



## *QUALITY ENHANCEMENT UNIT*



### *REVIEW PANEL REPORT*

### *CORK UNIVERSITY BUSINESS SCHOOL*

*Date: November 2018*

*“By embedding a strong quality-enhancement ethos, we will use our quality processes to ensure a culture and experience of best practice in the delivery of our academic mission, demonstrating our commitment to continuous evolution and improvement”*

*(UCC’s Strategic Plan 2017 – 2022, p.23)*

## Contents

Panel Report Template .....	3
Part 1 - Overall Analysis .....	3
1.1 List of Panel Members .....	3
1.2 Context and Overview .....	3
1.3 Review Methodology .....	4
1.4 Site Visit and Timetable.....	4
1.5 The Self-Evaluation Process .....	4
1.6 Good Practice Case Study.....	5
Part 2 – Findings of the Panel .....	6
2.1 School Overview.....	6
2.1.1 <i>Mission, vision, aims and objectives</i> .....	6
2.1.2 <i>Unit details including staff and student profile</i> .....	6
2.1.3 <i>Unit organisation &amp; planning</i> .....	6
2.2 Evaluation of Academic Standards .....	7
2.2.1 <i>Student “life-cycle”</i> .....	7
2.2.2 <i>Programme delivery and curriculum planning</i> .....	7
2.2.3 <i>School communication structures</i> .....	7
2.3 Evaluation of Student Learning Experience .....	7
2.3.1 <i>Teaching and learning, including the impact of research on teaching</i> .....	7
2.3.2 <i>Assessment</i> .....	8
2.3.3 <i>Learning resources</i> .....	8
2.3.4 <i>Student support</i> .....	8
2.3.5 <i>External links/community engagement/employability</i> .....	8
2.4 Staff.....	8
2.4.1 <i>Staff Profile</i> .....	8
2.4.2 <i>Staff Communication and Development Objectives</i> .....	9
2.5 Collaborative partnerships (e.g. joint programmes).....	9
Part 3: Recommendations .....	10
3.1 School Recommendations .....	10
3.2 University Recommendations:.....	11
Appendix 1: Timetable.....	12
Appendix 2: AACSB Standards Mapped to UCC’s Quality Review Standards .....	16
Appendix 3: List of Programme Offerings .....	19

# Panel Report Template

## Part 1 - Overall Analysis

### 1.1 List of Panel Members

Name	Position/Discipline	Institution
Mr Noel Brennan [Student Reviewer]	Medicine and Neuroscience	University College Cork
Ms Melanie Currie	Deputy Dean, Nottingham Business School	Nottingham Trent University
Ms Kate O'Brien	School Manager, College of Science, Engineering and Food Science	University College Cork
Professor Bob O'Keefe	Vice Principal and Dean of Management	Royal Holloway, University of London
Professor Metka Takavčič	Professor and Member of the Academic Unit for Management and Organisation	University of Ljubljana
Professor Helen Whelton [Chair]	Head, College of Medicine and Health	University College Cork
Dr Kay Taaffe [Secretariat Support]	Quality Enhancement Advisor	University College Cork

### 1.2 Context and Overview

Founded as the Faculty of Commerce, teaching and research in business at UCC has a long history dating back to the foundation of the University; however, the School, in its current structure, has only been in existence since December 2014. This review takes place in the context of the relatively recent formation of the Cork University Business School (CUBS) which brought together the existing individual Departments of Accounting, Finance & Information Systems; Economics; Food Business & Development; and Management & Marketing. The Panel found that there is a demonstrable commitment to the creation and progression of CUBS as an integrated School comprising the former Departments.

Because of the alignment of the School's strategic plans with those of the University, the School enjoys and receives excellent support from the College and University for its strategic ambitions through, for example, support for international accreditation; internationalisation; and academic recruitment. In January 2017, following a number of years of association, University College Cork (UCC) formalised its strategic alliance with the Irish Management Institute (IMI), which has provided opportunities for the expansion of the School's programme offerings, particularly in industry-facing executive education.

### **1.3 Review Methodology**

UCC provides a customised approach to the internal review process for academic areas which have professional accreditation, to allow alignment and to reduce duplication. For the purposes of the CUBS review, a customised approach was adopted to align the University's internal quality review with the School's AACSB<sup>1</sup> accreditation process in terms of documentation, sequencing, and standards. The AACSB standards were mapped against UCC's internal quality review standards and, with the exception of the AACSB standard relating to financial arrangements (which is not part of the UCC model), there is broad comparability between the rest of the standards and those guiding UCC's quality review process (see Appendix 2 for an outline of the mapping).

The composition of the Panel, which included international expert peers from AACSB accredited institutions, provided good coverage across the disciplines within CUBS and brought extensive experience in relation to professional accreditation for Business Schools. Internal reviewers provided knowledge of the institutional and organisational structures within the University. The Student Representative, who had considerable experience on School and College committees, ably represented the student perspective. Secretariat support from the Quality Enhancement Unit (QEU) was provided to the Peer Review Panel throughout, to facilitate the conduct of the review and to support the Review Panel in formulating and agreeing the final Panel Report.

### **1.4 Site Visit and Timetable**

The Site Visit was well-organised and enabled consultation with key stakeholders. The Panel agreed to focus on the AACSB standards and ensured, at the outset, that the various stakeholder meetings addressed each of these standards. There was extensive engagement with School staff and good attendance at meetings; the round table format of the staff meeting worked particularly well – particularly given the large numbers in attendance. The Panel met with Programme Directors for most of the flagship programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate level; however, it was noted that the executive MBA, which would be considered a significant programme within the School's portfolio, was not represented at the meeting with Programme Directors.

### **1.5 The Self-Evaluation Process**

#### **1.5.1 Self-Evaluation Report (SER), SWOT Analysis and Benchmarking**

Much of the documentation for the Panel was generated as part of the AACSB submissions. These included: an Initial Self-Evaluation Report (iSER), dated June 2017; an updated iSER, dated September 2018; and an Executive Summary outlining the School's recent history, structures and academic activities. In line with the University's internal process, a Good Practice Case Study was presented.

The School undertook a SWOT analysis in 2018 as part of their AACSB process, however, the detail and outcomes of that exercise were not explicit in the documentation. In future, the information provided to the Panel would benefit from the inclusion of some additional key data in relation to the School's core activities e.g., FTEs; student data; organisational chart etc. – these could be provided in the form of electronic links. The Panel appreciated that the School's Business Plan was made available on request and this did provide additional context.

The Panel held the strong opinion that the School needs to extend its international benchmarking to move beyond current points of reference. This is required to gain greater understanding of activity within internationally renowned Business Schools and to learn from international peers, competitors and aspirants.

---

<sup>1</sup> Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business

### *1.5.2 Developments since last review*

Because this was the School's first review in its current structure, and the focus was forward-looking in terms of building a coherent School structure, the Panel did not look at historical reports on the individual Departments.

### **1.6 Good Practice Case Study**

The Panel commended the case studies, which gave an insight into the breadth and quality of the student learning experience, and highlighted excellent examples of interdisciplinarity within the School. The examples evidenced the staff's engagement with CIRTL<sup>2</sup> programmes and their commitment to innovative approaches to learning and teaching. The QEU will liaise with the authors to have these Case Studies published on the QEU website.

---

<sup>2</sup> Centre for the Integration of Research Teaching and Learning

## Part 2 – Findings of the Panel

### 2.1 School Overview

#### 2.1.1 *Mission, vision, aims and objectives*

The mission and vision presented in the documentation are high level and laudable, but somewhat lacking distinctiveness. There is an opportunity to leverage the School's distinctive offerings (for example, in areas relating to Food, Health, Policy etc.) and to promote these as the School's KPIs nationally and internationally; however, in doing this, care should be taken to balance these priorities against the core functional areas of the academic portfolio.

A significant piece of work for the School (CUBS) will be establishing and consolidating its brand and identity in an increasingly competitive national and international context. To capitalise on University College Cork's globally identifiable brand, the School should consider aligning its own branding for Cork University Business School with that of UCC, to avoid confusion for prospective students and stakeholders in domestic and international markets.

The merger between UCC/CUBS and IMI has increased the diversity of the offerings and raises the profile of the School – particularly in the area of executive education. In relation to the merger, the iSER acknowledges the requirement for on-going work in relation to the development of its faculty and operations. The School should clarify the relationship between IMI and the University/CUBS in terms of the integration of IMI with the School, and the associated governance. In the light of AACSB accreditation, it is critical that there is coherence between the CUBS and IMI missions, and that a shared vision around quality, teaching & learning, branding, Assurance of Learning (AOL) etc. is articulated.

#### 2.1.2 *Unit details including staff and student profile*

The School currently has a student enrolment of over 6,000 students (3,596 in CUBS and 2,498 in IMI) which includes full-time, part-time, undergraduate, postgraduate and executive education. The School has an academic faculty of 120 and 33 professional support staff. The School has benefitted from recent investment in senior academic appointments, with sixteen professorial appointments having been made or under recruitment in CUBS over the past eighteen months. It will be important that the new appointees are supported in furthering the profile of the School.

The Panel noted that progress has been made in increasing the internationalisation of the student profile – particularly at postgraduate (PG) level; there is an opportunity for the School to develop its branding and profile to attract undergraduate (UG) and PG students from all over Ireland, the EU and internationally.

#### 2.1.3 *Unit organisation & planning*

Although this is a School in transition, impressive strides have been made in a relatively short period of time towards integrating Departments into a coherent academic School. The Panel was impressed by the enthusiastic, dynamic and committed new leadership team which has been put in place to lead the navigation of the schoolification process and meet its accreditation ambitions. The AACSB process can be leveraged as a valuable mechanism to increase engagement and continuity across Departments. It was evident that progress in relation to planning and new policy formation is underway. There appeared to be considerable goodwill and engagement amongst the School staff for the new Business School and its aspirations.

Because of inherited Departmental structures within the School, there appeared to be a lack of cohesion of administrative systems and processes employed across the Department offices. There are many examples of best practice in individual Departments that could be shared and disseminated throughout the School. The recent appointment of a School Manager presents an excellent

opportunity to enable these systems and processes to become more streamlined. The School should map the requirements for programme support (i.e. support for programme administration and Programme Directors) and for centralised functions such as marketing, alumni, industry engagement, internationalisation, etc., and determine the extent to which current professional support staff can meet these needs.

## **2.2 Evaluation of Academic Standards**

### **2.2.1 Student “life-cycle”**

No data was provided around student progression and retention; however, the PG and UG students that the Panel met were highly complimentary regarding the quality of their programmes: i.e., of teaching and learning support; staff accessibility; quality of feedback; and the general student learning environment within the School. Almost all programmes at UG level have a work placement element which is highly valued by students. The connections to international student work placements that the BIS programme enjoys – especially in the US – is a significant draw for students and would be the envy of many other institutions. It was noted that the BA (Hons) Economics (through Transformational Learning) did not have a formal work-placement and this might be reconsidered.

### **2.2.2 Programme delivery and curriculum planning**

The School’s Executive Summary lists 77 undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in the School’s portfolio of programmes (including IMI – see Appendix 3 for the complete list). The level of enrolment on these programmes varies substantially with some being highly subscribed and others with low or no recruitment. The Panel was of the opinion that there is considerable scope for rationalisation and consolidation of the programme portfolio. This could include providing different pathways and specialisms for individual programmes through, for example, consolidation of routes, core and specialist pathways, and exit awards within single programmes.

Given the number of programmes, and the attendant implications for the development of the School’s AOL processes, the School should firstly develop a framework to systematically review and rationalise the programme portfolio. Requiring a data driven approach and an agile mind-set, this framework should include looking at programme design and currency; targets for recruitment; assessment and student workload; industry links and employability; and assuring that excellence is evidenced across all programmes.

### **2.2.3 School communication structures**

Impressive strides have been made in a relatively short period of time towards integrating Departments into a coherent academic School – a process which is on-going. Given the intensive and extensive change that is underway within the School, the work to date was commended. Continuing effective communication to all staff will be essential to further develop team-based structures for the cohesion of the School. The adoption of a communication platform at School level, such as the recently acquired WorkVivo (when implemented), could greatly facilitate communication.

Both formal and informal communications with students – particularly in relation to feedback – were commented on very positively by the students. The implementation of the University’s new VLE, Canvas, provides an opportunity to standardise student communication and streamline submission of assignments and to ensure the look and the feel of the student interface are consistent. Similarly, some consideration should be given to the consistent recording of lectures and the use of Panopto.

## **2.3 Evaluation of Student Learning Experience**

### **2.3.1 Teaching and learning, including the impact of research on teaching**

The academic staff demonstrated a strong commitment to innovative teaching and learning – as evidenced by the excellent case studies presented – and there has been consistent engagement

amongst School staff with CIRTl programmes over the years. External stakeholders spoke very highly of the School and of the quality of the graduates; work placement featured in almost all of the School's undergraduate programmes and was highly valued by the students. Feedback from students was very positive, with statements such as: "teaching quality is amazing", "structure and materials are excellent" and "lecturers are excellent academically and personally".

The appointment of the new Chairs has been transformative in enhancing a research agenda at the School. There are some pockets of excellence in research at the School and some laudable initiatives put in place to support the development of a growing research environment.

### *2.3.2 Assessment*

Student feedback indicated that, on some programmes, there are too many assignments resulting in overassessment (potentially arising from 5 ECTS modules on PG programmes). Others mentioned that the assessment load is clustered, and assessment strategy and planning at programme level could be improved. This should be considered as part of the rationalisation of the programmes and in the light of the University's recently approved Academic Strategy. In addition, the School needs to ensure a consistent approach to electronic submission of course work in line with the University's sustainability goals.

### *2.3.3 Learning resources*

Currently the Departments within the School are separated across campus, which presents a challenge for the integration of the School. Capital investment is on-going however and a move to a new state-of-the-art building for the School's executive education function is imminent.

Some students reported having difficulty accessing IT labs to carry out assignments, because labs are being used for teaching purposes throughout the day. This was a particular issue for students needing to access the STRATA package. The School should ensure a consistent approach to the provision of IT, including ready access to industry-standard software and ease of access to IT labs. A strategy needs to be in place for the on-going development and deployment of IT within the School.

### *2.3.4 Student support*

From the student perspective, the staff support is excellent. Students spoke of good supports for "transition to professional life" and for employability skills. Many programmes have built-in career support (guest lectures with employers, CV preparation, simulated interviews, etc.), although students reported that it can be difficult to access career services at peak times, which is a University-wide issue. Opportunities for staff-student communication was greater in smaller programmes and less accessible in the larger programmes where student numbers are very high.

### *2.3.5 External links/community engagement/employability*

The Panel met with a representative group of external stakeholders, including employers, work placement hosts and alumni; it was clear that the School is addressing skills needs and providing quality graduates for key services and industries in the region. There was a strong will, amongst this group, to engage more widely with the School and offer support in the form of guest speaking, work placement, career direction and curriculum advice; such support could be leveraged to enable students to enhance and develop the essential soft skills required for career progression.

## **2.4 Staff**

### *2.4.1 Staff Profile*

Because of the large number of programmes delivered by the School, most of the academic faculty are involved in academic administration roles as Programme Directors or Co-Directors. To ensure fair



workload distribution for all staff, a transparent workload allocation model should be implemented. This model should take account of the administrative duties of academic staff – especially in relation to the Programme Director roles – and ensure that staff have sufficient time to engage in research and learning and teaching (L & T) activities to advance their own career objectives. The School should map the academic administrative functions with its professional capacity, and align the requirements for programme support to ensure that academic staff are primarily engaged in academic pursuits and student support, rather than administration.

At the meeting with staff, the view was expressed that “Departments are still doing their own thing” – albeit that this culture is beginning to change with improved interdepartmental communication. To avoid duplication, and maximise synergies and economies of scale, the Panel recommends that the School leverages the existing skills, best practice and institutional knowledge of professional staff within the Departments. To that end, the School should explore centralised professional support for functions such as marketing, alumni and industry engagement. In particular, it should be explicitly clear about what functions are carried out at Department, School, College and University levels.

#### *2.4.2 Staff Communication and Development Objectives*

In the context of the many changes that are occurring across the School, staff shared a sense of ambition and hope for the School and viewed the growth as positive. They welcomed opportunities for staff CPD and highlighted the importance of increased information, consultation and communication around the changes that are taking place (e.g., the AACSB process). In the light of the on-going change, a training needs analysis would be beneficial – for example around areas such as AOL for both academic and for professional staff.

### **2.5 Collaborative partnerships (e.g. joint programmes)**

The acquisition of IMI is a real strength which has increased the diversity of the School’s offering – particularly as a leader in executive education – and raises the profile of the School, especially at national level. Current governance arrangements do not appear to promote integration of IMI with CUBS, addressing the reporting relationship between IMI leadership and Head of College could be constructive at this point. In seeking international accreditation, the School may want to keep under review the governance arrangements with IMI as they move into the next stages of the relationship. The Panel recommends that the School seeks clarification around the relationship between IMI and the University/CUBS in terms of its integration with the School. Furthermore, in the light of AACSB accreditation, there is a need to articulate a shared vision around quality, teaching & learning, branding, AOL etc.

## **Part 3: Recommendations**

### **3.1 School Recommendations**

#### **The Panel Recommends that the School:**

1. Develops a strategic plan which articulates the distinctive strengths of the School and identifies the opportunities that arise from schoolification
2. Looks to a wider selection of international business schools for benchmarking to inform its strategic direction
3. Considers aligning the branding of the Business School with that of UCC to avoid confusion for prospective students and stakeholders in domestic and international markets
4. Seeks clarification around the relationship between IMI and the University/CUBS in terms of its integration with the School and governance arrangements
5. Considers the coherence of the CUBS and IMI missions, and in the light of AACSB accreditation, articulates a shared vision around quality, teaching & learning, branding, AOL etc.
6. Develops a framework to systematically review and rationalise the programme portfolio
7. Implements the framework to review and rationalise the portfolio of programmes, including assessment and student workload
8. Maps the requirements for programme administrative support and determines the extent to which current professional support staff can meet these needs
9. Implements a transparent workload allocation model which takes account of the administrative duties of academic staff – especially in relation to the Programme Director roles – and ensure that staff have sufficient time to engage in research and L & T activities to advance their own career objectives
10. Ensures that programmes remain current and linked to industry requirements for graduate employability
11. Ensures a consistent approach to the provision of IT, including ready access to industry-standard software and ease of access to IT labs; a strategy needs to be in place for the on-going development and deployment of IT within the School
12. Ensures a consistent approach to electronic submission of course work in line with the University's sustainability goals
13. Considers centralised roles for functions such as marketing for programmes, and alumni and industry engagement, etc. and clarifies what should be done at Department, School and University levels
14. Ensures good communication channels to keep staff updated with change, for example, adopting WorkVivo (when implemented by University) for internal communications
15. Expands its international remit by: broadening the diversity of its markets; increasing mobility for staff and students; and developing the curriculum to augment the international focus in teaching and research

### **3.2 University Recommendations:**

#### **The Panel recommends that the University:**

1. Continues to support the School in its journey towards integration and appropriately resource the School to meet the AACSB requirements, while being realistic about time scales for accreditation
2. Develops and implements a University-wide policy around the use of Panopto, Canvas and other IT supports that meets the needs of students in a digital age
3. Ensure that information on CUBS programmes is easily accessible on the University's website and that the terminology used for programme and course descriptions is consistent

## Appendix 1: Timetable

### CORK UNIVERSITY BUSINESS SCHOOL

Tuesday 20 November 2018	
12.00 – 14.00	<p>Convening of Panel members and initial briefing by Director of Quality Enhancement.</p> <p>Panel discussion and identification of issues to be explored. Followed by lunch.</p>
14.00 – 15.30	<p>Meeting with Dean, Cork University Business School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to be joined by Vice-Deans and Heads of Departments at 14.45</li> </ul> <p>Vice Dean Research  Head, Food Business &amp; Development  Vice Dean Executive Education &amp; Internationalisation  Head, Business Information Systems  Vice Dean, Teaching &amp; Learning  Head, Management &amp; Marketing  Head, Accounting &amp; Finance  Head of Economics  Vice Dean, Graduate Studies  Accreditation Project Manager</p>
15.30 – 16.00	Private meeting of the Panel (tea/coffee)
16.00 – 17.00	<p>Meeting with School staff</p> <p><i>Discuss issues such as strategy, communications, research &amp; education, staffing, teaching &amp; learning, curriculum &amp; assessment.</i></p>
17.15 – 18.15	<p>Meeting with Stakeholders, with representatives from:</p> <p>Bank of Ireland  Cork County Council  Cork Business Association  Janssen  Cork City Council  Central Statistics Office  VMWare  PWC  Aldi</p> <p><i>The Panel meets with work-placement partners, past graduates, employers of graduates and other stakeholders as appropriate to discuss views on the quality of education received and the quality of the graduates.</i></p>
19.00	Informal dinner for members of the Panel & staff members of the School

Wednesday 21 November 2018	
08.45 – 09.00	Convening of the Panel
09.00 – 09.45	Meeting with Head of College <i>Panel discuss College strategy and priorities.</i>
09.45 – 10.30	Enhancing Student Learning Experience <u>3 Cases on:</u> 1. the MSc in Data Business 2. the BA in Transformational Learning 3. the capstone module in the BSc Food Marketing and Entrepreneurship
10.30 – 11.00	Private meeting of the Panel (tea/coffee)
11.00 – 11.30	Meeting with School Administrators from:  Business Information Systems Management & Marketing Accounting & Finance Food Business and Development Economics School Manager, CUBS
11.30 – 12.00	Meeting with IMI representatives  Chief Executive Officer Director of Executive Education
12.00 – 12.45	Undergraduate students, representing the following:  2nd Year, BComm 3rd Year, BComm 4th Year, BComm 4th Year, BComm (International) 1st Year, Business Information Systems 2nd Year, Business Information Systems 2nd Year BA Econ (TL) 3rd Year, BA Econ (TL) 4th Year, BA Econ (TL) 1st Year, BSc Finance 2nd Year, BSc Finance 4th Year, BA (Economics) 3rd Year, BSc International Development & Food Policy BSc Food Marketing and Entrepreneurship
12.45 – 13.45	Lunch and private meeting of the Panel

13.45 – 14.30	<p>Postgraduate students, representing the following:</p> <p>IS for Business Performance  Business Information &amp; Analytical Systems  PhD (M&amp;M)  MSc Business Economics – 2 x student representatives  Corporate Finance  MSc Food Business and Innovation  PhD (BIS)  Innovation in European Business  MSc Management &amp; Marketing  Master ACC</p>
14.30 – 15.00	<p>Meeting with Deputy President &amp; Registrar</p> <p>Discussion of University academic and development strategy</p>
15.00 – 15.30	Tea/coffee for the Panel
15.30 – 16.00	<p>Meeting with Senior Officers of the University:</p> <p>Director of Research Support Services, Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation  Interim Vice-President for Teaching &amp; Learning</p>
16.00 – 17.30	<p>Meeting with Programme Directors/Chairs of Boards of Studies. Focus on curriculum, programme portfolio, assurance of learning.</p> <p>BSc Accounting  MSc International Accounting Practice  MSc\Diploma (Data Business) &amp; (Digital Business) [IMI]  BA Economics (through Transformational Learning)  MSc Business Information Systems  BSc International Development &amp; Food Policy  MSc Corporate Finance  BA (Economics)  BSc Finance  PG Dip Business Practice  MSc (Health Economics), PG Dip (Health)</p>
19.00	Working private dinner for members of the Panel to commence drafting the report.

Thursday 22 November 2018	
08.45 – 09.00	Convening of the Panel
09.00 – 10.00	<p>Meeting with Dean, Cork University Business School</p> <p>Clarification and discussions of main findings by Panel</p>

10.00 – 10.30	Private meeting of Panel and tea/coffee
10.30 – 11.00	Closing presentation
11.00 – 12.00	Advisory meeting with Panel RE AACSB process  Dean, Cork University Business School Vice Dean, Accreditation & Governance
12.00 – 14.00	Further work on drafting the final report (lunch delivery for 12.30)

## Appendix 2: AACSB Standards Mapped to UCC's Quality Review Standards

### Cork University Business School (CUBS)

#### Statutory Context for Quality Review

Quality assurance at UCC is informed by international best practice and has regard to the requirements of the *Qualifications and Quality Assurance Act, 2012*<sup>3</sup> and with the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015)*.<sup>4</sup>

Under the *Qualifications and Quality Assurance Act* the University is required to undertake periodic cyclical review of the quality of education, research and services on a 7-year cycle.

'National policy is that the provider-owned, quality assurance procedures of designated awarding bodies will be comprehensive. This means that such procedures will cover all education and training, research and related activities of the designated awarding body' (QQI statutory guidelines for designated awarding bodies).<sup>5</sup> This statutory requirement for internal quality review by UCC is separate from other quality or accreditation processes under the national quality arrangements.

#### Quality Process

The quality process sits within a framework of principles that govern all types of quality review:

- The process adheres to the four-stage model for review set out in the ESG and approved by QQI (i.e. self-assessment, peer review, site visit, published report) thus ensuring consistency of operation;
- The review is carried out through a process that is independent in its operation and allows the panel to come to its conclusions independently and without interference;
- All reviews are intended to provide both assurance of quality and standards and a means by which the unit under review can consider enhancements;
- There is student member on all review panels who is a full member of the panel;
- All review panels meet students.

#### Principles of Enhancement

UCC's main principles of enhancement as defined by the Strategic Plan are described in UCC's Quality Enhancement Policy:

'An enhancement ethos both challenges and supports the systematic examination of what we do as a University to enable excellence in serving learners, stakeholders and our wider community in terms of our education, research and other activities. Our approach to quality is founded on openness, systematic self-evaluation, engagement with peer review processes and a commitment to enhancement-based outcomes that are responsive, creative, enabling and student-centred. Through our quality enhancement approach, we seek to: preserve our institutional autonomy through accountability and transparency which will enable the diversity of our activities; recognise and share good practice; increase our reflexive capacity; support institutional learning and development to encourage responsiveness across all our activities.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2012/act/28/enacted/en/html>

<sup>4</sup> ESG (2015) European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the European Higher Education Area: [http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG\\_2015.pdf](http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Sector-Specific%20Quality%20Assurance%20Guidelines%20for%20Designated%20Awarding%20Bodies.pdf>



In our quality enhancement approach, we are committed to:

- Building and embedding a culture of quality which is engaged, reflective and connected
- Working collaboratively to develop effective evaluation approaches that allow critical reflection on achievement of strategic goals and objectives and an appraisal of the known and anticipated needs of stakeholders
- Engaging students as active partners in the quality enhancement process to embed a student-centred approach
- Developing quality processes that promote creativity, excellence and innovation
- Using peer review as an important reference point for confirming and developing the quality of the University's activities
- Undertaking institutional reflection on the outcomes of quality review processes to contribute to on-going institutional planning, resource allocation and institutional development
- Ensuring that quality processes facilitate the sharing of good practice internally and externally
- Developing our evidenced-based approach to quality enhancement informed by relevant research and good practice nationally and internationally.'

### Context for CUBS Review

UCC provides a customised approach to the internal review process for academic areas which have professional accreditation, to allow alignment and reduce duplication. The specific context for the CUBS review takes into account the current AACSB accreditation process and therefore will be a customised review which aligns the University's internal review process with the AACSB accreditation process in terms of documentation, sequencing, and standards. The standards have been mapped between AACSB and UCC and with the exception of the AACSB standard relating to financial arrangements (which is not part of UCC model) there is broad comparability between the rest of the standards and UCC's model.

AACSB Standard	UCC Quality Review Standards
<b>Standard 1:</b> Mission, Impact, Innovation	Quality Review – mission and aims of unit; strategic and curriculum planning
<b>Standard 2:</b> Intellectual Contributions, Impact and Alignment with Mission	Research Quality Review – updated research activities part of ISER.
<b>Standard 3:</b> Financial Strategies and Allocation of Resources	Not applicable to Quality Review
<b>Standard 4:</b> Student Admissions, Progression and Career Development	Quality Review - student admission, progression, recognition and certification (ESG 1.4)
<b>Standard 5:</b> Faculty Sufficiency & Deployment	Quality Review – staff resources, workload and development (ESG 1.5 and 1.6)
<b>Standard 6:</b> Faculty Management & Support	Quality Review - school organisation / planning and staff development (ESG 1.5)
<b>Standard 7:</b> Professional Staff Sufficiency and Deployment	Quality Review - staff resources, workload and development (ESG 1.5 and 1.6)

<b>Standard 8:</b> Curricula Management and Assurance of Learning	Quality Review – Information management: local quality assurance, enhancement and monitoring activities (ESG 1.7)
<b>Standard 9:</b> Curriculum Content	Quality Review – learning, teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3)
<b>Standard 10:</b> Student-Faculty Interactions	Quality Review - student support (academic and pastoral) (ESG 1.6)
<b>Standard 11:</b> Degree Programme Educational Level, Structure and Equivalence	Quality Review – on-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes (ESG 1.9)
<b>Standard 12:</b> Teaching Effectiveness	Quality Review – learning, teaching and assessment; staff competence and continuing professional development (ESG 1.3 and 1.5)
<b>Standard 13:</b> Student Academic and Professional Engagement	Quality Review – student-centred learning teaching and assessment (ESG 1.3)
<b>Standard 14:</b> Executive Education	Consistent with QQI expectations
<b>Standard 15:</b> Faculty Qualifications and Engagement	Quality Review - academic collaborative partnerships and external relations

## Logistics

*Timing:* The site visit will take place from 20-22 November 2018.

*Facilitation:* The logistics and associated costs for UCC are undertaken by QEU. QEU will facilitate the review which will encompass: appointment of reviewers; all organisation logistics; support & secretariat for site visit.

*Panel members:* The external Panel will be drawn from AACSB Schools internationally. CUBS will nominate a long list of international reviewers with support from QEU as required. Contact with reviewers will be through QEU.

*Documentation:* The documentation provided by CUBS will be (1) the draft updated ISER (October 2018) produced by CUBS to meet the requirements of the AACSB accreditation accompanied by (2) a Case Study of Good Practice as required by the UCC quality review method.

*Report:* The Panel will produce a report. A draft of the report will be sent to CUBS for factual check within 6-8 weeks of the site visit. The final Panel report will be presented to QEC for approval and publication.

### Appendix 3: List of Programme Offerings

<b>Programme Offerings</b>
BSc (Hons) (Accounting)
BSc (Hons) (Business Information Systems)
BA (Hons) (Economics) (through transformational learning)
BSc (Hons) Business Economics
BSc (Hons) Financial Economics
BSc (Hons) Business & Financial Economics
BSc (Hons) Credit Union Business
BSc (Hons) (Food Marketing and Entrepreneurship)
BSc (Hons) International Development and Food Policy
BCL (Hons) (Law and Business) Degree
BSc (Hons) (Finance)
BComm (Hons)
BComm (Hons) (International) with Chinese Studies
BComm (Hons) (International) with French
BComm (Hons) (International) with German
BComm (Hons) (International) with Italian
BComm (Hons) (International) with Hispanic Studies
BComm (Hons) (International) with Irish
HDip Human Resource Management
Postgraduate Diploma in Project Management
Postgraduate Certificate in Innovation, Commercialisation and Entrepreneurship
Postgraduate Diploma in Health Economics Practice <b>(online)</b>
Postgraduate Diploma in Economics of Business Practice
Postgraduate Diploma in Supply Chain Management - Lean SCM Black Belt
MSc (Economics)
MSc (Human Resource Management)
MSc (Project Management)
MSc (Management and Marketing)
MAcc (Accounting)
MSc (Asset Management)
MSc (Business Information and Analytics Systems)
MSc (Corporate Finance)
MSc (Digital Health)

MSc (Electronic Business) - Changing to MSc (Design and development of Digital Business) in 18/19
MSc (Information Systems for Business Performance)
MSc (Innovation, Commercialisation and Entrepreneurship)
MSc (Innovation in European Business)
MSc (International Accounting Practice)
MSc (Management Information and Managerial Accounting Systems)
MSc (Health Economics Practice)
MSc (Economic & Enterprise Development)
MSc (Business Economics)
MSc (Economics of Business Practice)
MSc (Financial Economics)
MSc (Co-operative and Social Enterprise) (Online)
MSc (Food Marketing)
MSc (Supply Chain Management - Lean SCM Black Belt)
MSc Food Business & Innovation
MSc Co-operative, Agri-Food and Sustainable Development
Executive MBA
Mcomm
MSc (Healthcare Leadership)
PhD (Business Information Systems)
DBA (Business Economics)
PhD
MSc in Management Practice
MSc in Digital Business
MSc in Data Business
MSc in Business Practice
MBS in Business Practice
IMI Diploma in Business Finance
IMI Diploma in Data Business
IMI Diploma in Digital Business
IMI Diploma in Executive Coaching
IMI Diploma in International Business Development
IMI Diploma in Leadership
IMI Diploma in Management
IMI Diploma in the Management of Governance & Compliance
IMI Diploma in Marketing & Digital Strategy

IMI Diploma in Organisational Development & Transformation
IMI Diploma in Organisational Behaviour
IMI Diploma in Regulatory Management
IMI Diploma in Strategic HR Management
IMI Diploma in Strategy & Innovation
IMI Diploma in Technology Leadership
Certificate in Procurement Management
Higher Diploma in Leadership Development