

**University College Cork**  
**National University of Ireland, Cork**  
**Quality Improvement/Quality Assurance**

**Peer Review Group Report**

**Office of Marketing & Communications**

**Academic Year 2005/06**

**4<sup>th</sup> January 2006**

**Members of the Peer Review Group:**

Professor Neil Collins, Department of Government, UCC (Chair)

Professor William Reville, Department of Biochemistry, UCC

Ms. Melda Slattery, Head of Public Affairs, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland

Mr. Ian Conn, Director of Communications & External Affairs, The University of  
Edinburgh, UK.

**Timetable of the site visit**

The detailed timetable for the site visit is attached as Appendix A.

The Peer Review Group (PRG) found the timetable to be well organised and suitable for the purposes of the review. The reviewers had adequate time to meet with staff, Officers of College<sup>1</sup> and other stakeholders, to visit the facilities available to the unit and to consider issues raised during the visit. The reviewers were facilitated in the arrangements for meeting additional stakeholders during the visit upon request. The PRG expressed its thanks to Dr. Ryan and her colleague Ms. Ní Néill for their guidance, efficiency and courtesy.

**PEER REVIEW****Methodology**

All members of the PRG participated in all meetings and activities during the site visit. The external reviewers took primary responsibility for leading the discussions on issues specifically related to the functions of the Office of Marketing and Communications (M&C); all members participated in discussions on the management and external activities of the unit. For the most part, the PRG relied on the Quality Promotion Unit to select those who it interviewed as part of its investigation.

**Peer Review Group Report**

The Peer Review Group Report was drafted during the afternoon and evening of the second day of the site visit by all members of the PRG. The report was finalised via

---

<sup>1</sup> The term College is used throughout in its traditional UCC sense to refer to the whole university.

email communications following the site visit and all members of the PRG agreed with the report.

## **OVERALL ANALYSIS**

This report on M&C is intended to help UCC colleagues to complete a process of self-reflection, analysis and planning in relation to the role, functions and operation of the unit. The newly competitive environment for universities places an increased importance on communications and marketing, which makes M&C's work particularly important for College. The methodology used to compile the report reflects the short time available to the reviewers, their lack of specialist training for the function and the use of the template supplied by the UCC Quality Promotion Unit. It is hoped that the report will assist UCC in improving the quality of information, promotion and marketing as provided by M&C in particular and by the university in general. The report is a public document but it is written primarily for fellow academics, administrators and stakeholders at UCC. The task of the Peer Review Group (PRG) was made easier by the high esteem in which the director and staff of M&C are held by all those who presented evidence during the two days of evidence taking. They are well-known, well-liked and well-regarded.

### **Self-Assessment Report**

This report begins with a commentary on the *Quality Assurance Self-Assessment Report* (QASAR) prepared by M&C, which is made up of a brief review with supporting documents. This is divided into a section on M&C's statement of mission and objectives followed by an examination of other issues raised by the documentation. Taking a cue from the current public sector reform process, the report then looks at the views of M&C's internal and external customers. The main recommendations are in the report's conclusions.

### **Self-Assessment Report: Mission and Objectives**

The QASAR provided by M&C succinctly covered all aspects of current activity and listed the members of staff with brief biographical information. It also includes a summary of the results of a quality review questionnaire. The PRG noted that the design of the questionnaire used for the survey was poor and that the response level to

the questionnaire was relatively low. This was possibly due to the identification of respondent, the relatively small fraction of staff of the university having regular contact with M&C and the less than optimal timing of the questionnaire.

The QASAR's production values, as reflected in its aesthetics and quality of presentation, were poor.

M&C has evolved out of a pre-existing Public Affairs Office and, prior to that, an Information Office. It sees its current role as being more proactive relative to the previously reactive function assigned to it, although it is still very much developing its identity. The incremental process by which M&C has developed has put a considerable focus on functions prioritised by the Office of the President. The quality review process provides an opportunity to re-examine the rationale as well as the location of the current and potential functions of the unit.

M&C perceives its role as one of:

...providing competitive advantage for UCC through excellence in marketing and communications initiatives.... to positively influence the perceptions of relevant audiences in desired directions.

The primary activities identified by M&C were:

- brand
- events
- media
- publications
- visitors.

This report will discuss each of these activities, as identified prior to making recommendations for improvement.

#### **i) Brand**

The QASAR uses the word "brand" to identify a "sphere of activity". The two major branding initiatives to date have been a re-designed UCC website and a new visual

identity. The redesigning of logo and its impact on University stationery, such as letterheads and business cards, was the subject of both praise and criticism in the supporting material for the QASAR. The comments from those who responded to the questionnaire frequently doubted the value of the new brand, particularly the changes to the crest and name. Some also commented on the burden to other parts of the university of these changes in terms of stationery, printing and related costs.

The website has been broadly welcomed as a significant improvement on its predecessor. Despite detailed criticisms, the attempt to develop a coherent house-style and identity was viewed favourably by most respondents to the questionnaire. Student opinion was particularly critical of the web page as a source of information. Students felt a concerted attempt should be made to survey their opinion on the content and navigation of the website. They would welcome particular attention being paid to information for 'current students' and the quality of the search engine. The PRG did not select the students who gave evidence but their opinions are reflected in the QASAR.

The visual identity project has many critics. The PRG noted, however, that the Visual Identity Guidelines are still 'draft' and this clearly provides the flexibility to develop their implementation further, as feedback is received from stakeholders. Some issues arising from adoption of the guidelines may require clarification.

The Self-Assessment Report provided limited detail about the process of consultation that preceded the adoption of the new web site or the visual identity. The course of action seems to have been informed by an overly hierarchical model of the university setting and did not easily provide for input from across the spectrum of departments. This may have led to some of the misgivings expressed by colleagues from outside M&C about the effectiveness of this sphere of activity.

## **ii) Events**

The PRG noted that the remit of M&C includes the organisation of high profile UCC events, such as degree awarding ceremonies. While these were not described in detail in the QASAR, it was nevertheless clear what was involved. The events function received a great deal of favourable comment from all those who participated in the review. This assessment was also echoed in the supporting material for the QASAR

both at the level of individual comment and aggregated questionnaire material. The experience of M&C in this area might, some colleagues suggested, be documented as protocols for events, including VIP invitations. This could be made available to all departments in the university in booklet or electronic form.

### **iii) Media**

The PRG noted that UCC benefits from a particularly good national and local media profile. The role of M&C in generating this favourable position was outlined in its report. Objective measurement of print and broadcast media coverage was recorded and supported by extensive cuttings files.

According to its web page, M&C “is responsible for internal and external marketing communications”<sup>2</sup>. In the QASAR, M&C is said to be “responsible for UCC’s interaction with all print and broadcast media”. Clearly, however, it only deals with a fraction of the overall communications of UCC. M&C must be prioritising some tasks. Particular mention is made in the Self-Assessment Report of the role of M&C in damage limitation when negative publicity arises from time to time. This function has been controversial within UCC and points to the need for M&C to clarify its role vis à vis the broader University focus and its Office of the President orientation.

### **iv) Publications**

M&C is responsible for several weekly, monthly and annual publications including *UCC Guide* (weekly), *UCC News* (monthly), *UCC Graduate* (annual) and *President’s Report* (annual). As M&C web page says, it “also issues press releases, events updates and other announcements in a range of media”. The QASAR described how these publications have evolved recently under the active direction of M&C and the PRG noted that there was a recognition of their widely acknowledged quality.

The comments of colleagues on the publications were all presaged by an acknowledgement of the high standards attained. Those who responded to the call for comment made various suggestions as to small changes to the range, titles and content of the publications. For example, it was suggested that the use of Irish in M&C’s

---

<sup>2</sup><http://www.ucc.ie/en/SupportandAdministration/ServiceandAdministrativeOffices/MarketingandCommunications/>

publications could be usefully re-examined to ensure more mainstream use of the language. The most important observations of those who contributed to the two days of verbal evidence concerned the place of M&C output in the full portfolio of UCC marketing publications. Again the theme that was repeated by almost all those who spoke to the PRG centred on the university versus the “East Wing” focus of the Office. The PRG acknowledges that the Director is unhappy with this widespread perception.

**v) Visitors**

The Office of Marketing and Communications is responsible for a newly developed Visitors Centre for UCC. The QASAR makes surprisingly little reference to this excellent and important initiative.

**Self-Assessment Report: Other Issues**

Responses to the Administrative and Support Staff questionnaire distributed by M&C as part of the Quality Review provided some additional elaboration and insight into the work, objectives and priorities of the Office. The level of reply to the questionnaire was low, perhaps reflecting a reluctance to engage on the part of colleagues who would prefer not to be identified. It may, however, also point towards the relatively small fraction of overall staff in the university who have regular contacts with M&C and the timing of the survey. The questionnaire relies heavily on questions where the respondent is required to answer from one of four options. These appeared to be unbalanced and non-linear, making it difficult to interpret many of the questions. (See for instance Q 3 and 4)<sup>3</sup>. Additionally, the PRG noted that it was difficult to see how someone who was very dissatisfied with the service (Q5)<sup>4</sup> would respond. Many of the open-ended questions tended to focus on the “one thing” that M&C does well or badly. The PRG considered that it would have been more appropriate to allow respondents greater freedom in airing their views.

---

<sup>3</sup> Question 3: *Did you find M&C staff helpful?* Answer Options: ‘Extremely Helpful’, ‘Helpful’, ‘Average’, ‘Improvement needed’.

Question 4: *Did you find M&C staff professional?* Answer Options: ‘Extremely professional’, ‘Professional’, ‘Average’, ‘Improvement needed’.

<sup>4</sup> Question 5: *Were you satisfied with the service, or outputs, received from M&C staff?* Answer Options: ‘Very satisfied’, ‘Satisfied’, ‘Average’, ‘Improvement needed’.

The PRG explained the purpose of the oral evidence part of the review process to each group and individual that it interviewed. The emphasis in each case was on collegiality, helpful feedback and candid judgement. In all but one case, UCC colleagues seemed able to grasp the gist of the PRG's approach. For the most part, therefore, the process avoided overly defensive, aggressive and unhelpful inputs.

### **SWOT Analysis**

Within the wider process adopted by the university for quality reviews, there is a formal requirement on departments to carry out a SWOT analysis as part of the self-assessment process. This is usually incorporated into the self-assessment report as a discrete section. In this case, the results of a SWOT analysis were not presented according to the usual *pro forma*. The SWOT methodology is open to criticism and alternatives are available. Whatever techniques of formalised self-reflection are used the PRG was advised that they would generally be facilitated by someone from outside the group. The PRG noted that the Quality Promotion Unit in UCC offers help with the completion of the SWOT analysis, or its equivalent. M&C carried out a scaled down form of SWOT and its results were only used as background data to inform the general comments made by the Director in his overall analysis and recommendations.

The PRG used the concepts of strengths and weaknesses to group some of its observations:

- **Strengths**

The quality and experience of the director and staff members of the Marketing and Communications Office are its main strength. This was acknowledged by the wide range of stakeholders that met with the PRG. Under the headings of publications, media, events, website and visitor services there is consensus that a very good job is being done by M&C, with quite modest human resources. The flat management structure of M&C is very energising and motivating for the individual members of staff who are given quite a degree of autonomy in their area of responsibility. This contributes greatly to their very evident work ethic and enthusiasm.

- **Weaknesses**

The range and depth of activities undertaken by M&C greatly extends the existing complement of five full-time and two part-time staff. The PRG felt that their ability to meet expectations of a wide range of user groups would be enhanced by having administrative support. A secretary/administrator is clearly necessary for the efficient coordination of the unit. There was agreement from almost everyone who spoke to the PRG that such an appointment would free up staff members to do other tasks and this would relieve current pressure on 'phone answering in the unit.

While space is clearly at a premium on campus for all departments and units, the office accommodation available to M&C is sub-optimal and impacts adversely on the service offered. Together with the idea for a secretary/administrator appointment, however, this problem was assigned only a very low priority by M&C's line managers.

As noted above, the PRG observed that M&C's working practices reflected a flat hierarchical structure. This was evident from the task-orientation of the staff and the focus on delivery of particular services. M&C is extremely busy and the PRG felt that this level of commitment to College is a considerable asset. In the PRG's view, however, the structure reduced the attention paid to strategic direction and leadership. For a flat structure to work effectively, all staff must have a clear appreciation of the organisation's vision. This shared understanding has not been generated in M&C. The QASAR, the individual and team contributions to the review all highlighted the lack of information given to staff of the budgetary frameworks, policy guidelines and future direction of the unit.

The PRG were aware of the *ad hoc* nature of the unit's development, as well as its good fortune in attracting diligent and hardworking staff. As M&C develops, it may be that it should consider more formal and explicit guidelines to staff duties and operating procedures. The PRG understood the Director's relatively greater attention to performance rather than process and accountability. Nevertheless, it felt that it would help the role of M&C in UCC

if it had a closer link to the normal committee structure and could benefit from input from users of the service.

### **Benchmarking**

The PRG noted that benchmarking is also a formal requirement of the quality improvement/quality assurance process in UCC. It is used by College to evaluate various aspects of the output and processes of both academic and administrative units in relation to best practice elsewhere in the university or other relevant sectors. This allows the university to develop plans for improvement. Benchmarking may be a single occasion or a continuous process. Because of the nature of the work of M&C, the PRG felt that the latter option would be the preferred one. This probably explains why the QASAR does not present benchmarking findings as a separate section. Though they are referenced throughout the report, the benchmarking findings could usefully have been presented together to facilitate easier comparison.

### **Internal Customers**

Satisfying internal customers would generate genuine teamwork among all University departments with an interest in the marketing and communications functions. The PRG was, therefore, especially interested in this constituency. In line with the tenor of all the verbal evidence collected, the internal customers' comments highlighted the respect in which the staff of M&C is viewed. Hard work, civility and enthusiasm are acknowledged characteristics of this unit. Some irritation arises, however, from the perceived lack of congruence between the title *Office of Marketing and Communications* and the current role of M&C.

Many other parts of College take a large part in both the generic marketing and communications function and are very close to the UCC's Irish and international customer base. Publications, events and press relations are features of the workload of other administrative units, faculties and departments and some colleagues questioned the boundaries between M&C and themselves. There was uncertainty about the extent to which M&C should provide support and advice to colleagues in UCC generally. For example, at a very practical level, it was suggested that M&C should develop a marketing and communication tool-kit that can be customised to specific users' needs for the benefit of academic departments.

There was some concern that its origins in the “East Wing” may have inhibited a University-wide focus developing. The PRG acknowledged these comments but were also reminded of the difficult period for UCC in terms of media attention in which the current director took up office. The president of a modern university is inevitably in the media spotlight and UCC has been under particular scrutiny recently. It may be that a broad view of the contribution that M&C makes to the university may yet be developed when the need to deal with negative is less pressing.

The budgetary arrangements for M&C are open to considerable criticism. For example, according to the evidence presented to the PRG, the unit routinely exceeds its budget. The expenditure of the department seems not to be the subject of the disciplines associated with public sector management. Evidence presented to the PRG from several sources suggested that M&C expenditure was authorised on an *ad hoc* and poorly supervised basis. The staff were conscious of costs and sought to run events and publications as prudently as possible but the data for comparison, tracking or performance measurement were not known to them. The funds formally allocated to M&C were clearly insufficient for its tasks and were quickly exhausted but overruns were not seen as data for more realistic budgeting. As with other administrative departments, annual deficits/surpluses were not carried over from year to year. Given the management’s emphasis on “product” over “process” and M&C’s flat hierarchical working, the staff’s considerable annoyance, expressed clearly to the PRG, at the lack of financial transparency seems well warranted.

The internal comments on this unit reflected the belief, possibly unjustified, that many of the reforms of College’s image associated with M&C were based on very limited consultation. It was put to the PRG that M&C might have been informed by a more hierarchical model of university governance than that which actually prevails. The agreement of deans and senior officers is important for innovations to succeed. It is not, however, sufficient to engender the kind of broad assent that assists successful implementation. The more sensitive the topic, the more the need for “buy in”. The proposed “colour coding” of Faculties was seen as an example of a detail of the new look that exemplified the lack of consultation and the failure to accommodate alternative views. The evidence presented to the PRG suggests that the university’s

shield, logo and symbols are very important issues for many staff members and the new corporate symbols have yet to gain the broad endorsement of staff because of insufficient debate. At practical levels, internal comments also highlight the ongoing costs associated with recent changes as an issue that was insufficiently taken into consideration. The generally negative comments from its internal customers about the reforms of College's image may not reflect the best efforts of M&C but they are a real concern for the success of the marketing and communications function of UCC.

Fortunately for the staff of M&C, their stock of goodwill among their colleagues is so high after years of sterling service that all critical comments are tempered. Nevertheless, M&C may wish to address its own communications function to avoid dissipating its collegial support level. It may consider the need for an internal information document outlining its aims, strategy and structures. A statement of services offered would also be helpful to other colleagues and potential users of the services. Similarly, internal customers that only engage in the marketing function infrequently asked if M&C could administer a store of stands, generic UCC posters and other collateral material to lend for use on a once-off basis. Other colleagues in academic departments identified the need for professional advice or a marketing and communication tool-kit, which can be customised to specific users' requirements.

The success of M&C's events function, in particular, is greatly helped by its close and efficient relations with General Services. Some concern was expressed, however, at its lack of a more useful link with other support departments such as the Printing Office and Audio Visual Services. To augment its resources, M&C might consider exploring greater availability of UCC photographic services. Similarly, a more formalised liaison between the M&C and the Development Office as well as the Alumni Office would enhance of the overall marketing of UCC.

### **External Customers**

The PRG was impressed by the uniformity of the commendation from external customer contacted. The national press, especially the *Irish Times*, praised the unit's professionalism and responsiveness. Similarly, alumni representatives, printers and other suppliers of media related services were extremely positive about M&C. The constituency of external customers is, however, potentially vast. It could include all

groups or individuals who are not members of UCC but may be closely associated with it. The PRG would have valued input from the local media in the university catchment area, parents of potential CAO candidates, employers of graduates, etc.

## **Conclusions**

This exercise has shown that both internal and external users of the services of M&C are very satisfied with its performance in its identified primary areas of events, media, publications and visitors, while expressing some reservations about branding. The quality of the staff of M&C is widely acknowledged. Some weaknesses were identified, in part arising from the *ad hoc* manner in which this office has evolved over the years and recommendations are made to rectify them. Clearly, the evolution of the unit was not a matter of chance but that it reflects short term pressures and little broad managerial or strategic consideration at university level.

The Office of Marketing and Communications has a misleading name. It promises more than its hardworking staff and position in the organisational structure can deliver. UCC is marketed and communicates with its stakeholders through a wide range of academic and administrative departments. Major events are organised, significant publications produced and important media relationships are forged in many areas in the university without any input from M&C. UCC is active in all these spheres but has no coherent strategy. It is possible that there is no coordination or corporate direction and that College-wide deliberation is needed in this general area. However, the existence of M&C and its reporting relationship with the Vice-President for Planning, Communications and Development suggests otherwise. The current title and organisational relationships of M&C need to be changed to provide College with a better service, offer more effective leadership and ensure greater transparency. A repositioning of M&C would also enhance the contribution to The university of the unit's hardworking, skilled and committed staff.

The PRG suggests that M&C reassess its contribution to College along two broad dimensions that, for heuristic purposes, it represents as focus and function. The Group's own analysis is presented graphically in Figure One. M&C is currently focussed, in the sense of loyalty, direction and rationale, on the Office of the President. An alternative outlook suggested by the PRG echoing several internal customers would

be to concentrate on the broadest appreciation of College's needs. At the same time, M&C operates as a provider of high quality but limited services. The PRG suggests that an alternative outlook would be that of facilitator of the marketing and communications functions of College. Juxtaposing these dimensions would provide M&C with four potential future organisational set of responsibilities.

1. carry on as at present – predominantly providing a narrow range of services
2. facilitate but largely outsource the current service
3. facilitate a new portfolio of College-wide services
4. provide a new portfolio of College-wide services

The PRG recommend a 1+3 strategy but realises this would involve a repositioning of M&C, new financial management arrangements, closer accountability through College committees and some extra resources. M&C's role would be strengthened by a policy-based mandate and re-enforced by publicising its activities through an annual report to Academic Council. M&C's budget should move to be needs-based rather than historic. Individual functions should contribute to formulation of a realistic budget to facilitate analysis of spending patterns. Tracking of total marketing expenditure across UCC would be useful additional information and become a key function of a "1+3" M&C.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Following its deliberations and findings the PRG makes the following recommendations for improvement.

The PRG recommends that:

1. A clear definition of marketing and promotional activity for M&C and for Admissions, International Education Office and other departments is made. In the view of the PRG this would assist in maximizing the effectiveness of all units.
2. A clear strategic plan is put in place to facilitate the development and future direction of the unit.
3. A statement of services offered is published by M&C. This would be helpful to other colleagues and potential users of the services of the unit.

4. An operational plan be developed in order to make explicit the future direction of M&C with specific reference to resourcing.
5. M&C's role would be strengthened by a policy-based mandate and re-enforced by publicising activities through annual reports to Academic Council.
6. The budget for the unit should move to be needs-based rather than historic. Individual functions should contribute to the formulation of a realistic budget to facilitate analysis of spending patterns. The tracking of total marketing expenditure across UCC would be useful additional information and should be carried out.
7. Consideration be given to the task-based organisation of the unit in recognition of the fact that some M&C functions are highly dependent on one individual rather than on the team.
8. A secretary/administrator be appointed with responsibility for the coordination of M&C. This and would free up other staff members to do other tasks and would also relieve current pressure on 'phone answering.
9. Staff accommodation be recognised as inadequate for purpose and consideration be given to provision of alternative accommodation.
10. Consideration be given to the provision of collateral marketing materials which would be helpful to colleagues holding/attending events – e.g., display stands, folders and 'UCC at a glance' type publication.
11. M&C be particularly sensitive and proactive in its own communications, in view of its central role.
12. Protocols for events, including VIP invitations, should be prepared and made available to all departments in College.
13. Consideration be given to the development of a marketing and communication tool-kit which can be customised to specific users' needs for the benefit of academic departments.
14. The website be further developed needs to reflect the changing structures of College. Deeper consultation should be undertaken to develop style for the next level down – e.g. individual departments/function.
15. Recognising that their views will change with greater familiarity, an attempt should be made to survey student opinion from time to time on the content and navigation of the website. Particular attention should be paid to information for 'current students' and the quality of the search engine.

16. A greater awareness of the use of Irish may be required by M&C.
17. A more formalised liaison between the Office of Marketing & Communications and the Development Office for the purpose of the enhancement of the overall marketing of UCC and building on the cooperation between the Alumni Office and publications be put in place.
18. M&C consider securing greater availability of university photographic services.

**Timetable for conduct of Peer Review Visit**

**Office of Marketing & Communications**

***Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2005***

- 17.30 Meeting of members of the Peer Review Group  
Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion Unit, Dr. N. 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.
- 19.30 Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group, Head and staff of M&C

***Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> October 2005***

- 08.30 Convening of Peer Review Group in Tower Room 2, North Wing, Main Quadrangle, UCC  
Consideration of Self-Assessment Report
- 09.00 Mr. Brian Dunnion, Director
- 09.30 Meeting with all members of staff
- 10.30 Tea/Coffee
- 10.45 Private meetings with members of staff.
- 10.45 - Nancy Hawkes  
11.00 - Roslyn Cox  
11.15 - Dick Hogan  
11.30 - Ruth McDonnell  
11.45 - Marie McSweeney  
12.00 - Dara O'Shea  
12.15 – JP Quinn
- 12.15 Time for consideration of issues by PRG
- 13.00 Working private lunch for members of the Peer Review Group
- 14.00 Visit to core facilities of M&C. PRG to be escorted by Mr. B. Dunnion
- 15.00 Representatives of students of UCC.
- Mr. Kris McElhinny, Arts  
Mr. Diarmuid Angland, Arts  
Ms. Sinead Aherne, Arts  
Mr. Philip Healy, Commerce  
Ms. Deirdre Duffy, European Studies  
Mr. Diarmuid Cahillane, Science  
Ms. Deirdre Milner
- 15.45 Representatives of staff of UCC

Dr. Ruth Davis, Research Office  
Professor Julia Kennedy, School of Pharmacy  
Dr. Anne Mills, Admissions Officer  
Ms. Siobhan Murphy, School of Nursing & Midwifery

16.15 Representatives of staff of UCC.

Ms. Ann Cronin, Promotion Officer, Faculty of Science  
Ms. Marita Foster, International Education Office  
Ms. Fiona Kearney, Director, Glucksman Gallery  
Ms. Sheila Maguire, General Services Officer  
Mr. Don O'Sullivan, Department of Management & Marketing  
Mr. Pól Ruiséal, Director, Ionad na Gaeilge Labhartha  
Professor Mairtin O Fathaigh, Adult Continuing Education

17.00 Representatives of recent graduates, employers and other stakeholders

Mr. Fred Lianis, Student  
Mr. Michael MacSweeney, ProVision Photography  
Ms. Eleanor Neff, Student  
Mr. Gerry O'Malley, Chair Alumni Board  
Mr. Alan O'Shea, Designmatters Ltd  
Mr. Derek Shears, Designmatters Ltd  
Mr. John Waterman, Watermans Printers

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 for members for the Peer Review Group

***Friday 14<sup>th</sup> October 2005***

08.30 Convening of Peer Review Group in Tower Room 2, North Wing, Main Quadrangle, UCC

09.00 Professor Paul Giller, Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs

09.30 Members of Deans-EMG

Professor David Cox, Acting Dean, College of Arts, Celtic Studies & Social Sciences/Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Celtic Studies  
Professor Patrick Fitzpatrick, Acting Dean of the College of Science, Engineering & Food Science, Dean of the Faculty of Science  
Mr. Robin Graham, Secretary  
Professor Peter Kennedy, Vice-President for Research Policy & Support

10.15 Ms. Catherine Fairtlough, President's Assistant, President's Office

10.30 Dr. Jean Van Sinderen-Law, Director of Development

10.45 Ms. Carmel Cotter, Finance Office

11.30 Dr. Michael Kelleher, former Secretary & Bursar (recently retired) and former member of the University Executive Management Group

12.00 Mr Michael O'Sullivan, Vice-President for Planning, Communications & Development

- 12.30 Mr. Peter Flynn, Computer Centre
- 12.45 Mr. Edward Burke, Head, Printing Office, UCC
- 13.00 Working private lunch for members of the Peer Review Group
- 13.30 Conference call with Mr. Dick Ahlstrom, *Irish Times*
- 14.00 Conference call with Mr. Eoin English, *Irish Examiner*
- 14.15 Preparation of first draft of final report
- 16.15 Mr. Brian Dunnion, Director
- 17.00 Exit presentation, to be made to all staff of the unit by the Chair of the Peer Review Group summarising the principal findings of the Peer Review Group.
- 19.00 Working private dinner for members of the Peer Review Group to complete drafting of report and finalisation of arrangements for speedy completion and submission of final report.

***Saturday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2005***

Externs depart