

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

Peer Review Group Report

Office of Registrar

Academic Year 2003/04

25th May 2004

INDEX

Summary of site visit	3
Findings and Recommendations of Peer Review Group	5
List of Recommendations (Appendix 1)	18
Timetable of site visit (Appendix 2)	20

Summary of site visit

Members of the Peer Review Group:

1. Professor Patricia Barker, Professor of Finance and former Registrar, DCU.
2. Mr. Peter Curtis, Registrar, University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia.
3. Dr. David Law, Academic Registrar, University of Warwick, UK.
4. Professor Michael Murphy, Dean of Medicine and Health, UCC.
5. Professor Colm O'Sullivan, Department of Physics, UCC. — Chair

Timetable of the site visit

The Peer Review Group found the timetable (Appendix 2) suitable and adequate, though quite demanding, given the focus of the review on five individual operating Sections as well as the large overarching structure of the Registrar's Office. At their request, changes to the original timetable were made to make additional time available for interviews with the Heads of Sections. In response to a number of issues that arose on the first day, the Peer Review Group also requested interviews with two additional officers of the University (Director of Buildings and Estates, representing the College Safety Officer, and the Vice President for Human Resources).

Peer Review

All members of the Peer Review Group shared responsibility for all aspects of the review process and for the production of the Report. All members were in attendance at all interviews listed in Appendix 2 and at all meetings during which the Report was drafted. After the site visit, the Report was finalised and agreed through a number of cycles of email communication.

Overall Analysis

- Self-Assessment Report:

The Self-Assessment Report comprised five individual Self-Assessment Reports, one from each Section together with an overarching Self-Assessment Report covering the Registrar's Office as a whole. One Section (International Students) had been reviewed previously and was not covered in the current process nor were other Student Services reporting to the Registrar (Student Careers Service, Student Health, Student Counselling & Development and Disability Support Service).

The reviewers were particularly impressed by the thorough documentation, the comprehensive analysis, the enthusiastic engagement and participation by staff and the thoughtful and reflective self-reviews that emerged.

- Each individual Section of the office carried out its own SWOT analysis (two in the case of the Admissions Office, which had engaged in such an exercise one year earlier). No overall SWOT analysis involving all Registrar's Office staff was carried out; instead, an overall analysis exercise was undertaken at Registrar's Management Group (RMG) level. The reviewers found no reason to dissent from the reported results of any of the analyses undertaken. Many of the recommendations listed in the self-assessment reports were of a very detailed, local nature and many had already been implemented by the time of the site visit of the Peer Review Group; these recommendations will not be addressed explicitly in this report, which has taken a more strategic focus, but they have all informed the thinking of the Peer Review Group.
- The primary benchmarking exercise for the Registrar's Office as a whole was a site visit to the University of Leeds. This was an appropriate choice in light of similarities between the recent history of UCC and of Leeds University (provincial institutions that have experienced similar relative expansions in student numbers during the past decade). Individual Sections also undertook site visits to two university institutions within the state (UCD, DCU). The results of earlier visits to universities in Western Australia by the Head of the

Admissions Office were also used for benchmarking purposes. The Peer Review Group concluded that benchmarking of good practice was a valuable part of regular planning and performance monitoring and should be incorporated as far as possible into the ongoing management of the Office.

Findings and Recommendations of the Peer Review Group

General Context

The Peer Review Group noted that the Registrar in UCC, as in other Irish universities, has broader roles than is common internationally. The Irish model gives a distinctive role to a Registrar as the principal academic officer of the university as compared to the UK or Australian model of Registrar as principal administrative officer. This was taken as a given characteristic by the Peer Review Group and provided the functional context for the review. *Thus the review focused primarily on the administrative functions of the Office, the subject of the self-assessments, rather than the academic leadership role of the Registrar.*

The review was also directed to that part of the Registrar's Office comprising the core academic administration areas only. However, while the Student Services areas and the International Education Office were outside the direct scope of the review, the Peer Review Group did examine broadly the relationships between the different parts of the larger 'Registrar's Office' and has not felt inhibited in making recommendations that might extend to these areas. The Peer Review Group would recommend that any future review process should incorporate *all* units that report directly to the Registrar.

University-Wide Issues

General Overall Finding

The Peer Review Group was particularly struck by the very positive feedback from all those interviewed during the site visit. There was universal high regard for both the

personnel and the operation of the Office among the students, academic staff, administrative colleagues, senior Officers of the University and external stakeholders who participated in the review. Words that continually cropped up in describing the staff included 'professional', 'helpful', 'understanding', 'committed' 'hard working' and 'efficient'. A similar atmosphere of mutual respect seems to exist between staff within the Office in different grades and between the different Sections.

The Registrar's Office in University College Cork is clearly an effective, efficient and highly motivated unit of university administration. The absence of criticism from other sections of the University was striking. All of the staff appear to be exceptionally committed, despite working under intense pressure at critical times during the academic year, indicating a successful leadership style at the top and in each of the Sections reviewed.

Many difficulties encountered by the Registrar's Office can be attributed to lack of resources and constraints of building and space. Such issues will not be addressed in this Report except in relation to the physical ramifications of the 'one-stop-shop' recommendation [Recommendation 10]. Other difficulties relate to University-wide policy, particularly in the areas of planning, resource allocation and staffing, and while these are outside the brief to review the Registrar's Office *per se*, the Peer Review Group felt it necessary to comment in so far as these issues impact directly on the operation of the Registrar's Office.

Issues of Organisation, Governance and Structure

This section discusses issues of University-wide significance which will have a significant bearing on consideration of how the University deals with the Report of the Peer Review Group and whether it can usefully feed into the University's strategic planning and QA/QI programme.

The role of the Registrar's Office involves servicing and contributing to academic governance and policies of the University, interacting primarily with Academic Council, Academic Board, Council of Deans and Deans EMG. There seems to be a lack of clarity as to whether this is predominantly a policy implementation or a policy initiation role. The Registrar's role is clearly seen as initiation and while some of those interviewed indicated the role of the Office was largely one of implementation, the Peer Review Group found strong support among all constituencies for a more active role for the whole office in policy initiation, development and review.

The Peer Review Group recommends a wider role for all sections of the Registrar's Office in support of the role of the Registrar in policy initiation. This should enable a regime in which policy informs operations and *vice versa*. [1]

The Peer Review Group detected a need for a working definition of the broader 'Registrars Office' comprising the core academic administration together with other units reporting to the Registrar and other student services. There was a feeling that greater cohesion was desirable and that discussion was needed within UCC on how this might be achieved. One of several models might be the creation of a position of Dean of Student Affairs (or an equivalent administrative position depending on the model chosen) responsible for the full range of student services and reporting to the Registrar.

The Peer Review Group recommends that those student service units currently reporting to the Registrar be integrated more closely operationally and better integrated with the core academic administration units into the managerial structure of the Registrar's Office. [2]

The Peer Review Group detected a lack of clarity in the roles and relationships between different areas of central administration with similar functional interests (Registrar's Office/ Computer Centre/ Finance/Marketing/HR, etc.). This was particularly acute in relation to the marketing and communications role of the Admissions Office *vis a vis* the Marketing Office and in the interface between the Systems Administration Office and the Computer Centre, where there are justifiable concerns about emerging conflicting priorities and implications for resource allocation and budgeting. Efficiency

in the Registrar's Office is predicated on clarification of precise roles and responsibilities throughout the University. Functional clarity of purpose is essential at the interface between the Registrar's Office and other sections of central administration.

The Peer Review Group recommends that the Registrar negotiate with the relevant Vice Presidents and Directors of Centres to develop frameworks to manage the interface between his office and the Computer Centre, the Finance Office, the Office of Marketing and Communications, the Department of Human Resources, etc.

[3]

The Peer Review Group felt there would also be merit in the University re-evaluating the roles of the different entities reporting to different members of senior management. For example, statistical and other management information (including institutional research and performance reporting) which is necessary to support planning and resource allocation, does not appear to be consolidated in the planning portfolio of the Vice President responsible for planning. Statistical information is compiled in the Registrar's Office (Systems Administration) and a new MIS (Management Information System) is planned for the Finance Office. It would be desirable if the roles and responsibilities that fall within the ambit of each senior officer, including the Registrar, were defined more clearly, and organised more functionally.

The Peer Review Group supports the on-going process of devolution and believes that it is appropriate and should be enhanced. Several of the Sections recommended devolving certain functions to faculties and departments. It is essential, however, that the final intended profile of the devolved structures be clearly articulated. The Peer Review Group was made very conscious of the risks involved if the devolution process is not carefully managed. An effective partnership model with faculties is essential. Sustained specialist skills and appropriate training are required to effect a devolved system. Faculties and/or departments must exhibit (or be organised to ensure) the critical mass that will guarantee the administrative expertise necessary to support the devolved functions. The Peer Review Group was made aware of reservations at faculty

administration level about whether many of the responsibilities currently exercised within the Registrar's Office could be undertaken effectively by faculties in the short term.

The Peer Review Group expects that there will be some re-definition of the role of the Registrar and the functioning of the Registrar's Office in the light of devolution.

The Peer Review Group recommends the devolution of the academic structure (as defined within the ITS system, e.g. module descriptors, etc)¹ to faculties/ departments /schools and the ensuring of appropriate resources required to implement this.

[4]

Planning and Resourcing Issues

Many issues raised in the self-assessment reports related to how budgets and priorities are set within the University. The review team discerned both the need and the intention to make strategic and operational planning more systematic and transparent and more overtly linked to the University budget process.

The Peer Review Group noted that the University is currently reviewing its strategic plan. In order to develop good future plans it is necessary that all stakeholders understand how strategic planning and resource allocation occurs at university level. The reviewers found a lack of appreciation among staff of the planning processes adopted by the central management of the University and, in particular, how broad planning goals translate into operational priorities and budget allocation. The implementation of the recommendations of the Peer Review Group in relation to the Registrar's Office would be greatly facilitated by greater clarity on the future systems for strategic planning within the University. This should be effected by appropriate consultation with and participation by staff.

¹ Academic structure is defined as the syllabus for each qualification according to the entries in the College Calendar and Book of Modules.

Beyond the strategic plan, it is necessary to develop operational planning to guide the identification and implementation of priority objectives, implementation strategies, resource allocation, accountability and responsibility. The Peer Review Group believes that an operational plan should be developed urgently and that a university wide approach to developing an integrated planning-budget process would greatly assist the Registrar's Office in building its own future.

The Peer Review Group recommends that processes be set up within the University so that more strategic and operational planning can take place and that a structured cycle of planning, budgeting and performance monitoring and reporting be developed institution wide and within the Registrar's Office.

[5]

Staffing issues

A range of significant staffing issues, mostly at university-wide level but having serious impact on the Registrar's Office, arose both in the self-assessment reports and in interviews with the Peer Review Group. Particular concerns centred on

- (a) grading scheme for administrative staff
- (b) staff development and training, including staff induction
- (c) workload, overtime and stress management
- (d) health & safety issues.

The Peer Review Group concluded that greater clarity, flexibility and emphasis needs to be given to all of these issues by the whole University as a matter of priority/urgency.

Staff at all levels expressed strongly articulated views on the effects of the re-grading mechanism currently used in the University. It was felt that these led to inflexibility in office practices and to real or perceived inequities. There was a widely held view that individual quality was neglected in the current system and there was no incentive for performance. This in turn had a negative effect on staff morale.

The Peer Review Group recommends that a review of the present grading system be undertaken and that a promotion system for administrative staff (to operate in parallel with the grading system) be developed.

[6]

The Peer Review Group noted that there appeared to be some industrial impediments to progress in this area but was aware of systems elsewhere in higher education internationally that, to a substantial extent, addressed the problem.

The Peer Review Group noted strong support among staff within the Registrar's Office for the performance development reviews that are planned and feels that many of the issues they raised can be addressed as part of enhanced performance management (review and training) within the institution. We also detected a desire for the elaboration of more flexible or generic job descriptions to encourage multi-tasking, enhancing the potential for greater job mobility and satisfaction.

The Peer Review Group recommends that specific developmental multi-tasking training be provided for staff, as appropriate, as an integral part of performance management, including annual review.

[7]

The PRG was impressed by the breadth of training courses and programmes that are made available by the Department of Human Resources. However it was evident that staff in the Registrar's Office cannot or do not avail of these opportunities for self-enhancement to the degree desirable both for reasons of time pressure and because of the perceived disincentive effect of the grading system.

The Peer Review Group recommends that the Registrar's Office promote greater participation by staff in appropriate university-wide staff development programmes. In particular, time should be freed up to allow staff to participate in developmental activities. Multi-tasking should be used to best effect in order to ensure that work does not accumulate to be dealt with by someone who has spent, for example, two days on a training course.

[8]

Registrar's Office Issues

The Peer Review Group was very impressed by the engagement of all Registrar's Office staff with the quality review process and with the recommendations brought forward. The observations that follow essentially emphasise the points raised in the self-assessment reports which we found to be consistently and perceptively focussed on these issues. Many of the recommendations in the Self Assessment Reports, however, were of a very micro or 'housekeeping' nature and are not commented on here as they are essentially within the scope of the Sections' own local authority to implement. The Peer Review Group commends all Sections of the Registrar's Office for addressing detailed work practices in this way and has directed its own recommendations to more strategic issues.

Function & Structure

The Peer Review Group found wide support for greater integration of services and offices. There was a general understanding that effectiveness and job satisfaction could be enhanced by greater structural cohesion with wider teamwork and cross-working. This would involve new reporting arrangements and relationships and require greater emphasis on professional development and multi-skilling of staff.

There was a clear awareness of the high risk involved in having very small units where skills, knowledge and experience are confined to a small number of staff with little or no backup or capacity for succession planning and career development.

The Peer Review Group recommends the re-configuration of internal structures of the Registrar's Office, and a supporting training programme, to enable greater integration. Consideration should be given to a structure involving a smaller number of larger Sections.

[9]

Together with a greater use of IT resources, implementation of this recommendation should have the concomitant impact of freeing up time for staff to engage in reflection,

review and participation in developmental programmes. Proposals in the self-assessment reports concerning the renaming of units should be addressed in the context of this recommendation.

The Peer Review Group found general support for the continuing development of a greater client focus; 'clients', in this context, include staff, students and external stakeholders.

In particular, there was widespread support for a 'one-stop-shop' for student services. Such a concept involves both a physical one-stop location and a specifically designed seamless electronic one-stop system. A central ground floor location for the physical one-stop-shop is essential and would also address access difficulties reported in the self-assessment documents. The Peer Review Group was pleased to note statements of support for the concept by a variety of senior officers.

The Peer Review Group recommends the immediate commencement of the design and development of a one-stop-shop for student services (including those falling within the responsibility of the Vice-President for Finance) so that such a resource can be put in place as soon as a suitable physical location has been identified and made available.

[10]

The Peer Review Group found general support for enhanced use of IT for greater efficiency and effectiveness. This will also be required to implement the above recommendations and to support the ambitions of the Registrar's Office in relation to the management of postgraduate students. Making information available to clients in a user friendly and easily accessible way would also reduce pressure on staff by avoiding the need to communicate such information verbally. A greater use of web publication of official documents should be encouraged; in particular, the practice of using print versions to generate the web version, rather than *vice versa*, should be avoided.

The Peer Review Group supports the recommendation in the self-assessment report of the Office of the Registrar that IT investment to support student

administration be increased. Early introduction of a student portal will be critical. [11]

The Peer Review Group recommends greater use of ‘User Groups’ in planning enhanced use of IT. [12]

The Peer Review Group recommends a reduction in the reliance on and production of hardcopy versions of official documents such as Calendars. [13]

The Peer Review Group recommends a more integrated approach to the University's core publications, perhaps through the creation of a single Publications Office. [14]

The suitability of the ITS system should be carefully examined by a project team from the Registrar’s Office, the Finance Office and the Computer Centre, and, if necessary, adoption of an alternative management system should be considered. [15]

Management

The Peer Review Group detected a desire for greater staff involvement in planning and in the prioritising of resource allocation within the Office. This would probably be best implemented via the Registrar's Management Group and would include a greater personal involvement on the part of the Registrar, as recommended by the Registrar's self-assessment presentation. We see such a development as capitalising in a more structured way on the enthusiasm and initiative of individual staff.

The Peer Review Group recommends greater involvement of all Registrar’s Office Sections in planning and resource allocation within the Office and a greater personal involvement of the Registrar in this process. [16]

The Peer Review Group heard from many staff about the benefits of the self-assessment exercise, in spite of the large investment of time involved. The Peer Review Group feels that there is merit in capitalising on this enthusiasm by developing a systematic mainstreaming of the QA process and its incorporation into a more formal cycle of planning and performance improvement within the Office (and the University).

The Peer Review Group recommends that the Registrar's Office develop a programme of regular self-evaluation including such features as benchmarking and SWOT exercises together with routine staff exchange arrangements and client satisfaction surveys.

[17]

A serious problem identified to the Peer Review Group was that of ensuring adherence to the formal processes and deadlines and of making the scheduling of work more transparent so that there is an appreciation of the deadlines and pressures affecting all units. There is a need for the Office as a whole to look at its annual workload schedule and to plan accordingly.

The Peer Review Group recommends that an annual cycle of key activities within the Registrar's Office be prepared together with associated deadlines. A web-delivered Calendar of Events should be derived from this critical path analysis planning and should be published for all stakeholders to access. The Registrar should seek from the appropriate University bodies a clear authority to enforce deadlines on faculties, schools and departments, including the use of appropriate sanctions.

[18]

Reflecting our recommendation that the University should engage in more strategic and operational planning, the Registrar's Office should move to implement more systematic performance management, including the use of performance targets, measures and reports. This would give rise to better planning and resource allocation, to the encouragement of staff training and development and, in particular, would help to

alleviate the widespread concern arising from the grading system. It would also address perceived inadequacies in staff induction and training.

The Peer Review Group recommends the development of more systematic performance management structures within the Registrar's Office. [19]

The Peer Review Group endorses the concerns expressed by staff in several Sections regarding the lack of standard operating procedures (SOPs). The small staff complement in some areas and the low level of cross-working and multi-skilling is a particular source of vulnerability.

The Peer Review Group recommends that documentation of policies and procedures including the formulation of standard operating procedures be put in place in all areas as a matter of urgency. [20]

The Peer Review Group would like to point out that, while this recommendation may mean more work in the short term, in the context of other recommendations it should, once completed, help to reduce overall workload. In particular, it should reduce the need of having to make time-consuming, *ad hoc* and customised responses to enquiries of all kinds, and offer some protection against the vulnerability of the Office to the loss of key staff.

Working Environment

Staff reported a large number of concerns regarding the safety and quality of their working environment. These included issues in relation to service windows, ergonomics, confidentiality, accessibility, desks and chairs, queues and the movement of materials. Lunchtime closure of offices was seen as a downgrading of service to clients, particularly students.

The Peer Review Group recommends that an urgent application be made to the University Safety Officer for a comprehensive Health and Safety review, including ergonomic screening, of the entire Registrar's Office area. [21]

Conclusion

The Peer Review Group offers its recommendations, both for the University as a whole and the Registrar's Office in particular, with the objective of improving the quality of an Office which it found to be high achieving, highly committed and very professional. Most of the recommendations have both strategic and management implications and, with few exceptions, have relatively modest resource requirements for their implementation.

The Peer Review Group commends the staff of the Office and hopes its recommendations will assist its development and ongoing quality improvement.

List of Recommendations

1. That a wider role be developed for all parts of the Registrar's Office in support of the role of the Registrar in policy initiation. This should enable a regime in which policy informs operations and *vice versa*.
2. That those student service units currently reporting to the Registrar be integrated more closely operationally and better integrated with the core academic administration units into the managerial structure of the Registrar's Office.
3. That the Registrar negotiate with the relevant Vice Presidents and Directors of Centres to develop frameworks to manage the interface between his office and the Computer Centre, the Finance Office, the Office of Marketing and Communications, the Department of Human Resources, etc.
4. That the devolution of the academic structure (as defined within the ITS system, e.g. module descriptors, etc) to faculties/ departments /schools be advanced and that the appropriate resources required to implement this be ensured.
5. That processes be set up within the University so that more strategic and operational planning can take place and that a structured cycle of planning, budgeting and performance monitoring and reporting be developed institution wide and within the Registrar's Office.
6. That a review of the present grading system be undertaken and that a promotion system for administrative staff (to operate in parallel with the grading system) be developed.
7. That specific developmental multi-tasking training be provided for staff, as appropriate, as an integral part of performance management, including annual review.
8. That the Registrar's Office promote greater participation by staff in appropriate university-wide staff development programmes. In particular, time should be freed up to allow staff to participate in developmental activities. Multi-tasking should be used to best effect in order to ensure that work does not accumulate to be dealt with by someone who has spent, for example, two days on a training course.
9. That internal structures of the Registrars Office be re-configured and a supporting training programme be put in place, to enable greater integration. Consideration should be given to a structure involving a smaller number of larger Sections.
10. That the immediate commencement of the design and development of a one-stop-shop for student services (including those falling within the responsibility of the Vice-President for Finance) so that

such a resource can be put in place as soon as a suitable physical location has been identified and made available.

11. That IT investment to support student administration be increased. Early introduction of a student portal will be critical.
12. That greater use be made of 'User Groups' in planning enhanced use of IT.
13. That there be a reduction in the reliance on and production of hardcopy versions of official documents such as Calendars.
14. That there be a more integrated approach to the University's core publications, perhaps through the creation of a single Publications Office.
15. That the suitability of the ITS system should be carefully examined by a project team from the Registrar's Office, the Finance Office and the Computer Bureau.
16. That there be greater involvement of all Registrar's Office Sections in planning and resource allocation within the Office and a greater personal involvement of the Registrar in this process.
17. That the Registrar's Office develop a programme of regular self-evaluation including such features as benchmarking and SWOT exercises together with routine staff exchange arrangements and client satisfaction surveys.
18. That an annual cycle of key activities within Registrars Office be prepared together with associated deadlines. A web-delivered Calendar of Events should be derived from this critical path analysis planning and should be published for all stakeholders to access. The Registrar should seek from the appropriate university bodies a clear authority to enforce deadlines on faculties, schools and departments, including the use of appropriate sanctions.
19. That more systematic performance management structures within the Registrar's Office be developed.
20. That documentation of policies and procedures including the formulation of standard operating procedures be put in place in all areas of the Registrar's Office as a matter of urgency.
21. That an urgent application be made to the university Safety Officer for a comprehensive Health and Safety review, including ergonomic screening, of the entire Registrar's Office area.

Timetable for conduct of Peer Review Visit

Office of the Registrar

Monday 22nd March 2004

- 18.00 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.
- 20.00 Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group and members of the Co-ordinating Committee for the Unit

Tuesday 23rd March 2004

- 08.30 Convening of Peer Review Group
Consideration of Self-Assessment Report
- 09.00 Professor Aidan Moran, Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs
- 09.30 Mr. Con O'Brien, Academic Secretary
- 09.55 Ms. Mary MacDonald, Head, Examinations & Student Records
- 10.20 Ms. Anne Mills, Head, Admissions Office
- 11.00 Dr. Hilary Doonan, Head, Systems Administration
- 11.25 Ms. Anne Burke, Academic Programmes & Publications
Meetings with staff of the Registrar's offices
- 11.45 Alison Bowdren, Administrative Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Margaret Coakley, Senior Executive Assistant, Admissions
Eleanor Fitzgerald, Data Analyst, Systems Administration
Margo Hill, Examinations Administrator, Records & Exams Office
Angela Manley, Administrative Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Helen O'Donovan, Student Records Administrator, Records & Exams Office
Lynn Bannon, Deputy Admissions Officer, Admissions
Michelle Power, Access Officer, Admissions
Jane Crowley, Student Retention & Progression Officer, Admissions
Jennifer Barrett, Executive Assistant, Admissions
Esther O'Farrell, Administrative Officer, Academic Secretariat
Carmel Quinlan, Mature Student Officer, Admissions
- 12.05 Caroline Arnopp, Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Marie Costello, Senior Executive Assistant, Admissions
Yvonne Creedon, Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Noirin Deady, Senior Executive Assistant, Admissions

Niamh Finnegan, Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Anne Landers, Senior Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Anita Cronin, Senior Executive Assistant, Admissions
Fiona Grant, Executive Assistant, Admissions
Anne-Marie Horgan, Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Katherine Lehane, Executive Assistant, Admissions
Mary McSweeney, Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Barbara Neville, Senior Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office

12.25 Deirdre Daly, Senior Executive Assistant, Admissions
Aine Flynn, Executive Assistant, Academic Secretariat
Maeve Minihane, Senior Executive Assistant, Admissions
Lorraine Moore, Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Carole O'Brien, Senior Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Anne Riordan, Executive Assistant, Records & Exams Office
Kevin Harrington, IT Project Support Officer, Systems Administration
Martha Henchion, Administrative Assistant, Admissions
Emer O'Driscoll, Senior Executive Assistant, Academic Secretariat
Sandra O'Herlihy, Senior Executive Assistant, Admissions
Trish O'Reilly, Senior Executive Assistant, Academic Secretariat
Noel O'Sullivan, Senior Executive Assistant, Systems Administration
Frances Buckley, Executive Assistant, Academic Programmes

13.30 Visit to core facilities of Unit, escorted by Dr. H. Doonan

14.00 Mr Martin Hayes, Director, Computer Centre

14.30 Representatives of students

Ms. Mary O'Sullivan, MPhil, Student Union Postgraduate representative
Mr. Anthony Kelly, Law III
Ms. Denise Santry, B Comm (II)
Ms. Suzanne White, Elec Eng II
Mr. Rhys Powell, PhD Science

15.00 Representatives of students in the following categories:

Access; Disability; Mature; Non-EU

15.30 Heads of Units reporting to Registrar

Mr. Seamus McEvoy, Head, Student Careers Service
Mr. Paul Moriarty, Head, Student Counselling & Development Service
Ms. Mary O'Grady, Head, Disability Support Service
Ms. Louise Tobin, Head, International Education Office

16.00 Representatives of Deans and Faculties

Professor Caroline Fennell, Dean of Faculty of Law
Ms. Mairead Loughman, Administrative Officer, Faculty of Science
Professor David Cox, Dean of Arts

Mr. Colman Quain, Administrative Officer, Faculty of Commerce

16.20 Representatives of Heads of Departments, of Academic staff responsible for examinations in academic departments and of other staff

Mr. Leslie Brooks, Administrative Officer, Department of Computer Science
Professor Gerald Fitzgerald, Department of Microbiology
Professor Seán Ó Coileáin, Department of Modern Irish

17.00 Meetings with representative selections of recent graduates, employers and other stakeholders

Ms. Ide O'Neill - Access
Mr. Michael O'Mahony - Access
Ms. Sephine Hallahan - Guidance Counsellor
Mr. Frank Mulvihill - Guidance Counsellor
Mr. Tim Kelleher - Principal, Coláiste Stiofáin Naofa
Mr. Charles Payne - Principal, Ashton School
Mr. Donal Murray - Principal, Carrigaline Community School
Ms. Kathleen Feeney - Principal, Christ King Secondary School
Ms. Edel Walsh - Recent Graduate
Mr. Alex Horstmann - Recent Graduate
Ms. Noirin Moynihan - NUI representative
Mr. Philip Josling - ITS representative
Ms. Carol O'Leary, Invigilator
Ms. Joan O'Leary, Invigilator

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 dinner for members for the Peer Review Group

Wednesday 24th March 2004

- 08.30 Convening of Peer Review Group
- 09.00 Mr. Michael Kelleher, Secretary & Bursar
- 09.40 Professor Aine Hyland, Vice-President and member of EMG (Executive Management Group)
- 10.00 Professor G. T. Wrixon, President
- 10.20 Mr. Michael O'Sullivan, VP for Planning, Communications & Development
- 10.40 Mr. Jerry Buckley, Head, Enterprise Applications, Computer Centre
Mr. Peter Flynn, Head, Electronic Publishing, Computer Centre
- 11.20 Ms. Carmel Cotter, & Mr. Cormac McSweeney, Finance Office
- 11.40 Ms. Marguerite Lynch, Centre Manager, ACE
- 12.30 Mr. Mark Poland, Director, Office of Buildings & Estates
- 14.00 Preparation of first draft of final report
- 16.00 Mr. Noel Keeley, VP for Human Resources

- 16.30 Professor Aidan Moran, Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs
- 17.00 Exit presentation made to all staff of the Unit by Mr. Peter Curtis, 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.