place, so the issue may be primarily one of communication and awareness, but this then in itself is an issue of significance. The PRG observes that the development of the two-year PDE programme represents a significant opportunity to address these issues and to establish new systems.

#### **4.4 Research & Scholarly Activity**

4.4.1 There is a clear recognition within the School of the importance of research in its work:

4.4.1.1. the relevance of research in the School's mission is expressed in different ways at several points in the SAR and respective annexes ('close relationship between research and teaching' ... 'the school has a vibrant research culture'). Going back to the previous Review (2006), the PRG could see improvement following some of the recommendations – as, for example, the setting up of a 'School Research and Graduate Studies Committee' chaired by the Head of School, convening four times in each academic year (p.193). We consider that this is a very important structure that should be consolidated and used for stimulating, feeding and developing the research culture;

4.4.1.2. such a Committee could also be used for identifying innovative areas of research, reorganising and optimising efforts in some of the present programmes. In fact, two key areas of research were identified: (i) Inclusive Cultures, Learning and Pedagogy and (ii) Teacher Education and Professional Development. Considering these programmes together with the observation that some 'academics also work on topics of individual interest' (App. p.327), the PRG suggests the possibility of starting by optimising these two key areas (while continuing to seek other research areas of potential interest);

4.4.1.3 the recognised 'intention in the future to enhance further national and international research profile, building on existing success' (SAR, p.6) led us to strongly recommend joint efforts for more internationalisation and for the broadening of research interests.

4.4.2 High numbers of research students reflect culture of research:

4.4.2.1 one area in which there is also evidence of the staff research culture is the increased numbers of post-graduate students at Masters and in particular at the PhD level. At present, 63 PhD students are enrolled in the School of Education - 17 on Cohort 1 (2008), 28 on Cohort 2 (2011) and 18 following individual route (p.342);

4.4.2.2 at the moment 12 staff members are involved in PhD supervision, which represents a great effort. Since the practice is for two supervisors to be assigned to research students, this could be a good way to engage less experienced supervisors, thus developing their scholarship and supervision skills.

- 4.4.3 The PRG read of excellent individual research activity, but saw a varied picture in terms of research:
- 4.4.3.1 to have a clear picture of the staff research profile there was a need to read the individual staff profiles in the Appendices. As a suggestion for future evaluations, it would help if teams are provided with a summary of those information sources;
  - 4.4.3.2 the PRG noted quite a variety in research interests. Such diversity is good but may also lead to variety in the quality of research outcomes and the ‘quality’ of publications may suffer if researchers publish without taking into account the relevance of the journal in question to their potential primary research audiences. It may sometimes be effective to use more ambitious criteria in selecting a venue for publication (considering the journal impact factor, for example);
  - 4.4.3.3 the PRG would like to have had access to a selection of publications, instead of just a list in each member profile, to have a clearer picture of the interesting research work being developed by staff. The same with PhD theses – some copies would have been very helpful in better understanding the research lines and interests in question. The PRG suggests that exemplar staff publications be supplied as a routine part of future reviews;
  - 4.4.3.4 the PRG notes that UCC has its own research evaluation forthcoming; overlap between that exercise and this kind of review will need to be carefully delineated to avoid duplication of efforts or lacunae in coverage.
- 4.4.4 The PRG believes it would have been useful to see examples of publications and a permanent display of staff publications:
- 4.4.4.1 a permanent display of staff publications would keep students, colleagues, other stakeholders and the public in general well informed about the School’s ‘vibrant research culture’. We believe that this could stimulate more students to enrol in research in the future and contribute to a stronger sense of community;
  - 4.4.4.2 a more informative Web page relating to research would also be useful;
  - 4.4.4.3 the PRG anticipates some difficulties surrounding where to place this display, since the School is spread across the University Campus, with staff offices located in 7 separate buildings. The central UCC Library could be a place to look at, at least for a temporary exhibition, with the Head of School making approaches in this direction.
- 4.4.5 The PRG feels there is potential to develop more international connections regarding research. Following the last Research Quality Review, which recognises and expresses the need for more internationalisation, this line of development should be given a high priority. Indeed, this effort will certainly contribute to driving a novel impetus to research and education programs. This line of development would certainly help the school to be more ambitious in its research publication police and strategy.
- 4.4.6 The PRG would have welcomed a clear response to issues raised in the last research review. It was difficult for us to find a well-structured response to issues raised in the last Research Review. Some of them have already been referred to in this report but a much clearer response to them in the SAR would have been welcome.



## 4.5 Staff Development

- 4.5.1 In Appendix G Staff Development, the School of Education set out staff development activities and the PRG noted and commended the following:
- 4.5.1.1 staff development is linked to the inter-linked areas of teaching, learning and research;
  - 4.5.1.2 academic staff development needs are identified by the School's programmes committees and through discussions at staff meetings;
  - 4.5.1.3 the 2012-13 staff development programme includes seminars on: The Junior Cycle Review; Literacy Development; Using METIS to monitor student progress and Marking Student Work;
  - 4.5.1.4 the Cohort PhD generates new opportunities and needs for staff development, e.g., public lectures, staff development seminars, courses and events have covered themes of supervision, co-authoring with research students, contemporary issues in doctoral education, research methods and applied research;
  - 4.5.1.5 individual staff development needs are identified through performance reviews, mentoring/one-to-one meetings with individual staff members and followed up with HR or locally at School level;
  - 4.5.1.6 in relation to individual staff members, every effort is made to facilitate attendance at conferences and to support conferences held in UCC;
  - 4.5.1.7 in 2011, it was decided to ring-fence some funding to support research, particularly work leading to publications in peer-reviewed journals and also the presentation of research at conferences;
  - 4.5.1.8 while UCC as a whole has ceased funding attendance at conferences, staff may apply to CACSSS for funding up to €500 for this purpose;
  - 4.5.1.9 staff members in the School who are registered for doctorates have been given a reduced work load and supported in prioritising their doctoral studies over other curriculum development, administrative, and research activity;
  - 4.5.1.10 some academic staff members attend seminars delivered by Ionad Bairre, UCC's Teaching and Learning Centre;
  - 4.5.1.11 a number of staff are actively involved in the running and development of programmes run by Ionad Bairre (Certificate/ Diploma in Teaching and Learning in Third Level Education);
  - 4.5.1.12 the School Manager oversees and monitors the development needs of the core administrative staff and advises the Head of School on appropriate responses;
  - 4.5.1.13 administrative staff are expected and encouraged to update their range of skills and the current team has demonstrated a desire for such development;
  - 4.5.1.14 despite the financial constraints it is hoped that the School and the University can continue to support the development of its staff with reference to teaching and research;
  - 4.5.1.15 the topics of professional learning, inter-agency working, placement and workplace learning pertain to the programmes in teacher education and in childhood studies and are likely to remain challenging, exciting areas of importance in the coming years. Therefore it is expected that staff will need opportunities to evolve thinking and practices in these spheres;

4.5.1.16 research students now have two supervisors and all supervisors are encouraged to regularly update their practice by participating in the sessions made available through the Graduate Studies Office and also to share practice and concerns through regular meetings about supervision and the mentoring of research students;

4.5.1.17 changes to programmes brought about by directives from accreditation bodies (especially the Teaching Council) will always be prioritised by the School and resources will need to be directed towards ensuring that staff collectively have the necessary skills to implement accredited programmes.

4.5.2 The PRG notes that in the Benchmarking Exercise, representatives from UCC's School of Education found that they had much in common with the School of Education at Cardiff Metropolitan University with regard to provision for staff development (Benchmarking - SAR ps. 24-25).

4.5.3 The PRG notes that in the SWOT Analysis undertaken by the School of Education for its Self Assessment Report, training or staff development courses/events organized by the School, the College or other agencies over the previous three years had been attended by 75.0% (12) of the Academic Staff, 42.1% (8) of Part-time Staff and 100.0% (7) of the Administrative Staff.

4.5.4 Staff Development through External Relations - the PRG notes that Active research links exist with colleagues across a range of universities and research institutions internationally e.g. USA, Australia, UK, France, Norway, Sweden, New Zealand, South Africa and Uganda. Staff also belong to SIGs and international networks and there are research collaborations with other researchers in UCC and across Irish Universities (e.g. the Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South, SCoTENS)" (Appendices P. 329).

4.5.5 The PRG notes that in its *Strategic Goals and Leading Actions to achieve our Mission*, the School of Education states at 11 that it will continue to promote the professional development of teaching staff and adjust professional development to meet the needs of the next five years. Particular areas of development will be in the sphere of technology-enabled learning, mentoring for schools, and school-university partnerships. (Appendices P. 417).

4.5.6 The PRG heard the following during meetings with individual members of staff :

4.5.6.1.1 a wish to attend conferences when not presenting a paper (it is noted that funding up to €500 is available through College funds for this);

4.5.6.1.2 a request for training and development for new course leaders would be welcomed (it is noted that such already exists through a mentoring process);

4.5.6.1.3 a desire for annual, rather than bi-annual, appraisal systems to set out and monitor individual staff development;

4.5.6.1.4 the Acting Vice President for Teaching and Learning expressed gratitude for School of Education staff input into Ionad Bairre programmes.

4.5.7 In the Overall Summary Recommendations (based on Analyses of Questionnaires, SWOT and Staffing), the School of Education makes the following statements which relate directly or indirectly to staff development:

- 4.5.7.1.1 ‘There is a need to devote energy to developing more flexible modes of delivery by exploiting the new technologies.’ (SAR p.13);
- 4.5.7.1.2 ‘Staff development needs to be progressive and there is a need for greater engagement with schools and workplaces. While much staff development needs to be customised according to existing needs and needs arising, it will also be important for colleagues to source suitable CPD that is available within the university, e.g., research awards support.’ (SAR p.15);
- 4.5.7.1.3 ‘The need to evolve our links with schools remains significant especially in light of new demands from the Teaching Council for placement, integration of theory and practice, reflective practice as well as new demands from changing curricula at post primary level.’ (SAR p.15).

## 4.6 External Relations

- 4.6.1 This section has a dual focus, one centred on staff engagement with external bodies and the other looking at School of Education students studying abroad and international students coming to the School of Education. There is evidence that there is vibrant activity in the former while the latter is not a strong feature of the School. They will be dealt with separately, in so far as that is applicable, here.
- 4.6.2 The PRG notes that staff contribute to national policy making through their work on national bodies, for instance, the Teaching Council, the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment and Irish Aid. Active research links exist with colleagues across a range of universities and research institutions internationally e.g. USA, Australia, UK, France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, New Zealand, South Africa and Uganda.’ (SAR p. 6).
- 4.6.3 The PRG notes that staff had been supported financially, through a centralised academic travel grant and also from School funds, as noted previously at 4.5.1.7, to attend national and international conferences, and papers and symposia have been presented at major international conferences [e.g. the American Educational Research Association (AERA), European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI); the British Educational Research Association (BERA), international conference of the United Kingdom Literacy Association; (UKLA), and the European Conference on Educational Research (ECER)] as a direct result of this invaluable research support. (Appendices p.328).
- 4.6.4 The PRG notes that while University support is no longer available for travel to international conferences, CACSSS now makes some funding available for this purpose.
- 4.6.5 The PRG notes the School of Education states that:
  - 4.6.5.1.1 it will enhance interaction with the public and showcase research by hosting public lectures, summer schools, events and conferences;
  - 4.6.5.1.2 it intends to extend links with BRIC countries and with “old” and “new” Europe including the IUFM, Clermont-Auvergne and Lumsa University in Rome;
  - 4.6.5.1.3 some students have the opportunity to study comparative education linked to a visit to China and stronger links will be established with the University of Shanghai and Chengdu Sport University;

- 4.6.5.1.4 in Childhood Studies, several students through the Erasmus programme have had the opportunity to spend a semester on placement in the US, Canada and many EU countries;
  - 4.6.5.1.5 in conjunction with the HOPE foundation, students have been placed in Calcutta, while involvement with the TVP Volunteer Project has enabled student placements in Tanzania. (Appendices p.419);
  - 4.6.5.1.6 the intention is that every academic member of staff will demonstrate tangible evidence of a significant international engagement annually as reported on UCC's institutional research information system (IRIS). (Appendices p.419).
- 4.6.6 The PRG noted that external relations are frequently connected to research and this is covered in the Research Section of this Report. There is an impressive list of connections with bodies within UCC, at national level and internationally provided in Appendix H: External Relations Appendices p.361 – 366.
- 4.6.7 The PRG notes that at H9, in its analysis of External Relations, the School states that its 'involvement with both internal and external agencies of all kinds...demonstrates the commitment of staff to the aims outlined in the School's mission statement. Furthermore it illustrates the diversity of academic interests present within the School'. (Appendices p. 366).

#### **4.7 Internationalisation**

- 4.7.1 The *UCC Strategic Plan for the Student Experience 2009-2012* includes the following at 5.7 – Strengthening Internationalisation: 'the international character of the university is reflected in the wide-ranging academic linkages with universities overseas, the presence of 2,000 international students on campus and opportunities for UCC students to study abroad as an integral part of their degree programme. Some 80 nationalities are present on campus and such ethnic diversity enriches student life as do opportunities to study abroad. Internationalisation will be further strengthened through:
- building new academic partnerships with prestigious foreign universities;
  - developing international academic programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate levels including joint degrees;
  - exploiting the potential for twinning programmes;
  - providing more study abroad opportunities for UCC students under ERASMUS throughout the European Union and beyond under bilateral university agreements;
  - expanding the number of undergraduate and postgraduate degrees students especially from non-EU countries;
  - increasing the number of visiting students under the Junior Year Abroad Programme.' (P. 18).
- 4.7.2 The CACSSS Strategic Plan 2009-2012 re *Policy Initiatives in Respect of Students* states that 'The College (CACSSS) will seek:
- 4.7.2.1 to maintain an international campus (c. 10% non-Irish/non-EU students);

- 4.7.1.2 to market courses to international and JYA students in order to create a stimulating educational environment for all college students (p.11).
- 4.7.3 In the Analysis of External Relations, the School of Education states that ‘Some of our students have the opportunity to study comparative education linked to a visit to China and we hope to establish stronger links with the University of Shanghai and Chengdu Sport Uni. This international dimension is being developed to provide greater understanding of cultural diversity and to enhance the internationalisation of curricula more generally’ (Appendices p. 366).
- 4.7.4 The PRG notes that the Higher Education Authority (HEA), in its National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030, puts forward its policy on Internationalising higher education stating that ‘Throughout the world, educational institutions are collaborating across national boundaries, students are pursuing all or parts of their studies in different countries, and researchers and teaching staff are transferring permanently or temporarily between institutions. Institutions need to engage with international students in creative and positive ways. They should also take advantage of the opportunities to enrich their students’ experience, their staff development, and their research work by cooperating and working jointly with complementary institutions in other countries. Irish institutions need to grasp the opportunities presented by this increasing trend towards internationalisation of higher education.’ (HEA p. 80).
- 4.7.5 The HEA policy on Internationalisation is reinforced in the Report of the International Review Panel on the Structure of Initial Teacher Education Provision in Ireland (July 2012) stating that ‘Internationalisation in higher education is one of the key aspects of European higher education policy today... The Review Panel was surprised at the relatively low level of international student mobility in Ireland, for example in the Erasmus programme, particularly in view of the fact that Ireland is an English-speaking country. In particular, the proportion of outgoing students in teacher education institutions is very low by European standards... It suggests that a concerted effort should be made, at national level, to attract student teachers to the country and to encourage Irish student teachers to spend part of their study period abroad... European higher education systems aim to have one-fifth of their students graduating with one or other kind of internationalisation element in their degrees... The two-way experience would be valuable and enriching for teacher education.’ (pp. 23-24)
- 4.7.6 In the Overall Summary Recommendations\_the School of Education has not made reference to External Relations or Internationalisation.

## 4.8 Support Services

- 4.8.1 The School of Education clearly enjoys a positive working relationship with the Boole library in UCC. There is generally a high level of satisfaction among both staff and students with library facilities, resources and services. There is scope for School of Education staff to more energetically use their funding allocation for purchasing new resources through the Library services.

- 4.8.2 The SWOT analysis recognised that in the current climate, financial issues may impinge on intake into programmes and may directly affect student retention and the quality of the student experience.
- 4.8.3 While the school appears to have a good working relationship with the Disability Support Service, the PRG found that there could be greater awareness of and more conscious links developed with other university supports such as: careers; counselling; peer support; financial advice; international welfare; health; chaplaincy and students union.

## **4.9 Staffing**

- 4.9.1 The quality of academic and administrative staff in the School is high, and with the exception of assessment and feedback (which is explored more fully above) students speak in praiseworthy terms of the quality of the work of the staff. The staff are clearly dedicated to their roles, in terms of administration, teaching and scholarly research.
- 4.9.2 That said, it is clear that the School has certain pressing requirements in terms of staffing. In particular we note:
  - 4.9.2.1 due to staff movements and an internal promotion, there are several key vacancies in the academic staffing of the School. The PRG strongly supports the need for making appointments to fill these gaps;
  - 4.9.2.2 there are clear and strongly-felt issues surrounding the moratorium on administrative promotion. The PRG believes that a reconsideration of this position at University level is important in order to prevent further leakage of key administrative staff;
  - 4.9.2.3 administrative coverage on the EYCS programme is particularly problematic, as
  - 4.9.2.4 administrative cover is only available for 2.5 days/week. There is no administrative presence for this course between Wednesday lunchtime and the following Monday morning. In the view of the PRG, this impacts significantly both upon the student experience and places undue pressure on other administrative staff;
  - 4.9.2.5 whilst there is a moratorium on the employment of new administrative staff, it emerged in the course of the PRG review that courses attracting significant non-exchequer funding can use some of these monies to appoint appropriate support staffing. The School should consider whether this provides a potential way of bringing targeted administrative and other support into the School, which might free up staff for other duties.

## **4.10 Accommodation**

- 4.10.1 The dispersion of the school in seven separate buildings creates difficulties for the operations associated with its mission. The Eureka Science laboratory emerges as a good example and may be a case study for future improvements in accommodation and infrastructures. On the contrary the lack of a space for staff informal meetings and for exhibiting examples of research and teaching publications reveals the need for some reflection at School, College and even University level on the issue of accommodation and infrastructures. This effort should also contribute to improving the capacity and

giving more visibility to the School's Resource Laboratory (Fernhurst, Donovan Road) for student teachers.

- 4.10.2 Given the limited access hours to the Education Resources Room and the SEN resources room, the PRG felt that the School may wish to consider whether the contents of these facilities might be better housed in the main library, where more comprehensive access for students would be possible. This might also make available space for the kinds of meeting room referred to in the previous paragraphs.

#### **4.11 Financing**

- 4.11.1 Financial matters, in the current economic climate in Ireland, are a continuing cause for concern and universities, including UCC, have suffered their share of government-imposed budgetary cutbacks. They have also been subject to the employment embargo under the IMF Employment Control Framework which has stymied revision of grading for staff, promotion of staff and recruitment of new staff. Therefore, while the School of Education is the largest generator of fee income in UCC, through its post-graduate programmes, it cannot reap the rewards in terms of staffing and other resources. Much of its research income is externally sourced.
- 4.11.2 In Appendix C: School Organisation and Planning at C2 Budgeting in the Schools the UCC Allocated Budget is explained and the following points partly illustrate the situation:
- 4.11.2.1 all income earned by the School of Education goes into the UCC central exchequer;
  - 4.11.2.2 resources within UCC are allocated to the four Academic Colleges using the Resource Allocation Model (RAM);
  - 4.11.2.3 CACSSS receives its allocation from UCC and the Head of College then allocates income to the schools within the College;
  - 4.11.2.4 the School of Education is part of CACSSS, the College which allocates its budget.
- 4.11.3 The PRG heard that it is necessary for UCC to use School of Education surplus finance to support more expensive, less financially viable programmes to maintain a balance of programme provision across the university. However, it was not possible for the PRG to ascertain the per capita expenditure on students in the School of Education in comparison to students in other disciplines. This is an important matter and, despite explanations with regard to variables in formulae, it should be possible to produce the answer.
- 4.11.4 The School of Education states that 'at the time of the School's last review in 2005, the report stated that no consultation occurred between CACSSS and the School in determining the budget for the year. This situation has changed, in particular facilitated by the appointment of a Finance Analyst to the College. Since then, the School of Education has been fortunate to receive a favourable hearing in securing adequate funds to run the School. While the staffing embargo means that the funds cannot always be targeted towards our greatest need, we wish to acknowledge the financial support that has been available in recent times from the College of ACSSS.' (Appendices p. 195).

- 4.11.5 Budgetary details are given and it is explained that ‘...allocations are to cover both Non-pay (consumables) items and Part-Time Pay. The School of Education has a large team of part-time staff and also incurs huge costs in relation to travel and other expenses involved in the placement element of the PDE.’ (Appendices p. 196).
- 4.11.6 In the Analysis of Budgeting we are told that “The flow of information from central administration has improved and the university continues to make improvements to the central databank of information. As stated earlier, the School of Education has a very good working relationship with the College of ACSSS and has been able to rely on the Head of College, College Manager and Finance Analyst for information and consultation when required. This enables timely decision-making and up-to-date report compilation at School level...However... there is a need for further financial analyst support at the School level. With such large budgets to administer and the wide range of other activities that a Manager of a School of this size is required to be involved in, the School believes there is a necessity to restructure how it currently manages the finances of the School. The School has identified a gap in a structure where the Manager (Admin Grade 7) and an Executive Assistant are entirely responsible for these large budgets. The School of Education would benefit greatly from the appointment of an Accounts Administrative Assistant (Grade 4-5) to oversee the day-to-day management of all budgetary matters in the School, with the School Manager taking on the role of overseeing the School budget, in consultation with the Head of School. Currently much of this work is undertaken by a member of staff at Executive Assistant grade. A higher grade would better reflect the current level of activity while allowing expansion of some of the responsibilities within the role to provide some additional budgetary support to the Head of School and School Manager.’ (Appendices p. 197).
- 4.11.7 The School of Education was awarded €614,169 in external funding over the 5-year period 2008-2012, all competitively won awards, and details of these may be found in Appendix F. It ‘will continue to seek funding from national (DES, NCSE, NCTE, NCCA, SCoTENS, IRCHSS/IRC, IRCSET, Irish Aid, Teaching Council), international (e.g. European Science Foundation) and industrial (e.g. science-related companies) agencies.’ (Appendices p. 332).
- 4.11.8 The School of Education says that ‘Library funding has varied over the last five years and, not surprisingly, has been subject to some reduction. Nevertheless, the libraries provision of electronic journal system, supported by the HEA for all Irish universities, ensures staff and post-graduate researchers (PhD students especially) have access to journals vital to research in education...Library and the School’s own Teaching Resource Lab (TRL) subscriptions to professional journals (teacher union, professional associations, e.g. ACSD’s Educational Leadership) ensures staff have access to a range very ‘up-to-date’ material on vital issues in educational policy and practice...’ (Appendices p. 337).
- 4.11.9 In the Overall Summary Recommendations (based on Analyses of Questionnaires, SWOT and Staffing), the School of Education makes the following statements which relate directly or indirectly to Finance:
- 4.11.9.1 ‘colleagues appreciate the financial support occasionally available for their research and every effort should be made to ensure such support is continued and expanded.’ (SAR p. 13);



- 4.11.9.2 ‘serious consideration needs to be given to the non-replacement of senior academic staff over the last several years at a time of major change in course planning and provision and in light of significant increase in doctoral student numbers and the need for succession planning in the years ahead.’ (SAR p. 14);
- 4.11.9.3 ‘the need to consider the administrative support for the EYCS degree is urgent in light of the non-replacement of the former administrator of the course.’ (SAR p. 14);
- 4.11.9.4 ‘as is highlighted elsewhere in this review, the administrative staff of the school are seen as a key strength but their knowledge and commitment may be lost to the school (and CACSSS) if an opportunity for upgrading is not presented within the current posts.’ (SAR p.15);
- 4.11.9.5 ‘given the complexity and range of financial accounting in the School there is need for an Accounts Administrator (Grade 5-5) to oversee the day-to-day management of all budgetary matters in the school.’ (SAR p. 15).
- 4.11.9.6 While the School of Education believes ‘it has been fortunate to receive a favourable hearing in securing adequate funds to run the School’, the PRG regards the following extract as indicative of a regrettable financial situation considering the School’s contribution to the UCC budget: ‘The School views staff opportunities to engage with the wider research community as vital to the development of a research and publishing culture. Hence, despite cutbacks centrally within the university to the travel funds available to individual staff members, the School initiated its own research travel fund as well as research support fund (as detailed in App G). In all, between support for research project development and conference travel, there were 17 small grants to staff in 2012.’ (Appendices p. 337).

## 4.12 Communications

- 4.12.1 Communication structures in the School of Education appear to be working well. Staff are embedded in clear organisational systems, and much evidence was presented that confirmed that communication was flowing effectively between groupings and individuals. Some amount of overlap was noted in relation to programme or course committees that contain several of the same staff; but this may be inevitable (and indeed efficient) when particular skills or curricular areas are in high demand, or when a single module contributes to more than one academic programme.
- 4.12.2 The PRG noted that there was no single place where School staff can meet informally and without pre-arrangement, such as a staff common room, and that there was some demand for that. The multi-site build of the School (and the complex timetables occasioned by the breadth of UG and PG, full- and part-time courses delivered) does not lend itself to the establishment of a fixed break time when many might be able to make themselves available. It may nevertheless be worth trialling some such arrangements so that staff have greater opportunity to come to know one another well outside the fora of course-related committees.

4.12.3 Students drew attention to good practice in communication also, for example on the PDSEN, where systems are in place to allow course-related issues to be raised and resolved expeditiously.

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

4.13.1 This is covered effectively in p.449 of Appendices. The PRG feels that there is good follow through in terms of response to the findings of the last quality review.

4.13.2 In order to reflect the quality of work that has taken place in the School since the last quality review, the PRG feels some of the School's major achievements and developments could have been set out as examples: e.g. the Science laboratory.

**4.14 Compliance with European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area – especially relevant sections of Part 1 of the ESG.**

4.14.1 The School complies with European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance as set out in the ESG.

## **5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

### **5.1 PRG Recommendations with regard to School Organisation and Planning**

- 5.1.1 The PRG recommends considering possibilities, where appropriate, for coalescing and rationalising the work of some of the School committees (e.g. where teaching teams between programmes overlap) where doing so would free up staff time.
- 5.1.2 The PRG recommends exploring potential course development to attract international students in the interests of:
- (i) creating new contexts for teaching and learning;
  - (ii) generating additional income for the School;
  - (iii) creating additional posts.
- 5.1.3 The PRG strongly recommend the appointment of staff to the vacant academic and administrative posts.

### **5.2 PRG Recommendations with regard to Teaching and Learning**

- 5.2.1 The PRG recommends that the School considers on-going provision for the large number of students graduating from the Early Years and Childhood Development programme, as this cohort represents a significant potential on-going market for the School.
- 5.2.2 The PRG recommends that the development of new strategies relating to internationalisation of programmes be given careful consideration, as the International student market represents a significant area of opportunity for the University.
- 5.2.3 In order to address issues surrounding the assessment and return of students' work, the PRG recommends the establishment and publication to students, on all courses, of clear timeframes for return of assignments and mechanisms for students to complain and receive a formal response where these timeframes are not met;

### **5.3 PRG Recommendations with regard to the SAR**

- 5.3.1 The PRG recommends that in future review cycles the academic review group think carefully about how information is presented in the SAR in order to maximise impact. Less reliance on extended prose and lengthy bullet pointed lists would have provided a clearer insight. Presentation of elements of the materials in tabular or other form would have been helpful, as would a clear relationship between review of activity against previous targets, emerging on-going development targets and how these relate to broader institutional imperatives as set out in the UCC Strategic Plan.

- 5.3.2 Thought could be given as to how some of the materials presented in the Appendices could more usefully have been grouped and signposted within the SAR document.

#### **5.4 PRG Recommendations with regard to Research and Scholarly Activity**

- 5.4.1 We suggest reorganising ‘the research unit’, considering, for example, research lines in order to build research teams, accommodate the already well-established research interests and open new windows for those eventually not identifying themselves with the established areas. This could help academic staff to find new ‘research lines’, and reinforce their willingness to be engaged in developing and consolidating the School research culture;
- 5.4.2 We recommend the development of clear collaborative research activities, in teams with adequate critical mass (e.g. through further focusing the work of research clusters);
- 5.4.3 We strongly recommend a permanent display of staff publications, in order to maintain students, colleagues, other stakeholders and public in general well informed about the School ‘vibrant research culture’. We believe that this could stimulate more students to enrol in research in the future and contribute to a stronger sense of community. Parallel to this, we also suggest a more informative Web page;
- 5.4.4 We strongly recommend the development of more international connections regarding research;
- 5.4.5 We strongly recommend that the School develop a strategic response to the internal Research Review in order to demonstrate how it is moving against institutional and School imperatives;
- 5.4.6 To maintain and develop supervisory capacity and quality at doctoral level, the PRG recommends the involvement of more qualified supervisors.
- 5.4.7 We strongly recommend targeting high impact journals for publication.

#### **5.5 PRG Recommendations with regard to External Relations and internationalisation**

- 5.5.1 The PRG recommends that the School of Education maintain a range of external relations activities while being mindful of the demands on staff with a heavy workload;
- 5.5.2 The PRG recommends that the School of Education begin a discussion at staff level with regard to Internationalisation;
- 5.5.3 The PRG recommends that the School of Education take cognisance of the HEA policy on Internationalisation and move to attract international students and also to place its students overseas, as is already happening in other UCC programmes

## **5.6 PRG Recommendations with regard to Finance**

- 5.6.1 The PRG recommends that vacant academic and administrative posts be filled forthwith;
- 5.6.2 The PRG recommends that an Accounts Administrative Assistant be appointed to the School of Education;
- 5.6.3 The PRG recommends that sufficient finance be allocated to areas of need, e.g., appointment of staff; staff attendance at conferences; the School might consider turning one of its relatively little-used resource centres into a staff room and relocating these resources to the main UCC Library where there are longer opening hours (obviously the Library would want to look at quantities of material and storage implications, but we would strongly encourage the School to consider this to maximise their space resources);
- 5.6.4 The PRG recommends that information on the per capita expenditure per student in the School of Education be made available in the interests of transparency with regard to income and expenditure in the School;
- 5.6.5 The PRG recommends that the student/lecturer ratio be considered, and improved, in consideration of the findings at 4.

## **5.7 PRG Recommendations with regard to Staff Development**

- 5.7.1 The PRG recommends that the School of Education make specific plans for the implementation of Goal 11 in its *Strategic Goals and Leading Actions to achieve our Mission* i.e.: ‘We will continue to promote the professional development of our teaching staff and adjust our professional development to meet the needs of the next five years. Particular areas of development will be in the sphere of technology-enabled learning, mentoring for schools, and school-university partnerships.’ (Appendices P. 417);
- 5.7.2 As an elaboration of No. 3 in the Overall Summary Recommendations and on “technology-enabled learning “ in 1 above, the PRG recommends that all staff members familiarise themselves with the most advanced IT methodologies which are appropriate for teaching, learning and assessment so that these may be modelled for student teachers and replicated by the latter during their school placement;
- 5.7.3 The PRG recommends that the School of Education further develop the collaborative staff processes whereby in-house, programme-based and cross-programme expertise is shared through one-to-one, small group and whole group meetings/discussions/seminars;
- 5.7.4 The PRG recommends that each staff member set out an individual, annual, personal plan for his/her professional development, in consultation with his/her line manager;

- 5.7.5 The PRG recommends that the School of Education engage with Ionad Bairre with a view to customised programmes being developed for the School of Education staff, perhaps on a reciprocal basis in consideration of the School's input to Ionad Bairre programmes;
- 5.7.6 The PRG recommends that the School of Education pay close attention to the professional development needs of Part-Time staff, particularly school placement supervisors, to ensure that they are au fait and up-to-date with subject content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge, thus avoiding any conflict or contradiction between college teaching, school practice and the supervisor's expectations;
- 5.7.7 While recognising the heavy workload carried by staff members, the PRG recommends that staff maintain and develop their understanding of the enactment of their own area(s)/specialism(s) in the reality of school life so as to enhance their credibility in their engagement with students and schools.

## SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

### PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT TIMETABLE

#### In Summary

- Monday 21 January: The Peer Review Group (PRG) arrives at the River Lee Hotel for a briefing, followed by an informal meeting with School staff members.
- Tuesday 22 January: The PRG considers the Self-Assessment Report and meets with school staff, student and stakeholder representatives. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG.
- Wednesday 23 January: The PRG meets with relevant officers of UCC. An exit presentation is given by the PRG to all members of the School. 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.
- Thursday 24 January: External PRG members depart.

<b>Monday 21 January 2013</b>	
16.00 – 18.00	Meeting of members of the Peer Review Group. Briefing by: Professor Ken Higgs, Acting Director of Quality 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. <b>Venue: Tower Room, River Lee Hotel, Western Road</b>
19.00	Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group & Head of School & School Co-ordinating Committee:  Dr Paul Conway Ms Angela Desmond Dr Siobhan Dowling Professor Kathy Hall, Head Dr Rosaleen Murphy Dr Stephen O'Brien Dr Anna Ridgway <b>Venue: Jacobs on the Mall, South Mall, Cork.</b>

<b>Tuesday 22 January 2013</b>		<b>Venue: Tower Room 1, North Wing, Main Quadrangle UCC</b> <i>(unless otherwise specified)</i>	
08.30 – 08.45	Convening of Peer Review Group		
08.45 – 09.30	Professor Kathy Hall, Head of School		
09.30 – 10.30	Group meeting with all School staff <b>Venue: Council Room, North Wing, Main Quadrangle</b>		
10.30 – 11.00	Tea/coffee		
11.00 – 13.00	<b>Private meetings with individual staff members</b> <u>Group 1</u> 11.00: Dr Brian Murphy 11.15: Mr Denis Burns 11.30: Dr Declan Kennedy 11.45: Dr Fiona Chambers 12.00: Dr Fiachra Long 12.15: Dr Paul Conway 12.30: Dr Maura Cunneen <b>Venue: Tower Room 1, Main Quad.</b>	<b>Private meetings with individual staff members</b> <u>Group 2</u> 11.00: Ms Pat O'Connor 11.15: Mr Michael Delargey 11.30: Ms Angela Desmond 11.45: Ms Stephanie Larkin 12.00: Dr Stephen O'Brien 12.15: Ms Jacinta McKeon 12.30: Ms Carol Kennedy <b>Venue: Tower Room 2, Main Quad.</b>	
13.00 – 14.00	Working lunch		
14.00 – 15.30	Visit to core facilities of School, escorted by Professor Kathy Hall, Head of School, Ms Angela Desmond and Dr Declan Kennedy.		
15.30 – 16.15	<u>Representatives of undergraduate students</u> Niamh Baylor, 3 <sup>rd</sup> year, EYCS Patricia Coffey, 2 <sup>nd</sup> year, BSc(Ed) Leigh Dowling, 3 <sup>rd</sup> year, SSPE Ryan Gallagher, 3 <sup>rd</sup> year, BSc(Ed) Brendan Gilmartin, 2 <sup>nd</sup> year, EYCS Michael O Se, 1 <sup>st</sup> year, SSPE Grace O'Sullivan, 2 <sup>nd</sup> year, EYCS Elizabeth Prout, 1 <sup>st</sup> year, EYCS Catherine Russell, 4 <sup>th</sup> year, BSc(Ed) Stephen Sheehan, 3 <sup>rd</sup> year, EYCS <i>SSPE = Sports Studies &amp; Physical Education</i> <i>EYCS = Early Years &amp; Childhood Studies</i>		
16.20 – 17.00	<u>Representatives of graduate students</u> Caragh Bell, MEd (Modular) Kieran Burke, PDE Frances Clerkin, PhD Shauna Harrington, PDE Joe Moynihan, Cohort PhD		



	Valerie Mulcahy, PDSen Eileen O'Leary, PDSen Clare O'Sullivan, Cohort PhD
17.00 – 18.00	<u>Representatives of stakeholders, past graduates and employers</u> Ms. Cáit Breathnach, Colaiste Choilm Ms. Mary Keane, Principal, Christ the King Secondary School Mr. James Levis, past graduate Dr. Seamus Mac an Rí, Postgraduate Applications Centre Mr. Duncan McCarthy, past graduate Ms. Yvonne Ní Chualain, past graduate Mr. Donal O Buachalla, National Association of Principals & Deputy Principals (NAPD) Mr. David O'Connell, past graduate Mr. Bernard Twomey, Health Service Executive <b>Venue: Staff Common Room, North Wing, Main Quadrangle</b>
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. <b>Venue: Tower Room, River Lee Hotel, Western Road</b>

<b>Wednesday 23 January 2013</b>	
<b>Venue: Tower Room 1, North Wing, Main Quadrangle UCC</b> <i>(unless otherwise specified)</i>	
08.30 – 09.00	Convening of Peer Review Group
09.00 – 09.45	Professor Caroline Fennell, Head of College, CACSSS
09.45 – 10.15	Professor Anita Maguire, Vice-President for Research Policy & Support
10.15 – 10.30	Mr. Cormac McSweeney, Finance Office
10.30 – 11.00	Tea/coffee
11.00 – 11.15	Dr. Bettie Higgs, Deputising for the Vice-President for Teaching and Learning
11.15 – 12.30	Visit to UCC Library, meeting with Ms Margot Conrick, Head of Information Services and Mr. Ger Prendergast, Subject Librarian, Boole Library.
12.30 – 13.00	Professor Paul Giller, Registrar and Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs
13.00 – 14.00	Working lunch
14.00 – 16.30	Preparation of first draft of final report
16.30 – 16.45	Professor Kathy Hall, Head of School
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.

	<p>This presentation is <u>not</u> for discussion at this time.</p> <p><b>Venue: Council Room, North Wing, Main Quadrangle.</b></p>
19.00	<p>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.</p> <p><b>Venue: Tower Room, River Lee Hotel, Western Road</b></p>