



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

**QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY ENHANCEMENT**

**SCHOOL OF FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL SCIENCE**

**PEER REVIEW PANEL REPORT**

***ACADEMIC YEAR 2016-17***

**October 2017**

## Contents

Peer Review Panel Members .....	3
Context.....	3
Peer Review .....	3
Methodology.....	3
Self-Evaluation Report (SER).....	4
SWOT Analysis.....	4
Benchmarking .....	4
Developments since the last Review .....	4
Tour of the Facilities .....	5
Overall Analysis.....	5
Findings of the Panel.....	6
Recommendations to the School.....	11
Recommendations to the College .....	12
Recommendations to the University .....	12
Appendix 1: Site Visit Timetable .....	14

## Peer Review Panel Members

Name	Position/Discipline	Institution
Professor Sarah Culloty (Chair)	Head, School of Biological, Environmental and Earth Sciences	University College Cork
Mr Donnacha Fitzgerald (Student reviewer)	School of Pharmacy	University College Cork
Professor Richard Ipsen	Department of Food Science	University of Copenhagen
Professor Susan Lanham-New	Head, Department of Nutritional Sciences	University of Surrey
Dr Ed Shinnick	Department of Economics	University College Cork
Dr Kay Taaffe	Panel Secretariat Support	University College Cork

### Context

This Review took place during a period of transition for the School, with a new Head of School in place since December 2016. In addition, the School has recently, for the first time, appointed a School Manager. Given this period of intense development, which is underscored by the development of a Food Institute which will be key to supporting the collective interests of the School, this Review comes at an opportune time, enabling the input of expert advice from academic peers and from industry. The Panel noted the huge strides that have been made within the School in recent months, particularly around communication and branding. It was also noted that the University continues to view the School of Food and Nutritional Science as a flagship School because of its highly renowned reputation in research and scholarship in these fields. The University's new Strategic Plan (2017-2022) identifies that Food is one area of the University's research that is world leading.

### Peer Review

#### Methodology

The Panel met over three days and the timetable enabled comprehensive engagement with staff, students and stakeholders, and with senior management at University and College level. The tour of the facilities was particularly useful in terms of contextualising the teaching and research activity within the School. The composition of the Panel provided good coverage across the two disciplines of Food and Nutritional Science, student representation, and knowledge of internal institutional and organisational structures within the University. Secretariat support from the Quality Enhancement Unit (QEU) was provided to the Peer Review Panel throughout, to facilitate the conduct of the review and support the Review Panel in formulating and agreeing the final Review Report.

### **Self-Evaluation Report (SER)**

The Panel considered that the SER rather under-sold the School, hiding many achievements which only became evident over the course of the Site Visit. It was remarked by the Panel that the diagram on page 5 (relating to the research activity at the School) provided a visual representation of a divide which also became apparent to the Panel during the Site Visit, namely the School presenting as separate entities along Food and Nutrition lines. While there was no indication of any inaccuracy in the SER, it appeared somewhat incomplete with little evidence of self-evaluation and reflection, nor did it address the Review recommendations from the last SER. There was some analysis of student data but much of the material presented lacked analysis and synthesis of the impact on practice on the ground.

Some useful detail was provided around staffing and the summary tables in relation to student feedback were helpful. The Report indicated a wide variety of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes and there were some excellent examples of good practice provided by FITU, which demonstrated an outward-looking perspective towards the workplace and industry. While some information is provided, the Panel would have welcomed more specific information around graduate destinations and suggest that this might be tracked more closely at School level, in association with the University's career service (or through, for example, an alumni society or LinkedIn). Given the excellent employment record of graduates within the School, this would be valuable information for prospective students and other stakeholders.

In general the SER presented more questions than answers and would have benefitted from additional synthesis and analysis of the evidence provided; for example, while considerable procedural material in relation to external accreditation was provided, there was little discussion on how this impacted on the programmes' curriculum and delivery. There was a vagueness around the accreditation with the Association for Nutrition (AfN) which was of concern to the Panel. In addition, examples of innovative teaching, or engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning, did not come through in the report and while research-led teaching was referenced in the SER, this was not supported by examples or evidence.

### **SWOT Analysis**

The SWOT analysis had been undertaken in the previous year in the context of the School's strategic planning and provides insights into the key strengths and strategic challenges facing the School. The Panel would recommend that the School engages in on-going communication and self-evaluation processes through away-days, research days, seminars etc. to enhance the overall cohesion and cooperation between the units and to ensure that all staff have an opportunity to engage in the process of strategic planning for the School and its role within the forthcoming Food Institute.

### **Benchmarking**

The benchmarking against the University of Reading was detailed and was a suitable comparison and there are similarities in terms of programmes and schools. The School benchmarked well against the comparable academic unit in terms of metrics and outputs.

### **Developments since the last Review**

The Self-Evaluation Report provided little evidence of reflection on the developments and recommendations since the last quality Review in 2009/2010. The Panel did not see the previous Panel Report (2009/2010) until quite late in the process at which point they had developed their own preliminary recommendations. It was noted that many of the same recommendations were made in 2009, and while some had been addressed, others

remained on-going, particularly in relation to the strategic integration of the School. Having had sight of the Quality Improvement Plan Status Update in 2013, the Panel notes that many actions are on-going (e.g. in relation to workload model, industry links, student supports) and should now be embedded as part of an on-going quality enhancement infrastructure within the School.

### **Tour of the Facilities**

The external reviewers were of the impression that the facilities are unprecedented at undergraduate level and are of a very high standard. The equipment was highly impressive and the School should continue its current refurbishment drive which is currently paying dividends. The Panel acknowledged the constraints around access to the teaching equipment with the current student numbers, however it was recognised that many undergraduate programmes in other HE institutions would not have equipment of this scale.

The Panel commends the new branding and image which is projecting the School in a modern and dynamic fashion and which should be continued – this is important for both students and staff. It noted, however, a lack of shared spaces for postgraduates and staff to interact with each other for either social or informal knowledge sharing. The Panel recommends that an audit of facilities for post-graduates should be undertaken to ensure appropriate conditions in terms of access to space and equipment, including such basic equipment as laptops, for all postgraduate students. The School should focus on ensuring equitable access to facilities for all postgraduates and a process for access and sharing of equipment across teams should be implemented to ensure that students do not have to go outside the School for equipment that is available internally.

### **Overall Analysis**

The Panel was impressed by the highly committed, dedicated and resourceful staff in the School; staff actively engaged with the Review and demonstrated a willingness to seek continuous improvement. It became evident to the Panel over the duration of the Site Visit that staff are committed to research-led, learner-centred teaching. However, with several staff members approaching retirement and a consequent loss of discipline specialisms, it is evident that strategic planning for development and succession will be required. The aforementioned issue of the traditional separation of Food and Nutrition emerged during meetings with staff and students alike and, in the light of the staffing issue, highlights an urgent need for the School to develop a strategy to advance more cohesively as a whole unit, leveraging the strengths of both communities within the School.

The feedback from stakeholders was very positive and it is clear that graduates from the School are held in high esteem within industry. There are addressable opportunities for improvement, for instance, in the area of soft skills and some industry stakeholders also expressed the view that they would welcome more engagement with the School. While the current demand for Food Science programmes is strong with high CAO entry points, the Panel recognises the challenge of cyclical demand and the need to ensure that the School maintains a recruitment policy which will continue to attract high quality students.

A key strength of the School is the link to industry, both for the six month work placement taken by third year students and career destinations for graduates. The invaluable support provided by the Careers Service in the delivery of this successful placement programme was noted. Students are highly supported by Programme Directors, Year Heads and Technical Staff, albeit in an informal way. The School operates an “open door” policy and there is evidence of good pastoral care. Because of the numbers on each programme and the nature

of the laboratory work, students are known individually to staff and consequently the progress of each student can be closely monitored.

The Panel noted that with increased competition from other institutions and the demand for regulation within the professions, external accreditation should be a priority; consequently it recommends that the School urgently addresses the issue of accreditation of the BSc in Nutritional Science with the AfN. The Panel acknowledges the current accreditation by the IFT of the BSc in Food Science and recommends that the School continues to review whether the IFST, when it becomes available, might be an appropriate and relevant accrediting body.

The Panel was of the view that, with the food industry being one of the fastest growing industries in the world and the strategic placement of the School in the South of Ireland at the centre of this, it is an opportune time for the School to focus on the development of its Strategic Plan with a clear implementation policy, harnessing the good will of the University, the links to APC and the imminent development of the Food Institute. The Strategic Plan should be ambitious, taking full advantage of the University's renewed emphasis on Food.

### **Findings of the Panel**

Note that the Panel's recommendations for the School, College and University are outlined at the end of this Panel Report.

### ***School Organisation and Planning***

The Panel recognised that the disciplines of Food and Nutritional Science are viewed as amongst the strongest in the University with national and international profiles in research, teaching and learning. The staff at the School are some of the highest performers in terms of research outputs in the University. It was evident that the School was in a phase of transition and that substantial effort had gone into this in recent months.

As previously mentioned, there appeared to be a lack of cohesion and integration within the School structures and this was arising at all levels across the School – including at undergraduate and postgraduate level. While there had been some interdisciplinary research projects across Food and Nutrition in recent months, governance and operational strategies need to be developed to actively encourage integration of research, academic and administrative functions across the School. This is a priority in the short to medium term.

It was highlighted that the Food programmes fluctuate in terms of numbers, with a cyclical demand for the Food Science programmes. In terms of CAO entrants, this needs to be “future proofed” by continuing to implement practices and recruitment policies which will attract students. Developments are on-going in relation to provision of programmes for international students within the School. The Panel applauded the delivery of the 2+2 programme, which has commenced with 20+ Chinese students enrolled, while recognising the additional pressures this places on resources, infrastructure and staff.

### ***School details including staff profiles***

A huge strength of the School resides with the academic staff and the research outputs that they produce. There was a clear commitment to teaching, and excellence in programme delivery, as evidenced by the number of staff who had undertaken accredited programmes in teaching and learning. The Panel was impressed by the commitment to teaching and instruction demonstrated by the Technical Officers in practical classes and the students

appreciated this interaction. There was a very strong commitment to students and student support overall – and this was highly appreciated by the students.

The School has had retirements of key academic and support staff in recent years and several more are imminent in the coming years. The current staff-student ratio is high by international standards and many academic staff carry a heavy research work-load in addition to lecturing and administrative duties.

Staff were also disappointed with the lack of support and recognition within the University, for the successes within the School, both in terms of attracting large strategic research grants and for the high impact research outputs. Staff reported highly burdensome bureaucratic systems within the University with engagement with multiple personnel and multiple administrative units required for all processes (such as Procurement, Finance, Research etc.). The lack of electronic sign-off for many processes adds to this burden. This has resulted in external stakeholders, e.g. industry partners, looking to other HEIs to partner with, where less burdensome processes are in place. This was a source of huge frustration for staff who have excellent industry engagement but see this competitive edge being eroded by the lack of agility within the system.

### ***Strategic and curriculum planning***

The excellent reputation of the School is evidenced by the on-going demand for the programmes and the high level of student entrant. The School is to be commended on its internationalisation agenda and the effort that they have put into this, while acknowledging that this brings added demands on staff.

The School annually monitors its programmes by means of feed-back from students, external-examiners and industry. Students expressed an interest in having Food and Nutrition modules earlier on the programmes, particularly in 1<sup>st</sup> year, to increase their motivation and engagement in their selected disciplines.

The School continues to develop new programmes as evidenced by the international programmes and an MSc in Dietetics which has outline approval from Academic Board and is likely to be introduced in 2019. Of particular concern to the Panel was the issue of external accreditation of programmes and in particular the current status of the BSc in Nutritional Science in respect of AfN accreditation, which was unclear.

In terms of curriculum planning, stakeholders mentioned specific areas of need for graduates within industry and these included sensory and statistical elements. The length of the work placement was mentioned as one area where other HEIs with longer placements might have an advantage but the Panel received mixed views from the industry stakeholders on this. There was also a suggestion that the programmes should continue to be responsive to other food areas if resources permitted, and seafood was presented as an example.

### **Teaching, learning and assessment**

While some staff members have taken the University's programmes in Teaching and Learning, there was little evidence in the SER of the impact or dissemination of new approaches to teaching, learning and assessment that may have been implemented as a result across the School's programmes.

Both staff members and industry representatives highlighted the need for "soft skills" for graduates. Stakeholders mentioned the need for students to expand skill sets and

understand the broader industry context or environment. It was noted that the School intends to develop a module to focus on the soft skills required by graduates when they take up employment. Many of these skills may also currently be embedded in existing modules. Many students do not recognise the opportunity for soft skills development within the programmes through, for example, work placement and group work. The Panel questioned whether it was necessary to isolate “soft skills” within a module format and suggested that these might be better incorporated within existing modules – especially in the light of pressure for the inclusion of different core skills and knowledge.

There was a keen interest amongst external stakeholders to engage with the School and it was felt that industry contacts could be leveraged more in respect of providing current and cutting-edge industry knowledge and experience. In addition, greater links could be forged between the School and FITU.

### ***Student support (academic and pastoral)***

Students reported being very well supported by the staff, although this support was informal. There was a high level of mutual respect and this was evident from discussions with both staff and students. Students benefit greatly from the links to industry, both as students seeking work placement and as graduates.

Despite being resource-heavy, staff placed a significant value on maintaining the extensive level of laboratory experience for students. Students reported a very high workload, particularly in respect of the continuous assessment associated with lab work which they perceive as receiving inadequate weighting. They also requested better advance preparation for laboratory work and more formative feed-back to support their learning.

It was noted that, as with other areas in the School, there were few opportunities for social interaction between students coming from Food Science and Nutritional Science, and the School does not have an identifiable Society designated to all students within the School (for example the Cowpunchers in times past).

Although most of the student feed-back and evaluation in the SER was positive, there was a slightly lower satisfaction rate amongst students around the Final Year Project and work placement. While there may be many reasons for this, including sample bias, it is surprising that this was the case because staff reported that students have traditionally been positive about these practice-based experiences.

The Panel acknowledges that there are university-wide processes in place for student feedback, nonetheless, they perceive a need for mechanisms at local level to provide feedback on modules, assessment, placement, student workloads etc. From the students’ perspective, it is important to have clarity on procedures to raise issues at School level.

### ***Student achievement and employability***

The School reports a very high rate of employment amongst graduates. It was noted that because of high employment levels amongst Food graduates, few are opting to undertake postgraduate programmes. Student academic achievement is in line with national norms.

One postgraduate student expressed concerns that the Postgraduate Diploma in Nutritional Science did not have sufficient employment oriented outcomes because of the lack of work-based learning and the removal of practical components from the programme. The Panel is



of the view that the School should examine the programme content and graduate outcomes on the Postgraduate programmes, particularly for non-cognate entrants.

### ***Staff Development***

Some staff are engaging in programmes provided with the OVPTL and others should be supported in doing this. Internal dissemination of innovation in relation to teaching and learning could provide another means of bringing staff together for inter-professional learning opportunities.

### ***Resources (staffing, physical, technical, other)***

While the tour of the School demonstrated excellent facilities and equipment of a very high standard, staff reported that they are struggling to maintain up-to-date teaching equipment, and a lack of capital funding means that research budgets are being used to purchase and maintain teaching equipment. In addition, postgraduate students reported a disparity of access to facilities and equipment, stating that this was often contingent on individual supervisors' research projects and funding.

### ***External relations***

The extent of the external engagement and the opportunities that this affords to graduates were reinforced at the meetings with industry stakeholders. The School is extremely fortunate to have high levels of support and good will which come from having many graduates in key, influential positions within industry. Work placement emerged as an important aspect for incoming students and attracted students to the School (e.g. through the Open Days which students commented had been very influential in their decision to come to the School). Placement was highly organised through a Placement Coordinator. The opportunity to engage in product development and entrepreneurship is encouraged through the Final Year Projects and this was welcomed by industry representatives. It is recognised that, with the development of the Food Institute, along with the APC Microbiome Institute, a shared vision for Food at UCC will be required. There appeared to be some uncertainty amongst staff as to the function and objectives of the Food Institute and the Panel had some concerns that there might not be sufficient integration and representation of Food at UCC without an active dialogue involving all stakeholders. . It is important that the Institute is viewed as an extension and integral support mechanism for the work of the School with bilateral professional knowledge-sharing and communication.

### ***Case Study of Good Practice***

The Case Study by FITU was highly commended by the Panel; it was noted that this exemplifies outward engagement with industry and presents an opportunity for replication both across the School and in other business oriented units across the University.

***Confirmation that programme provision is still located correctly on the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ)***

***Undergraduate Programmes:***

BSc in Nutritional Sciences (NFQ – Level 8)

BSc in Food Science (NFQ – Level 8)

BSc in Food Science and Technology (International; NFQ – Level 8)

BSc in Food Science and Technology (International; NFQ – Level 7 - Ordinary, exit award)

***FITU:***

Certificate in Food Science and Technology (NFQ – Level 7)

Diploma in Food Science and Technology (NFQ – Level 7)

Diploma in Speciality Food Production (NFQ – Level 7)

***Postgraduate Programmes:***

Higher Diploma in Food Science and Technology (NFQ – Level 8)

Postgraduate Diploma in Nutritional Sciences (NFQ – Level 9)

MSc in Food Science (NFQ – Level 9)

Postgraduate Certificate in Dairy Technology and Innovation (NFQ – Level 9)

The Panel agree that all programmes are located correctly on the NFQ.

***Compliance with European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area – Part 1***

The School is in compliance.

## Recommendations to the School

1. The Panel recommends that the School develops a Strategic Plan, with a shared vision integrating the interests of all the disciplines across the School, and puts in place, with the involvement of the College and University, an ambitious Implementation Plan to support the School in delivering on the University's strategy to be leaders in Food and Nutrition. Among the issues to be addressed in the Strategic Plan are:

  - A shared vision and mission for the whole School
  - A staff recruitment strategy which takes account of imminent retirements and succession planning over the next five years and beyond
  - Mechanisms for supporting inter-disciplinary engagement across the School by bringing people (staff and students) together socially, physically and academically through, *inter alia*: providing shared spaces for academic and social interaction; developing opportunities for knowledge-sharing and inter-professional learning and research; supporting a Graduate Committee for networking and peer-support amongst postgraduate students.
2. The Panel recommends that the School should pursue the external accreditation of the BSc in Nutritional Science **as a matter of top priority** given that their original accreditation has lapsed and liaise with AfN to see how best this can be achieved in the shortest time possible. In addition, the School should actively engage in external communication and dialogue to examine the potential of IFST becoming an external professional accrediting body for the BSc in Food Science.
3. The Panel recommends that the School implements a transparent workload model and develops a plan to support career development of all staff, through mentoring, training and balanced workloads to allow staff to achieve key performance indicators.
4. The Panel recommends that the School leverages the goodwill of industry links and their willingness to engage e.g. for teaching, guest speakers, career events, seminars etc. In addition, the School should exploit the opportunities for building and harnessing academic links with APC, Teagasc and others by, for example, exploring the possibility of joint academic appointments.
5. The School should ensure that the programmes continue to be responsive to industry needs, for example, by monitoring placement length and where resources permit, include sensory and statistical elements within modules, or provide electives for other food areas such as seafood.
6. The Panel recommends that the School put formal staff-student committees or processes in place to get feedback from students particularly at module and year level.

7. The Panel recommends that the School explores more non-traditional approaches to teaching and learning, and engage with the OVPTL for this.
8. The Panel recommends that the School ensures parity and equity of access for post-graduate research students to resources, including shared spaces, computers, research equipment etc. A transparent process for this needs to be implemented.
9. The Panel recommends that the School ensures the integration of international students by involving them in different aspects of School activities and social events and ensuring that Irish students in the School benefit from this multicultural environment as well.
10. The Panel recommends examining the weighting of the marks attributed to lab work and the preparation of guidelines in advance of the labs. In addition, where possible an emphasis on food/nutrition is incorporated in modules at the earliest stages of the degree programs.
11. The Panel recommends the encouragement and support of an inclusive and collaborative student society in association with the UCC Societies Guild which actively engages with all students within the School. This should be student-led and incorporate representation from each student group (class representatives, international student representative, postgraduate representative etc.) on its committee to drive its active engagement and success as an inclusive student society for the School.
12. The Panel recommends that the School examines the programme content on the Postgraduate Diploma in Nutritional Science to ensure employability and progression of graduates and ensure that students receive comprehensive information in relation to graduate outcomes prior to entering the School's programmes

### **Recommendations to the College**

1. The Panel recommends that the College and the University work to ensure that the units in UCC representing aspects of Food research (i.e. APC, the Food Institute and other relevant Schools) have a shared vision and mission for what they want to achieve.
2. The Panel recommends that the College of SEFS dedicate space on its website to celebrating and recognising staff achievements.

### **Recommendations to the University**

1. The Panel recommends the sustained implementation of an effective LEAN strategy at University level for a range of administrative processes, including finance, research and procurement, to ease the burden on staff, beyond what has currently been achieved.

2. The Panel recommends that the University put in place a simple process that will recognise staff for key achievements outside of the current awards system in place; for example, that some consideration should be given to restoring the “focus on a staff member” section on the front page of the University website. Also some consideration should be given to allowing self-nomination of staff for various staff awards and to simplifying the process for application to encourage engagement from more staff.
3. The Panel recommends that the University consider mechanisms for promotion to recognise the contribution of staff who demonstrate excellence in teaching and learning.
4. The Panel recommends that the College and the University work to ensure that the units in UCC representing aspects of food and nutrition research have a shared vision and mission for what they want to achieve.

## Appendix 1: Site Visit Timetable

### SCHOOL OF FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES

#### PEER REVIEW PANEL SITE VISIT

<b>Tuesday 19 September 2017</b>	
12.00 – 13.30	<p>Convening of Panel members. Briefing by Ms Deirdre O'Brien and Dr Kay Taaffe, Quality Enhancement Unit, followed by lunch.</p>
13.30 – 14.30	<p>Private meeting of Panel <i>Panel agree issues to be explored in meetings with Head of School, Head of College and Stakeholders.</i></p>
14.30 – 15.30	<p>Professor Paul McSweeney, Head, School of Food &amp; Nutritional Sciences (to be joined by the School Administrator, Dr Bronagh Clarke at 15.10) <i>Discussion regarding developments to date, strategic priorities of the School and overview of educational provision.</i></p>
15.30 – 16.00	<p>Tea/coffee <i>Panel agree tasks and prepare for meetings with Head of School, Head of College and Stakeholders</i></p>
16.00 – 16.50	<p>Professor Paul Ross, Head of College (to be joined by the College Financial Analyst, Ms Leonie O'Doherty, at 16.30) <i>Panel discuss College strategy and priorities. The links between College/School financial resource allocations process, staffing resources and infrastructure.</i></p>
17.00 – 18.00	<p>Meeting with Stakeholders <i>The Panel meets with past graduates, employers of graduates and other stakeholders as appropriate to discuss views on the quality of education received and the quality of the graduates.</i></p> <p><i>Stakeholders:</i></p> <p>Dr Wayne Anderson, FSAI Ms Yvonne Collins, Dairy Senior Manager, Global R&amp;D, Pepsico Ms Aileen Deasy, Seafood Technologist, BIM Seafood Development Centre Mr Cal Flynn, Kerry Group Ms Siobhan Muldowney, Wyeth Nutritionals Ireland Ltd Mr Tom O'Callaghan, Teagasc Mr Eugene O'Connor, Dairygold</p>
19.00	<p>Informal dinner for members of the Panel &amp; staff members of the School <i>School Staff members:</i> Professor Kevin Cashman, Professor of Food and Health</p>

<p>Dr Bronagh Clarke, School Manager  Ms Mary McCarthy Buckley, Training Manager, Food Industry Training Unit (FITU)  Professor Paul McSweeney, Head of School  Dr Eileen O'Neill, Programme Coordinator BSc Food Science  Dr Tony Sheehy, Programme Coordinator BSc Nutritional Sciences</p>
---

<b>Wednesday 20 September 2017</b>			
09.00 – 09.15	Convening of the Panel		
09.15 – 10.15	Meeting with School staff <i>Discuss issues such as strategy, communications, research &amp; education, staffing, teaching &amp; learning, curriculum &amp; assessment.</i>		
10.15 – 10.45	Private meeting of Panel (tea/coffee)		
10.45 – 11.30	Enhancing Student Learning Experience <i>Opportunity for the School to showcase good practice and enhancements to the student learning experience (e.g. student feedback, staff development, graduate outcomes).</i> <i>School delegates:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professor Alan Kelly – Food Science product development</li> <li>• Mary McCarthy Buckley (FITU) – good practice case study</li> <li>• Professor Paul McSweeney, Head of School</li> <li>• Dr Eileen O'Neill – work placements</li> </ul>		
11.30 – 12.30	Tour of FITU and School facilities Tour to be led by Professor Paul McSweeney, Head of School		
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch and private meeting of the Panel		
13.30 – 14.00	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Representatives of 2<sup>nd</sup> year students:</p> <p>Billy Cronin, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Food Science  Ruth Dunne, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Michelle Hanna, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Jane Walker, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Food Science</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Representatives of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year students:</p> <p>Adam Cogan, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Food Science  Aisling Crotty, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Food Science  Aisling Fiuza, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Nadine Forde, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Thomas France, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Food Science  Ellen Murphy, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Food Science  Rebecca O'Dea, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Niamh O'Flynn, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Food Science</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Representatives of 2<sup>nd</sup> year students:</p> <p>Billy Cronin, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Food Science  Ruth Dunne, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Michelle Hanna, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Jane Walker, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Food Science</p>	<p>Representatives of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year students:</p> <p>Adam Cogan, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Food Science  Aisling Crotty, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Food Science  Aisling Fiuza, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Nadine Forde, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Thomas France, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Food Science  Ellen Murphy, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Food Science  Rebecca O'Dea, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Niamh O'Flynn, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Food Science</p>
<p>Representatives of 2<sup>nd</sup> year students:</p> <p>Billy Cronin, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Food Science  Ruth Dunne, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Michelle Hanna, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Jane Walker, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Food Science</p>	<p>Representatives of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year students:</p> <p>Adam Cogan, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Food Science  Aisling Crotty, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Food Science  Aisling Fiuza, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Nadine Forde, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Thomas France, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Food Science  Ellen Murphy, 4<sup>th</sup> Year Food Science  Rebecca O'Dea, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Nutritional Sciences  Niamh O'Flynn, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Food Science</p>		
14.00 – 14.30	Representatives of Postgraduate students: Giovanni Barone, Food Science (PhD)		

	Andrea Hemmingway, Nutritional Sciences (PhD) Tracey Kelly, Nutritional Sciences MSc (Research) Anuya Mane, Food Science (PhD)
14.45 – 15.15	Professor Caroline Fennell, Senior Vice President Academic & Registrar <i>Discussion of University academic and development strategy</i>
15.15 – 15.45	Tea/coffee
15.45 – 16.30	Meeting with senior officers of the University: Dr David O’Connell, Office of the Vice President for Research & Innovation Professor John O’Halloran, Vice President for Teaching & Learning
16.30 – 17.30	Meeting with Programme Directors/Chairs of Boards of Studies <i>Discussion on monitoring and review of programmes to include indicatively, student progression, assessment, External Examiner reports, external accreditation /recognition (where appropriate), supports for learners, placement (where appropriate).</i> <i>School delegates:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professor Alan Kelly (MSc Food Science – taught programme)</li> <li>• Ms Clodagh Kerr (Careers Services Placement Coordinator)</li> <li>• Professor Mairead Kiely (BSc Nutritional Sciences curricular change)</li> <li>• Professor Paul McSweeney (BSc Food Science and Technology [international 2+2 programme] and PgCert Dairy Technology and Innovation)</li> <li>• Dr Eileen O’Neill (BSc Food Science)</li> <li>• Dr Tony Sheehy (BSc Nutritional Sciences and PgDip Nutritional Sciences)</li> </ul>
19.00	Working private dinner for Panel members to commence drafting the report.

<b>Thursday 21 September 2017</b>	
08.45 – 09.00	Convening of the Panel
09.00 – 09.45	Professor Paul McSweeney, Head of School <i>Clarification and discussions of main findings by Panel.</i>
09.45 – 10.15	Tea/coffee and private meeting of Panel
10-15 – 10.30	Move to Food Science Building for exit presentation
10.30 – 11.00	Exit presentation <i>Exit presentation to all staff, to be made by the Chair or other member(s) of Panel as agreed, summarising the principal findings of the Panel. This presentation is <u>not</u> for discussion at this time.</i>
11.00 – 13.00	Further work on drafting the final report



13.00 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00 – 15.00	Further work on drafting the final report
15.00	Reviewers depart