

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

**QUALITY IMPROVEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

***COLLEGE OF ARTS, CELTIC STUDIES, & SOCIAL SCIENCES***

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2011/2012**

**16 December 2011**

## PEER REVIEW GROUP MEMBERS

Name	Position/Discipline	Institution
Mr. Trevor Holmes	Vice-President for External Relations	University College Cork
Professor Anne Moran (Chair)	Professor of Education Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Educational Partnerships and International Affairs	University of Ulster
Mr. Paul Moriarty	Head of Student Counselling & Development	University College Cork
Ms. Lynda O'Toole	Senior Inspector	Department of Education and Skills

## PEER REVIEW

### Methodology

The members of the Peer Review Group (PRG) convened on the afternoon of the first day to consider the timetable, the purposes of the site visit and the review itself. The members of the panel noted that the second international expert who had been appointed as a member of the PRG by the University was unable to travel to Ireland at the last minute for personal reasons and thus was unable to participate in the review visit. The members of the group exchanged comments and opinions following each meeting. Professor Anne Moran was appointed as Chair of the Peer Review Group (PRG). The members of the PRG divided for some of the elements of the site visit, as indicated in detail in the timetable (Appendix A). All members of the PRG engaged with all aspects of the review.

### Site Visit

The site visit was very informative and the various meetings were particularly valuable and assisted the PRG in forming views and recommendations for improvement. The PRG met with academic and administrative staff of the College, with students and with senior officers of the University, in addition to meeting with staff from UCC who expressed a wish to meet with the review team.

The site visit included a tour of some of the facilities used by the departments and schools of the College, in addition to the College offices.

Unfortunate circumstances meant the PRG were unable to meet with the Vice President (VP) for Student Experience.

## **Peer Review Group Report**

The PRG commenced drafting the report on the morning and afternoon of the second full day of the site visit. In particular, the members of the Group considered their key findings and recommendations for improvement whilst in UCC and presented a summary of their findings to the staff of the College in the exit presentation. The report was finalised subsequent to the site visit via email communications. It was agreed and approved by all members of the Group.

## **OVERALL ANALYSIS**

### **Self-Assessment Report**

#### **Context**

This report is presented in the knowledge and understanding of a number of broader contextual factors (internal and external), including:

- The transition phase for the College both in terms of its structures and with the appointment of a new Head of College who took up post in October 2010
- The acknowledged level of personal and professional commitment of the staff of the College
- The new Rules for the operation of the College which were approved by Governing Body in September 2011
- The schoolification process for the College which is still incomplete
- The development of the University's new Strategic Plan 2012-2017, which has recently commenced, and the subsequent completion of that plan which will provide a framework for the College plan going forward
- The prevailing external context within which the review was conducted particularly the national strategy for Higher Education in Ireland (Hunt report) and the national financial constraints under which the University as a whole is working.

The PRG considers that the timing of the review provides opportunities for the College and the University, notwithstanding a number of significant challenges. The College and the University are leading in terms of widening access to higher education for groups such as the socio-economically disadvantaged and the disabled. The College has a commendable record in attracting international students. Even in these straitened financial times, the College is generating a surplus, which provides even greater opportunities for its future development. In light of this, it was the view of the PRG, that the generation of additional income does need to be incentivised by the University, if staff are to continue to engage fully with such initiatives.

The PRG unreservedly endorsed the recommendation that was made by some members of staff of the College during the site visit for the appointment of an Associate Dean for First Year Students and for the appointment of a Vice-Head of College with specific responsibility for Teaching & Learning.

### **Self-Assessment Report**

The PRG found that the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) demonstrated a lack of clarity and understanding of the review process, including the requirements of the review, on behalf of the Head and staff of the College. Although the guidelines for the self-reflection process and the preparation of the SAR had been agreed with the College approximately twelve months prior to the review, the PRG found that they had not been followed in full. This resulted in limited ownership and engagement by staff of the College, with the full potential of the review not having been properly realised. The SAR fell short in a number of ways:

- The four main questions on page 2 of the guidelines were not addressed
  - o *What are you trying to do?*
  - o *How are you trying to do it?*
  - o *How do you know it works?*
  - o *How do you change in order to improve?*
- No executive summary and no action plan was provided
- No organogram detailing the structures of the College was provided
- Limited recommendations for improvement were included
- There was an absence of a quality focus and little evidence of an improvement approach
- The College Steering Committee was not fully representative, e.g. no students were represented on the committee
- The PRG was struck by the lack of awareness of the UCC Guidelines for preparation of the SAR by members of the Steering Committee
- The PRG noted with concern that they received four different answers as to who chaired the Steering Committee from the various members of the Committee with whom they met.

Given that invitations had been issued to external PRG members and dates set many months before the site visit, the expectation of the PRG was that the process for the preparation of the SAR would have been put in train at that point in time. The evidence before the PRG indicated that this did not happen. The PRG formed the opinion that the SAR submitted had been hastily created and the quality did not do justice to the current work nor the substantial achievements of the College.

The PRG acknowledged the work of the members of the Steering Committee and the efforts made by them to engage with internal and external stakeholders. However, outside of the circulation of

questionnaires, there was limited evidence of engagement with students and either internal or external stakeholders.

The PRG would have welcomed evidence of a greater overall level of dialogue on the College and all its activities which may have yielded a detailed action plan for improvements based on the findings and reflections of the College and all its members. The report concluded with the identification of two priorities arising from the SWOT analysis and referred to numerous other areas which had been similarly identified. These were presented in Appendix 18 in the SAR but unfortunately no attempt was made to analyse or prioritise these or indeed to comment critically on them.

While extensive data was collected, very little of this was properly reflected upon nor analysed within the SAR. The evidence-base relied on low response rates from stakeholders which calls into question the true reliability and the validity of the data and therefore the resultant conclusions drawn. Furthermore, in some areas there was limited use of available College and University data which resulted in an incomplete sense of the overall student experience being conveyed to the PRG. For example, no reference was made to the outcomes of the student satisfaction survey; to external examiners' reports; to longer term employability or to the findings from previous recent quality reviews.

The College did not complete any benchmarking exercise which the PRG viewed as a crucial missed opportunity and regretted that the potential of the review process to engage with comparable internal and external data had been totally overlooked.

The PRG expressed disappointment that only ten students (one undergraduate student and nine postgraduate students) from the largest college within the University actually turned up to meet with them. Those students that did attend the meeting commented that they had been notified at very short notice. As students are core to the business of the College, the PRG regretted that its engagement with student representatives was so limited.

The imbalance in attention paid to teaching & learning versus research & innovation and external engagement /community relationships as espoused in the University Strategic Plan, as reflected in the SAR and in the PRG's discussions, was of significant concern. Neither the questionnaires nor the section entitled Teaching and Learning in the SAR provided details about the quality of the student learning experience, the use of innovative pedagogies, research and scholarship informed teaching, assessment and feedback or creativity with regard to the use of emerging technologies and the use of technology facilitate blended or e-learning. It is regrettable that sufficiently more attention had not been devoted to this core aspect of the College's mission. The questionnaires did not deal with this aspect of provision, which was most surprising, although it perhaps reflected the limited understanding of the process, evidenced in the inaccurate concept of college encountered during the review. It questions the level of scrutiny and review to which the SAR was subjected prior to its submission. Additionally, the University has a number of units dealing specifically with this area and a considerable number of staff have engaged in professional development in teaching and learning. This, however, was not outlined in any detail in the SAR.

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

The PRG noted the following key achievements of the College:

- The significant progress achieved in research in respect of securing research grants; peer mentoring; quality research outputs; formation of clusters around themes; restructuring of the research committee and the overall positive impact of this on the profile of the College.
- The strength of the Graduate School with commendable numbers of students on both Masters and PhD programmes; the quality of supervision; development of training modules and the positive feedback provided by students.
- Achievements in widening access and participation through the recruitment of mature students which is the highest in the University at 14.6% compared to the University average of 11.7%.

### **College Details**

The PRG would have found it useful to have been provided with a diagrammatic overview of the structures within the College and their relationship to one another. This information was requested several times during the site visit but the College was unable to provide the information. There appeared to be limited ownership of the concept of College and the strategic potential that it and the new structures actually afford.

### **College Organisation & Planning**

The PRG acknowledges that the College is in a transition phase in terms of its development as a College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Science (CACSSS) from the pre-existing Faculties of Arts and Celtic Studies and the relatively recent appointment of a new Head of College. The PRG views this transition phase as providing the College with an opportunity to engage with all schools and departments of the College to express a dynamic ambitious new vision and roadmap for future achievement.

The PRG noted that new Rules for the operation of the College have been developed and that newly structured committees are required to be put in place. The PRG was heartened by the confirmation that all new committee structures will be in place by 1<sup>st</sup> November 2011.

The PRG found evidence of incoherence in the short and long term planning activities within the College and strongly recommends that this should be addressed in the preparation of detailed action plans as soon as possible. There is evidence of a disconnection between Schools and Departments and the College albeit that the 'schoolification' process is still only recently embedding. During the review it emerged in discussions that the College is seen solely as an administrative entity by some senior staff. This is an erroneous notion which the PRG felt must be dispelled. The College is an academic and administrative unit and this formation must be reflected in the schools and the College and should be personified in the relationship between the Heads of Schools and Head of College.

The PRG considered the new Rules adopted by the College and found the definition of the relationship between the Head of College, the Heads of Schools and the Heads of Departments and their responsibilities to be unclear. The PRG suggested that further attention should be devoted to ensuring a fuller understanding and ownership of the strategic role of the College and the expectations and accountability of senior staff in its successful delivery.

### **Research & Scholarly Activity**

The PRG recognised and heartily commended the level and quality of research conducted within the College. It acknowledged the considerable progress that has been made in research which is reflected in increased capacity and increased success in accessing external research funding. The growth in new research income for CACSSS is highly commended.

The research agenda has been underpinned by the introduction of mentoring, clustering around key research themes, together with the restructuring of the research committee. Research outputs have been enhanced over the past number of years and it is clear that this is having a positive impact on the overall research profile of the College. The PRG acknowledged and commended the leadership and dynamic involvement of research active staff in the College in research collaborations across Ireland. The College is particularly well positioned to establish a national and international leadership position through capitalising on these initiatives and extending its reach to other discipline areas, to include other colleges.

Graduate Studies are developing across the disciplines within the College following the formation of its Graduate School in 2008. The PRG noted the increase in PhD numbers across all disciplines most notably within the School of English. The experience of students has been enhanced through the implementation of a physical resource dedicated to graduate students and through development of a set of regulations for postgraduate student support and supervision. Students recognised the value of the graduate training courses on offer and especially the interdisciplinary research skills module. High satisfaction with these courses was reported to the PRG. The level of PhD students within the School of English is worthy of special mention and acknowledgment.

The PRG noted the College's expression of interest in '*Beyond Identities*' as a research theme, and would suggest that if this is to be brought to full fruition an academic leader/champion in the College should be appointed. The PRG noted the impressive success of ISS21 Institute achieved with limited resources.

The PRG both noted and commended the commitment of departments with high teaching loads who have engaged and implemented the university strategy to increase the numbers of PhD graduates. Some departments are now potentially victims of their own success and, if this success is to be maintained and enhanced, then the physical infrastructure must be similarly maintained and enhanced.

### **Teaching and Learning**

The PRG found, as previously noted, that there was a conspicuous lack of reference to teaching and learning in the SAR. There was a clear lack of awareness of the centrality of teaching and learning in the activities of the College and especially since it is part of the core mission of the College and University. This could in part be due to the absence of leadership in this area due to the fairly recent departure of the Vice-Head for Teaching and Learning and consequent lack of attention given to this

important activity. The opportunity now exists to appoint someone to this position within the College. National policy and the University Strategic Plan recognise three key missions of universities and higher education colleges in Ireland. One of these three (teaching and learning) was substantially overlooked in the SAR presented to the PRG. The PRG would have expected this to have been addressed, by the College's own review processes, prior to submission of the SAR to them for consideration. The College should have similar ambitions for leading in teaching and learning as it has clearly demonstrated it has for research.

The PRG recognised the potential of the College to lead in developments in teaching and learning, including the use of technology-facilitated learning, and the integration of ICT and e-learning. The PRG strongly recommended the exploitation of e-learning for the delivery of programmes to part-time learners and for the promotion of the internationalisation agenda. Such activities would help in the generation of revenue for the College which would help to alleviate problems caused by moderation of the UCC Resource Allocation Model.

The PRG recognises that expertise in the new technologies is available within UCC. While implementation of this recommendation will require central support there are some existing staff development opportunities which could help support continuing professional development, part-time programmes and programmes for international students. In keeping with the new financial rules for 2011/12 any revenue generated for these purposes will be held within the College thus helping to alleviate moderation issues identified in the SAR.

There is a need to ensure that teaching is current and informed by up-to-date research and scholarship findings. Senior academic staff should be involved in teaching on undergraduate programmes and especially in teaching first year students. The quality of teaching will benefit from the enhanced research activity of the academic staff of the College. Quality feedback in supporting student learning is critical and should be timely, formative and appropriate. A policy on student feedback should be developed by the College, especially for the continuous assessment elements of programmes.

At the end of the review process and site visit the PRG had no sense of the quality of teaching and learning in the College or of the scale of innovation, review or development and use of new technologies. The PRG would have expected discussions and much fuller engagement on teaching and learning.

### **Staff Development**

The PRG found there were a number of reports on activity and engagement with services and supports within the University, but insufficient evidence was provided to enable the PRG to comment in depth on the nature of specific development activities and the consequent impact on the overall work of the College.

### **External Relations & Internationalisation**

The PRG noted the strength of local endorsement of the College by external stakeholders and its success in implementing the internationalisation agenda. The College has been successful in attracting high numbers of international students to many programmes.

External relations should be understood in local, national and international contexts. The SAR did not reflect the quality and extent of activity by the College in this area. The excellent interaction and access was endorsed by the limited number of external stakeholders who met with the PRG. At a national level the College has taken a leadership position in key fora, for example, the Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences (IRCHSS), and at international level there is evidence of extensive participation in JYA, Socrates and EU programmes. The contribution of the School of Asian Studies, the Confucius Institute, and the achievements of the ISS21 Institute are all substantial in their own right but are not reflected with sufficient clarity in the SAR. The standing of the College with two key international partners of the University, namely Quinnipiac and Montana University, is also noteworthy.

The PRG was impressed by the list of potential members of the External Advisory Board to be established before year end. The PRG commended the commitment to addressing important aspects of external stakeholder engagement and international activities and policies.

### **Support Services**

The PRG was especially impressed with the leadership position of the College in which students with disabilities represent 5.9% of the student population, affirming the connections to the student support services by the College. The PRG received very detailed statistics from staff of the Careers Service on employability of graduates of the College. The PRG noted the concerns surrounding employment which need to be considered as part of the review of programmes using the available data within the Student Careers Service to inform future planning. The College should consider involving external stakeholders in curriculum review to ensure that new programmes are appropriately designed to meet the needs of society and the workforce. The PRG would encourage further engagement with Student Careers Service, Student Counselling & Development and the Chaplaincy in their endeavours to improve the employability of graduates and the development of generic competencies and transferable skills in students.

The PRG commended the development of the new web site and would encourage the College to take a broader view of ICT and to engage further with successful projects such as the digital humanities repository. Given the size of the College the PRG acknowledges the desire to have a dedicated resource for supporting ICT developments in the College but believes that the College needs to develop and articulate a compelling strategy to ensure the best use of such a resource in delivering the three pillars of the University Strategic Plan.

### **Staffing**

The PRG acknowledges the challenges of the uncertain environment in relation to staffing and planning. In this particular context the Head of College has a critical role in leading and motivating and supporting staff. Some senior appointments have been awarded to the College in the past couple of years. The PRG suggests that opportunities exist to build capacity and identify possible future leaders. Therefore, the College needs to plan for possible retirements, to engage in succession planning and to work to build leadership capacity.

In this regard the PRG suggests that the College should use its budget to ensure the planned professional development and up-skilling of its staff to meet its strategic ambitions.

## **Accommodation**

The PRG recognises some difficulties in areas of accommodation. Notwithstanding this some excellent progress has been made, including the provision of postgraduate research space. The PRG noted the excellent facilities in O’Rahilly Building (ORB). The PRG did recognise the variation in quality of accommodation available to units within the College. There is a stark contrast between accommodation in ORB and Donovan’s Road. The latter is deficient in many respects and should be re-furbished as a priority as soon as resources become available. There is a need to develop short and long term plans/strategies for future development. The PRG commends the College for dealing admirably with challenges in areas such as the Connolly Building. The very positive attitude and approach of the department housed in the Connolly Building was notable.

The PRG recommends that the College continues to work to enhance the quality of accommodation of all units and to seek to acquire appropriate accommodation where all disciplines can be accommodated.

The PRG accepts the validity in the argument put forward for creating an eastern corridor for Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences in the University. However, the PRG cautions that much of the future engagement of many departments will be increasingly interdisciplinary work with colleagues in departments outside of the College itself. Consideration needs to be given to the provision of space that is not too narrowly owned and enables student and staff to engage creatively beyond their own personal discipline.

## **Financing**

The PRG acknowledges the financial contribution made by the College to the University in terms of its success in generating income and contributing to the overall University financial position. The PRG was impressed by the College’s ability to generate a surplus. In addition the College has a reserve of over 1 million euro available for use for strategic purposes and to incentivise further income generation. The PRG understands that in the academic year 2011/12 non exchequer revenue will be returned directly to the College without moderation to contribute to a potential solution to the moderation issue. Future potential exists for additional income generation within the College. The PRG suggests that a portion of the College’s large reserve should be utilised to ‘pump prime’ such initiatives with seed capital. This would address the issues raised in the SAR.

## **Communications**

The overall lack of knowledge within the College of the quality review process was indicative of a lack of effective internal communication. The PRG acknowledged the increasing use of new technologies and social media in attempting to enhance communications and was very disappointed and surprised by the lack of awareness of the review by many members of the College. As identified earlier in this report, it suggests inadequate levels of communication and quality of engagement in this quality review.

While the PRG did consider suggesting the review process should be repeated in the short term, after some deliberation it decided that a more constructive course of action would be to suggest that the quality committee undertake a more rigorous level of oversight in the implementation of the recommendations for improvement.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

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

While a number of recurring issues were referenced in the SAR the College did not identify any recommendations for improvement.

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

The PRG recommends that the College

1. Seize the opportunity offered by the review to take significant steps to position the College at the centre of the University and adopt a leadership position for Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It should adopt a leadership position in enhancing interdisciplinary research in the College through expanded collaboration with other colleges and disciplines across the university.
2. Consider completing an international benchmarking exercise and use the information gained to help in the development of the College's strategic action plans.
3. Replicate the recent developments and successes achieved in research, in teaching and learning and external engagement.
4. Appoint vice-heads to lead on each of the key pillars of the University mission as expressed in the University Strategic Plan. Actively consider the appointment of an Associate Dean for 1<sup>st</sup> Year students.
5. Clarify roles, responsibilities and expectations of staff at all levels in the College against prioritised strategic objectives. Undertake a succession planning and leadership capacity audit to prioritise strategic staffing requirements. Ensure that the requisite strategic business acumen exists within the college support staff to deliver against its strategic objectives.
6. Introduce a programme review for all programmes currently offered in the College. Encourage innovative, interdisciplinary programme design to include the potential of liberal arts degree(s) in conjunction with other colleges. Develop a strategic approach to future programme development (full and part-time), capitalising on links with external stakeholders.
7. Use the opportunity of the newly established Teaching and Learning Committee within the College to develop a new innovative Teaching and Learning Strategy incorporating the use of multimedia technologies and e-learning.
8. Devise and implement a policy for integrating on-going student feedback into the college planning process.
9. Action short-term/urgent needs and plan for long-term priorities, for example, in the short term focus on the first year student experience, the refurbishment of buildings such as those on Donovan's Rd., and the development of a detailed costed proposal with identified funding sources for a flagship building.

10. Develop a plan for additional income generation including continuing professional development, international students, e-learning, lifelong learning and the expansion of interdisciplinary provision. Utilise the existing reserve to initiate such activities.
11. Review the current communication policy and processes within the college and ensure they are 'fit for purpose' in engaging the whole of College in achievement of its strategic intent.
12. Utilise the outcomes of this review process to inform the College's Strategic Plan.

The PRG recommended that the Quality Promotion Unit

1. Review the appropriateness of the time allotted to a college review site visit and extend either the timeline or the number of panel reviewers to enable a more detailed assessment of college activities.
2. Modify the guidelines for a College review to ensure adequate data, even from existing sources, is included in future SARs of College reviews.
3. Ensure the Quality Promotion Committee undertake a more rigorous level of oversight in the implementation of these recommendations for improvement.

## APPENDIX A

### COLLEGE OF ARTS, CELTIC STUDIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES

#### PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT TIMETABLE

##### In Summary

- Monday 10 October: The Peer Review Group (PRG) arrives at the River Lee Hotel for a briefing from the Director of the Quality Promotion Unit, followed by an informal meeting with College staff members.
- Tuesday 11 October: The PRG considers the Self-Assessment Report and meets with College staff and student and stakeholder representatives. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG.
- Wednesday 12 October: The PRG meets with relevant officers of UCC. An exit presentation is given by the PRG to all members of the College. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG in order to finalise the report. This is the final evening of the review.
- Thursday 13 October: External PRG members depart.

<b>Monday 10 October 2011</b>	
16.00	Meeting of members of the Peer Review Group Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion Unit, Dr. Norma Ryan. Group agrees final work schedule and assignment of tasks for the following 2 days. Views are exchanged and areas to be clarified or explored are identified.
19.00	Informal dinner for members of the Peer Review Group, Head of College of Arts, Celtic Studies & Social Sciences and College Co-ordinating Group. <u>College of ACSSS Co-ordinating Group:</u> Professor Caroline Fennell, Head of College Professor Graham Allen, School of English & Vice-Head of College (Research) Dr. Silvia Ross, Dept. Italian, School of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, & Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, CACSSS Dr. Pat Crowley, Dept. French, School of Languages, Literatures and Cultures Dr. Cathal O'Connell, School of Applied Social Studies Dr. Caitriona O'Dochartaigh, Dept. Early & Medieval Irish, Scoil Léann na Gaeilge Ms. Karen Coughlan, College Office Ms. Majella O'Sullivan, College Manager
<b>Tuesday 11 October 2011</b>	
08.30	Convening of Peer Review Group
08.45	Professor Caroline Fennell, Head, College of ACSSS
09.30	<u>Group meeting with all CACSSS Steering Group staff</u>

	<p>Professor Caroline Fennell, Head of College  Professor Graham Allen, School of English &amp; Vice-Head of College (Research)  Dr. Silvia Ross, Dept. Italian, School of Languages, Literatures and Cultures,  &amp; Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, CACSSS  Dr. Pat Crowley, Dept. French, School of Languages, Literatures and Cultures  Dr. Cathal O'Connell, School of Applied Social Studies  Dr. Caitriona Ó Dochartaigh, Dept. Early &amp; Medieval Irish, Scoil Léann na  Gaeilge  Ms. Karen Coughlan, College Office  Ms. Marian Cotter, College Office  Ms. Gina Morrissey, Acting College Financial Analyst  Ms. Anne Gannon, HR Business Partner for College  Ms. Majella O'Sullivan, College Manager</p>	
11.00	<p><b>Private meetings with individual staff members</b></p> <p><i>Professor A. Moran</i>  <i>Mr. T. Holmes</i></p> <p>11.00: Dr. Lee Jenkins, English  11.15: Ms. Virginia Teehan, Cultural Programmes and Research Support  11.30: Prof. David Ryan, History</p>	<p><b>Private meetings with individual staff members</b></p> <p><i>Ms L. O'Toole</i>  <i>Mr. P. Moriarty</i></p> <p>11.00: Ms. Anne Fitzgerald, English  11.15: Dr. Sabine Kreibel, History of Art  11.30: Prof. Robert Devoy, Geography</p>
11.50	Ms. Marita Foster, Acting International Education Officer	
12.10	Dr. Michael Murphy, President Working lunch	
13.00	Visit to core facilities of the College, escorted by Ms. Virginia Teehan, College of ACSSS (to commence in ORB G35, The Mary Ryan Meeting Room )	
14.00	<u>Heads of Schools/Departments in College of ACSSS</u> Prof. Pat Coughlan, School of English Prof. Nuala Finnegan, Acting Head, School of Languages, Literatures & Cultures Prof. Máire Herbert, Head, Scoil Léann na Gaeilge/School of Irish Learning Prof. Fan Hong, School of Asian Studies Dr. Mary Horgan, School of Education Dr. Ella Kavanagh, Arts Representative, Dept of Economics Prof. Graham Parkes, Head, School of Sociology & Philosophy Prof. Fred Powell, Head, School of Applied Social Studies Prof. Geoff Roberts, Head, School of History	
15.00	<u>Representatives of undergraduate students</u> Mr. Jason Fealy, 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr, Arts (Maths Studies, English)	
15.45	<u>Representatives of postgraduate students</u> Mr. Lorcan Byrne, 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr, PhD Sociology Mr. Conor Foley, 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr, PhD Applied Psychology Ms. Mary Joyce, 4 <sup>th</sup> yr, PhD Applied Psychology Mr. Thomas Kelly, Masters, Geography Ms. Kate Kirwan, 3 <sup>rd</sup> yr, PhD English	

	Ms. Niamh O'Mahony, 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr, PhD English Ms. Susan Martin, 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr, PhD Applied Social Sciences Mr. Niall Murphy, 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr, MA, History Mr. James Sullivan, 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr, MA, Sociology
17.00	<u>Meeting with Stakeholders</u> Mr. Sean Abbott, Head of Client Services, Cope Foundation Mr. Brendan Keohane, Principal Social Worker, Mercy Hospital Mr. Kieran McCarthy, City Councillor
19.00	Meeting of Peer Review Group to identify remaining aspects to be clarified and to finalise tasks for the following day, a followed by a working private dinner.
<b>Wednesday 12 October 2011</b>	
08.30	Convening of Peer Review Group
09.30	Professor Paul Giller, Registrar & Senior Vice-President
10.00	Ms. Anne Gannon, Human Resources, HR Partner to College of ACSSS
10.30	Mr. Cormac McSweeney, Finance Office
11.00	Professor Anita Maguire, Vice-President for Research & Innovation
11.15	Professor Grace Neville, Vice-President for Teaching and Learning
11.45	Discussion among the Peer Review Group
12.15	Mr. Ronan Madden, Arts, Humanities, Multimedia Librarian
12.30	Mr. Seamus McEvoy, Head, Careers Services
12.45	Dr. Anne Mills, Admissions Officer
13.00	Ms. Eleanor Fouhy, Head, Academic Programmes and Regulations Office
13.15	Working lunch
13.45	Preparation of first draft of final report
16.30	Professor Caroline Fennell, Head, College of ACSSS
17.00	Exit presentation to all staff was made by the Chair of the Peer Review Group summarising the principal findings of the Peer Review Group. This presentation is <u>not</u> for discussion at this time.
19.00	Working private dinner for members of the Peer Review Group to complete drafting of report and finalisation of arrangements for completion and submission of final report.