



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

**QUALITY IMPROVEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

***DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY***

**COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING & FOOD SCIENCE**

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2009/10**

**Date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2010**

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

AFF: Agriculture, Food & Forestry

CAO: Central Admissions Office

ESG: European Standards & Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

FITU: Food industry Training Unit

FNS: Food and Nutritional Sciences

FP7&8: Framework Programme 7&8

HRB: Health Research Board

IRCSET: Irish Research Council for Science and Engineering Technologies

PAL: Peer Assisted Learning

PMDS: Performance Management & Development System

PRG: Peer Review Group

QPU: Quality Promotion Unit

RQR: Research Quality Review

SAR: Self-Assessment Report

SEDC: Staff Enhancement & Development Committee

SFI: Science Foundation Ireland

SWOT: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

## PEER REVIEW GROUP MEMBERS

Name	Position/Discipline	Institution
Professor Gill Chard	School of Clinical Therapies	University College Cork
Professor Pat McArdle	School of Chemistry	NUI Galway
Professor Jim Thomas	Department of Chemistry	University of Manchester, UK
Professor Douwe Van Sinderen	Department of Microbiology	University College Cork

Professor Pat McArdle was appointed as Chair of the Panel and Professors Gill Chard and Douwe van Sinderen as Rapporteurs. Note: It had been the original intention that the PRG membership would include a broader range of expertise, covering industrial inorganic/materials science. Unfortunately, due to the necessity to change the dates of the site visit the individual selected, who had been available for the first planned review dates, was unavailable on the dates of the actual review.

### TIMETABLE OF THE SITE VISIT

The Peer Review Group (PRG) thanks the Quality Promotions Unit for their support before and during the site visit. The timetable was both suitable and appropriate. The original time table underwent a number of changes due to the non-availability of some persons to be interviewed. Most of the interviews and discussions took place within the allocated times, although flexibility allowed for more time to be taken in order to facilitate deeper discussions.

### PEER REVIEW

#### Methodology

All members of the Peer Review Group actively participated in the discussions and information-gathering exercise. Professor McArdle took the role of Chair of the PRG.

Professors Chard and Van Sinderen took the role of Rapporteurs. Professor Thomas, as International external reviewer, presented the draft report on behalf of the PRG at the exit presentation to staff of the Department of Chemistry. All members of the PRG collectively prepared the report.

In order to ensure appropriate time was allocated to each of the activities planned for the site visit the Peer Review Group divided itself into two groups, where Professors Chard and Thomas visited the Kane and Cavanagh Buildings, while Professors McArdle and Van Sinderen visited the Tyndall Institute and The Environmental Research Institute. The site visits to facilities were very well organized and gave the Peer Review Group an excellent impression and overview of the research and teaching facilities of the Department.

The site visit programme was appropriate. Discussions with individuals were open and frank, highly informative and helpful to the PRG, informing its decisions and recommendations for this report. The Department provided comprehensive documentation, although the volume could have been reduced substantially by use of on-line and web based resources being made available (staff CVs and module descriptors for example). Additional documentation was requested during the visit, including methods and summaries for teaching evaluations from Departmental staff, and external examiners' reports, which had not been included in the original SAR submitted to the PRG.

The PRG was impressed by the commitment and engagement of the staff, students and stakeholders who participated in the interviews. The PRG regretted that no 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> year students were available to meet with the PRG. Only 4<sup>th</sup> year students attended the undergraduate scheduled meetings. While these 4<sup>th</sup> year students gave a good account of the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year student experience, the PRG recommends that recruitment of students is representative of all courses across all years.

The Report was drafted during the site visit, and was finalized, amended and edited by all members of the PRG during the week following the site visit, using electronic communications.

## **OVERALL ANALYSIS**

### **Self-Assessment Report**

In general, the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) covered all required assessment areas, ranging from the Department's historical development through to present day activities and aspirations. The report provided the PRG with a good overview and sense of the Department and a clear commitment to excellence in chemistry teaching and research. The PRG noted the recent change of Head of Department (from January 2010). This has meant that the SAR was essentially written by the previous Head of Department, and that the new Head of Department had already begun to introduce changes. For example, the committee structure was now different with important consequences for the organization and management structure of the Department. Additional documentation and information on the changes was requested and provided by the Department.

Some deficits and inaccuracies of the report, however, were noted: (1) Information on teaching allocation and individual teaching load was not provided; (2) from discussions with undergraduate students it became clear that student questionnaires did not appear to be routinely distributed, and collation of module results was not provided; (3) the strategic plan would appear to be largely aspirational in that its objectives indicates growth of, and improvement to, the international reputation of the Department. However, the plan does not specify how these objectives are to be monitored or how improvements will be quantified; (4) research outputs had not been updated since the 2008 Research Quality Review of the Department.

In summary, the PRG affirms the quality of the programmes and the research within the Department. It is clear that the student experience is overall a positive one and that external stakeholders have a good relationship with the Department. However, the PRG is of the opinion that all of these could be considerably strengthened by stronger leadership within the Department and a clearer, more transparent Departmental management structure.

### **SWOT Analysis**

The PRG reviewed the SWOT analysis and accepts it as a fair and honest reflection of the Department during the period under review.

### ***Strengths***

The PRG agrees that a major strength of the Department is the quality of its undergraduate and postgraduate students, and their considerable contribution to the development of the industrial landscape and economy of Munster, particularly in the pharmaceutical industry. The persistent hard work of the staff must also be acknowledged in contributing to the development and continuation of these collaborations and partnerships over time. The PRG also noted the resources and service provided by the library, which is well up to international standards, to be a particular strength.

### ***Weaknesses***

With regard to weaknesses, the PRG considers that the apparent lack of financial flexibility within the University has severely impacted the Department. In particular, it precludes the provision of substantial start-up funds to facilitate the recruitment of academics/researchers of international standing. This is important in view of the UCD/TCD alliance that the Department rightly notes, and will be of increasing importance if the Department is to maintain its strong reputation nationally and internationally, remain competitive and maintain its research collaborations with industry. Additionally, the PRG noted that the lack of financial start-up support for new staff impacts on their ability to develop their own research portfolio in a timely and responsive manner. This has important implications for staff retention and the future stability of the Department. The PRG noted that the Department of Chemistry has not yet signed up to the restructuring agenda of the University in relation to school formation. The College of Science, Food Science & Engineering is reluctant to commit strategic resources that would perpetuate the current situation as it would be violating the College's strategic plan with respect to restructuring.

### ***Opportunities***

The PRG concurs with the Department's view that it has a number of opportunities, not least by increasing its visibility through strategically targeting published research outputs in high impact journals.

### ***Threats***

Threats also include the current financial and economic environment which has resulted (along with all other Irish universities) in a dramatic cut in non-pay budgets. While this is understandable, the maintenance of equipment and the provision of consumables for

teaching purposes is an important factor in the day to day running of the Department and needs careful monitoring.

### **Benchmarking**

The PRG considers that the benchmarking exercise was performed appropriately and fairly. The centres of excellence were well chosen and appropriate to the Department. The PRG accepts the conclusions of the Department in this regard and commends it for considering centres of research excellence as well as teaching and learning.

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

### **Department Details**

The details of the physical facilities and staff profile of the Chemistry Department as outlined in section 2.5 of the SAR were helpful and informative. Since the last review the physical environment of the Department has been very significantly expanded and now including facilities in the Cavanagh Pharmacy building, the Environmental Research Institute and Tyndall National Institute.

The PRG was disappointed to note that several of the recommendations for improvement arising from last Peer Review Group Report (2003) have not been acted upon or implemented. Many of the issues discussed in 2003 still remain, and these are discussed below in the appropriate section.

### **Department Organisation & Planning**

The Department benefits from the explicitly stated inclusion of Chemistry in the University's strategic plan. The departmental committee structure is compatible with strategic planning, but some recently appointed members of staff do not feel involved in this process. The PRG also noted that many staff members were unclear about changes to departmental structure, leadership and the processes of organisation and planning. There appeared to be lack of transparency in the Department over the decision-making process for these changes.

## **Teaching & Learning**

The PRG was impressed by the graduates from the Department of Chemistry. We were further impressed by the Department's inclusion of representatives from the Environmental Protection Agency and industry (including the senior scientists from Novartis and Eli Lilly, and a recent graduate from the spin-out company Glantreo Ltd.). All of the stakeholders spoke highly of the Department and reported positive experiences of UCC chemistry graduates. Considering the views and opinions of all these sources, the PRG formed the opinion that the quality of teaching and learning in the Department is high.

A key issue for the Department is a reduced number of students taking the chemistry degree programme. However, the PRG is of the opinion that due to the current economic recession this trend will be corrected as indicated by the recent increase in CAO applications in science and engineering. As the popularity of third and fourth year chemistry courses is influenced by the quality of first and second year teaching, the PRG believe that the Department could give some thought to how first and second year teaching is managed, and by whom.

The PRG group is of the opinion that the workloads of some staff within the Department are too high, especially those of early career academics, who also have a need to establish a research portfolio. In particular, the PRG suggests that the Department reviews the teaching load of new academic staff with a view to them developing a research portfolio first, rather than taking a full academic teaching load in their first year of employment. The PRG noted that the suggested approach is in line with University policy.

Continuous feedback to undergraduate students is of paramount importance. The PRG is alarmed to learn that, in some practical courses, feedback was not given to the students until the end of the module. It was also concerned that routine module evaluation is not carried out by staff in the Department at either undergraduate or postgraduate level.

## **Research & Scholarly Activity**

The PRG commends the Department for having secured substantial funding for infrastructural projects. The PRG notes the intention of the Department to increase both the quality and quantity of peer-reviewed publications. Since the Research Quality Review (RQR) took place early in 2009 there are indications that this is beginning to



happen, but this improvement must be sustained if the Department is to remain internationally competitive.

The PRG was pleased to meet with the postgraduate students. The Group congratulates the Department on the high quality of research supervision and the associated learning experience for students. The postgraduate students are offered many opportunities to present at national and international conferences; and the impact of these opportunities was clearly evident in these students. It was gratifying to see that a publication-oriented culture has permeated down to the postgraduate students, who are now acutely aware of the need to publish before thesis submission. The post doctoral fellows commented specifically on the high quality of research facilities in the Department compared to their previous experience in other universities and research institutes.

The PRG are pleased to note the increase in research spending and cognate activities. The Department is to be congratulated on the significant increase in the numbers of PhD students. However, this increase will have to be sustained in the future, despite the reduced government and industrial expenditure on research funding, if the Department is to remain competitive.

### **Staff Development**

The PRG noted that for a Department with aspirations to become internationally competitive a significant number of staff members have relatively low research profiles.

As noted earlier, the PRG is very concerned about the lack of start-up research support for newly recruited academic staff. We note, however, that immediate high teaching loads were partly due to loss of staff. The PRG was informed that it is the intention of the research sub-committee of the Department to provide a mentoring programme for recently appointed members of staff.

### **External Relations**

The Department has excellent relationships with external stakeholders including multi-nationals within the Munster region. It is clearly recognised as a centre of excellence by those with whom the PRG met. The PRG noted that the Department has developed fruitful collaborations with a number of the University's Research Institutes, including

ERI, ABCRF and Tyndall National Institute, with some more limited relationships with other Departments and Schools within UCC. The conversion of the Department to a School may facilitate the further development of relations with other Schools and Research Institutes within the university.

### **Support Services**

The PRG met with the VP for Student Experience, the VP for Teaching and Learning and the VP for Research Policy and Support, The PRG were assured that these support services are well provided within the University. The PRG considers that the library facilities of UCC are excellent and note that the Department has had a very productive relationship with the Science Librarian, which must be maintained.

### **Governance**

The PRG note that Departmental governance rotates between the Heads of the four sections. While Departmental committee meetings are inclusive of all staff, a hierarchy of Heads of Sections (HOST) appears to be the main body for policy and decision-making. The PRG was pleased to note that the HOST has recently been expanded to include chairs of the Research Committee and Teaching & Learning Committee, but the inherent difficulty of facilitating open decision-making and fair representation of Sections at Department level still exists. The PRG also regrets that the recommendation stated in the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) and follow-up report of 2003 (Appendix M) namely: (1) rotating Headships of three year duration and (2) expanding the possibility of senior staff other than full Professors taking the headship, has not been implemented. The PRG would like to be reassured that the members of the Departmental executive will properly represent the views of the staff. The PRG did note that the headship issues are complex, particularly with regard to the statutory rights of the full professors.

The PRG did not always experience a sense of collegiality and inclusiveness from staff with regard to the decision-making process and the executive management of the Department. There seems to be a difference of opinion between some academic staff with regard to the status of the Department as is, or a move towards restructuring as adopted by the University into cognate Schools. It was felt that although discussion regarding the

change to school status had been debated fully at Heads of Section level, the fuller debate had not embraced the views of all Departmental staff.

### **Staffing**

The PRG notes with concern the on-going vacancy created by the retirement of the Professor of Organic Chemistry. The current academic staffing level has reached a critical point and any further reduction will lead to a decrease in quality in teaching and research.

The PRG also notes the negative impact of the loss of key technical staff on departmental research activity, in particular the loss of the glass blower. Furthermore, the age profile of the current technical support staff is a cause for further concern as those who are approaching retirement are unlikely to be replaced in the current economic climate.

### **Accommodation**

The PRG is delighted to see a substantial improvement and significant expansion in some of the Departmental research laboratories, which have been refurbished to international standing, and hope that the remainder of the older research laboratories will be similarly scheduled for refurbishment in the near future.

Some of the teaching laboratories in the Kane Building are in urgent need of complete refurbishment. The PRG also notes with concern the Department's inability to update and replace the equipment in the teaching laboratories on a regular basis. The general facilities in the Kane Building undermine the undergraduate experience of chemistry.

### **Financing**

The funding model was discussed with the relevant staff and officers during the site visit and over all appears to be satisfactory. However, the current system that delivers accurate information on the budget to the Department half way through the academic year makes planning very difficult. This, coupled with the dramatic recent reduction in the non-pay budget, is causing severe hardship to the day to day running of the Department and jeopardises teaching quality and research.

## Communications within the Department

The PRG noted that many of the more recently appointed staff did not feel involved in decision-making in the Department. Moreover, the decision-making process is not transparent as discussed elsewhere in this report. Regular sectional meetings should empower staff of the section to contribute to the detailed planning of modules and courses. Departmental meetings should provide an open forum for all staff to express their views and for these to be respected at all levels.

## Quality Review Report 2001/02

The Department of Chemistry underwent a quality review in 2001/02. As commented above the PRG were disappointed to find that many of the recommendations for improvement made by the PRG in that report were not in fact implemented.

The Quality Promotion Committee (QPC) reviewed the progress on implementation of the recommendations in October 2003 and this report was published as a part of the Report of the QPC to Governing Body in 2003.

The following is a brief report on the status of these recommendations in 2010.

## Progress on Recommendations for Improvement

Recommendation of PRG	Recommendation of QPC	Follow-up Report February 2010
The establishment of three-year Headship from senior members of Department in line with College practise.	The QPC endorsed the principles of (1) rotating Headships of <u>3-year</u> duration and (2) of expanding the possibility of senior staff other than full professors taking the Headship. The QPC strongly recommended that active consideration be given to implementation of this recommendation, whilst recognising the rights of the full professors already established in the Department.	Not implemented.  The PRG noted that this recommendation had the support of the staff of the Department of Chemistry. Discussions were held but the recommendation had not been implemented to date.

<b>Recommendation of PRG</b>	<b>Recommendation of QPC</b>	<b>Follow-up Report February 2010</b>
A transparent method should be found to assign departmental duties, taking into account teaching, the extent of individual research activity and administration	The QPC recommended that the issue of workloads and their distribution among the staff should be discussed with the HR Department. This issue is also appropriate for consideration by the SEDC of the AC. The QPC recommended that the Department consults with the Chair of the SEDC.	Not implemented. The PRG noted that while there is transparency within the Department as to where the workloads are assigned, there are not necessarily equal teaching workloads for everyone.
An effort should be made to ensure that all students complete their PhD in a four year period and the project supervisors should endeavour to publish the work carried out in peer reviewed journals as quickly as possible.	The QPC referred the Department to the guidelines drawn up by the Dean of Graduate Studies in consultation with the IFGSB and the faculties. The QPC asked that the Department confirm whether or not the Department is adhering to the guidelines.	Implemented in part. The PRG noted that students are encouraged to publish work in peer viewed journals as part of their ongoing doctoral research work. Students commented positively that this is beginning to happen.
The Peer Review Group was of the opinion that the research income obtained by the Department is substantial but has not yet reached its maximum potential.	The QPC asked for a plan from the Department to address this issue, with input from all staff of the Department. The QPC was particularly interested how the Department plans to increase the level of research income from non-State funding sources. The QPC recommended the Department ensure each staff member is involved in development of the plans, and that the benefits to students and the local economy of increased activity by the Department in this area be recognised.	Implemented in part. The PRG noted that research is an item on the agenda of every staff meeting. Staff are continuing to collaborate with others both within and outside the Department in formulating new grant proposals.
We note the recent beneficial interaction with the Pfizer Pharmaceutical Corporation and encourage the Department to build on this exciting initiative.	QPC endorsed this recommendation and welcomed the Department's commitment to further development in this area of connections with industry.	Ongoing The PRG noted that the Department is continuing to work to establish further links with other pharmaceutical industries and are continuing to strengthen the links with Pfizer, Eli Lilly, Intel, etc.

<b>Recommendation of PRG</b>	<b>Recommendation of QPC</b>	<b>Follow-up Report February 2010</b>
<p>There are clear deficiencies in the departmental infrastructure and safety, such as laboratory layout and positioning and number of fume hoods and we think this should be addressed as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>The deficiencies need to be prioritised. The QPC referred the Department to the College Safety Committee and the College Safety Officer. The QPC acknowledged the urgent nature of the deficiencies and asked that a timetable for the proposed actions and improvements be drawn up following consultation with the Dean of Science, the Buildings Office and the staff of the Chemistry Department.</p> <p>Where expenditure is not required the QPC recommends immediate action be taken on all safety issues within the Department to improve the situation.</p> <p>It was the opinion of the QPC that it is important that some of the core budget allocated to the Department must be put towards these improvements. The QPC wished to know what proposals/plans the Department has for alternative (to UCC core funding) and/or additional sources of funding to rectify the shortcomings of the Department in this area, including any research proposals.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>The PRG noted that some refurbishment work has been done but that refurbishment of the laboratories on the lower floors of the Kane Building has yet to take place. These need to be refurbished as soon as possible.</p> <p>Safety has been improved in all undergraduate laboratories, but facilities remain poor and should be refurbished as soon as possible. Infrastructural difficulties identified in 2002 remain to be resolved.</p> <p>As the Department's core budget has been reduced (because of recent economic cutbacks) the PRG were not appraised of any proposals or plans for alternative or additional funding for future laboratory refurbishments.</p> <p>The PRG also noted that funding of new and replacement equipment in teaching laboratories is problematic, again because of reduced core budget to the Department.</p>
<p>The Department should improve its general housekeeping in the laboratories from the safety point of view.</p>	<p>The QPC strongly endorsed this recommendation.</p> <p>Also see above</p>	<p>Implemented.</p> <p>The PRG noted that the departmental safety committee has addressed this recommendation and has instigated a programme of regular safety inspections to ensure the rules and standards are being implemented.</p>

<b>Recommendation of PRG</b>	<b>Recommendation of QPC</b>	<b>Follow-up Report February 2010</b>
<p>To ensure its future development the Department must allow a more flexible use of space to accommodate existing and developing research needs.</p>	<p>The QPC recommended that the Dean of Science discuss the use and management of space within the Chemistry Department. The QPC asks the Dean of Science and the Head of the Chemistry Department to provide the committee with their plans for the review of the management of structures and space within the Department and for solutions to the space allocation issues.</p>	<p>Ongoing. The PRG noted that the delivery of additional space by the University has increased the space available to the Department and represents a significant improvement to the accommodation. However more needs to be done with respect to the facilities in the Kane Building.</p>
<p>The Department should continue and perhaps be a little more pro-active in encouraging staff at all levels to avail of existing university staff development programmes that they may not be fully aware of. In particular support staff should be encouraged to participate in such courses.</p>	<p>The committee considered that improvement in this area could be brought about by increasing the awareness of the staff to the training opportunities offered by HR Department. Information on these is widely circulated to all departments in the university. The Department should ensure all staff are made aware of these. The QPC requests that the Department draws up a plan to encourage greater involvement of staff in the programmes that are available. The QPC also recommended that the Department should maintain a log of all training that is undertaken by staff of the Department.</p>	<p>Ongoing The PRG noted that while staff are encouraged to make use of the university staff development programmes a more pro-active approach could be used to encourage all staff, in particular support staff, to participate in such courses.</p>

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

### **Recommendations for improvement made by the Department**

The PRG considered the recommendations made by the Department in the SAR important but very wide-ranging. The PRG endorses all the Department's recommendations but suggests prioritisation of these. Many of the Department's recommendations are incorporated below.

## **Recommendations for improvement made by the Peer Review Group**

The PRG recommends that

1. The recommendations of the last Quality Review Report are implemented:
  - i) The establishment of three-year Headship from senior members of Department in line with College practise.
  - ii) A transparent method should be found to assign departmental duties, taking into account teaching, the extent of individual research activity and administration
  - iii) An effort should be made to ensure that all students complete their PhD in a four year period and the project supervisors should endeavour to publish the work carried out in peer reviewed journals as quickly as possible.
  - iv) Make every effort to maximise the research income obtained by the Department.
  - v) That the Department should build on the recent beneficial interactions with companies, including the Pfizer Pharmaceutical Corporation, Intel and Glantreo.
  - vi) That the clear deficiencies in the departmental infrastructure and safety, such as laboratory layout and positioning and number of fume hoods, be addressed as a matter of urgency.
  - vii) The Department should improve its general housekeeping in the laboratories from the safety point of view.
  - viii) To ensure its future development, the Department must allow a more flexible use of space to accommodate existing and developing research needs.
  - ix) The Department should continue and perhaps be a little more pro-active in encouraging staff at all levels to avail of existing university staff development programmes that they may not be fully aware of. In particular support staff should be encouraged to participate in such courses.



2. As indicated in the SWOT analysis, the Department of Chemistry move to School status as soon as possible.
3. The Professor of Organic Chemistry is appointed as soon as possible.
4. Consideration is given to the filling of a lectureship in Energy Chemistry and appointment of experimental officers, as soon as resources permit.
5. It is essential that all members of the Department feel involved in the decision-making process. Serious consideration must be given to the development of a more collegiate atmosphere in the Department.
6. The Kane building be completely renovated.
7. A mentoring scheme for early career academic staff be established.
8. The most effective lecturers should present first and second year courses.
9. Module and course evaluations be implemented immediately to address the issue of the lack of student feedback on performance throughout the year.
10. The workloads of all staff in the Department should be reviewed immediately to take account of teaching, research and administration duties. Workloads should be monitored on an annual basis.
11. The teaching load of newly appointed, early career permanent staff should be no more than half of the norm for at least the first two years following appointment.
12. Newly appointed, early career permanent staff must receive adequate resources to establish a research laboratory.
13. The Teaching & Learning sub-committee must issue guidelines with regards to teaching materials submitted to Blackboard.
14. The Department should designate a staff member to liaise with the VP for Student Experience.

## APPENDIX 1

### DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

#### PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT TIMETABLE

##### In Summary

Tuesday 16 February: The Peer Review Group (PRG) arrives at Jury's Hotel for a briefing from the Director of the Quality Promotion Unit, followed by an informal meeting with departmental staff members.

Wednesday 17 February: The PRG considers the Self-Assessment Report and meets with departmental staff and student and stakeholder representatives. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG.

Thursday 18 February: The PRG meets with relevant officers of UCC. An exit presentation is given by the PRG to all members of the department. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG in order to finalise the report. This is the final evening of the review.

Friday 19 February: External PRG members depart.

<b>Tuesday 16 February 2010</b>	
16.00 – 18.00	Meeting of members of the Peer Review Group Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion Unit, Dr. Norma Ryan. 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.
19.00 – 21.00	Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group
21.00 – 22.00	Informal meeting for members of the Peer Review Group, Head of Department of Chemistry and Department of Chemistry staff members. Department of Chemistry staff members: Professor Jeremy Glennon, Chair of Quality Review Co-ordinating Committee Dr. Justin D. Holmes, Senior Lecturer Dr. J.J. Keating, Chair of Promotion of Chemistry Committee Dr. Simon Lawrence, College Lecturer Dr. Dan McCarthy, Acting Head of Organic Chemistry Dr. Florence McCarthy, Chair of Staff Student Committee Professor Anita Maguire, Director ABCRF/Head of Pharmaceutical Chemistry Professor Michael Morris, Head of Inorganic Chemistry Dr. Orla Ni Dhubhghaill, Examinations Co-ordinator

	Professor John Sodeau, Head of Chemistry Department, Head of Physical Chemistry Dr. John Wenger, Chair of Teaching & Learning Committee	
<b>Wednesday 17 February 2010</b>		
08.30 – 09.00	Convening of Peer Review Group	
09.00 – 09.30	Professor John Sodeau, Head of Department, & Professor Jeremy Glennon (former Head of Department to 31 December 2009)	
09.30 – 10.30	Group meeting with all departmental staff <i>See Appendix 1 for Department of Chemistry staff list</i>	
10.40 – 11.00	Mr Cormac McSweeney, Finance Office	
11.00 – 13.00	<b>Private meetings with individual staff members</b> <b>Group 1</b> <b>Professor Gill Chard</b> <b>Professor Jim Thomas</b> 11.00: Dr. Justin Holmes 11.15: Professor Anita Maguire 11.30: Dr. Dara Fitzpatrick 11.45: Dr. Florence McCarthy 12.00: Ms. Eileen O’Callaghan 12.15: Dr. Stuart Collins 12.30: Dr Gerard McGlacken 12.45: Professor Jeremy Glennon	<b>Private meetings with individual staff members</b> <b>Group 2</b> <b>Professor Pat McArdle</b> <b>Professor Douwe van-Sinderen</b> 11.00: Dr. Humphrey Moynihan 11.15: Professor Martyn Pemble 11.30: Dr. Simon Lawrence 11.45: Professor Michael Morris 12.00: Dr. John Wenger 12.15: Dr. Dan McCarthy 12.30: ----- 12.45: Dr Dean Venables
13.00 – 13.45	Working lunch	
13.45 – 14.50	Visit to core facilities <b>Group 1</b> The Kane & Cavanagh Buildings, escorted by Professor John Sodeau, Head of Department.	Visit to core facilities <b>Group 2</b> The Tyndall Institute & the Environmental Research Institute (ERI), escorted by Dr John Wenger and Dr Justin Holmes.
15.00 – 15.40	<b>Representatives of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Students</b> -----	
15.40 – 16.20	<b>Representatives of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Year Students</b> Sinead Greaney 4 <sup>th</sup> year Chemistry with Forensic Science Danielle Horgan, 4 <sup>th</sup> year Chemistry	
16.20 – 17.00	<b>Representatives of Graduate Students</b> Naomi Buckley, 2 <sup>nd</sup> year PhD Organic Chemistry (Supervisors ARM/SC) David O’Connor, 1 <sup>st</sup> year PhD Physical Chemistry (Supervisor JRS) John O’Donoghue, 1 <sup>st</sup> Year PhD Inorganic Chemistry (Supervisor ONiD) Jonathan Quille, 1 <sup>st</sup> year PhD Analytical/Pharmacy (Supervisors DF/JJK)	
17.00 – 18.00	<b>Representative of Stakeholders</b> Dr. John Alexander, Novartis	

	Dr. Brian Donlon, EPA Dr. John Hanrahan, Glantreo Ltd. Dr. Humphrey Moynihan, Eli Lilly
18.00 – 18.20	Professor Grace Neville, Vice-President for Teaching and Learning
19.00	Meeting of Peer Review Group to identify remaining aspects to be clarified and to finalise tasks for the following day, followed by a working private dinner.
<b>Thursday 18 February 2010</b>	
08.15	Convening of Peer Review Group
08.30 – 08.45	Mr. Con O'Brien, Vice-President for Student Experience
08.45 – 09.30	Professor Patrick Fitzpatrick, Head, College of Science, Engineering and Food Science
09.30 – 10.00	Professor Paul Giller, Registrar & Senior Vice-President
10.00 – 10.10	Ms. Carmel Cotter, Financial Analyst, College SEFS
10.15 – 10.40	Professor Peter Kennedy, Vice-President for Research Policy & Support Tea/coffee
10.40 – 11.40	Visit to UCC Library by Professor J. Thomas. Meeting with Ms Margot Conrick, Head of Information Services and Mr. Richard Bradfield, Science Librarian – Q+1, Boole Library.
11.40 – 12.10	<b>Representatives of Post-doctoral Fellows</b> Dr. Curtis Elcoate Dr. Tim Gabriel Dr. Stig Hellebust
12.10 – 12.40	Professor John Sodeau, Head of Department
12.40 – 14.00	Working lunch
14.00 – 17.00	Preparation of first draft of final report
17.00 – 17.30	Exit presentation to all staff, to be made by the Chair of the Peer Review Group summarising the principal findings of the Peer Review Group. This presentation is <u>not</u> for discussion at this time.
19.00	Working private dinner for members of the Peer Review Group to complete drafting of report and to finalise arrangements for the completion and submission of final report.

## Appendix 2 – Department of Chemistry Staff

### Academic Staff

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Section</u>
Brint, R.P ( <i>retired</i> )	Associate Professor	Physical
Collins, S. (Dr)	College Lecturer	Organic
Fitzpatrick, D. (Dr)	College Lecturer	Analytical
Glennon, J.D.	Professor	Analytical
Holmes, JD (Dr.)	Senior Lecturer	Physical
Keating, J.J. (Dr)	Lecturer	Pharmaceutical
Lawrence, SE (Dr)	Lecturer	Inorganic
McCarthy D.G. (Dr.)	Lecturer	Organic
McCarthy, F. (Dr.)	Lecturer	Pharmaceutical
McGlacken, G (Dr.)	Lecturer	Organic
Maguire. A.R.	Professor	Pharmaceutical
Moynihan HA (Dr.)	Senior Lecturer	Organic
Moriarty, J (Dr.)	Lecturer	Physical
Morris, MA	Professor	Inorganic
Ni Dhubhghaill,O (Dr.)	Lecturer	Inorganic
Otway D. (Dr.)	Lecturer	Inorganic
O Sullivan, T (Dr.)	Lecturer	Pharmaceutical
Pemble M E	Stokes Professor	Physical
Pravda M (Dr.)	Lecturer	Analytical
Venables D. (Dr.)	Lecturer	Physical
Sodeau, JR	Professor	Physical (Head of Department)
Wenger, JC	Senior Lecturer	Physical

### Technical Staff

Causer, Rosarie	Senior Technical Officer
Hogan, Anthony	Senior Technical Officer
Horgan, Terence	Senior Technical Officer
Kearney, Jeremiah	Chief Technical Officer
Kelly, Helen	Senior Technical Officer
Meehan, John	Senior Technical Officer
Murphy, Siobhan	Technical Officer
O'Connell, Donnacha	Senior Technical Officer
O'Connell, Patrick	Senior Technical Officer

### Administrative Staff

Cocker, David	Chemical Analyst
Dennehy, Christine	Senior Executive Asst
Jauch, Matthias	Systems Officer
O'Callaghan, Eileen	Department Manager
O'Neill, Mary	Senior Executive Assistant
Pettit, Colette	Executive Assistant (Job Share)
Tobin, Claire	Executive Assistant

### Support Staff

Browne, Noel  
Duggan, Denis  
Kent, Tina  
O'Flaherty, Christine  
Porter, Agnes

Technical Operative  
House Attendant (Job Share)  
House Attendant (Job Share)  
Departmental Operative  
Departmental Operative