

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

**QUALITY IMPROVEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

**SCHOOL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY**

.....

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2013-14**

**Confidential**

**18 February 2014**

## **PEER REVIEW GROUP MEMBERS**

- Prof. Patrick Leman, Royal Holloway, University of London, Dept of Psychology (Rapporteur)
- Dr Fiona Lyddy, NUI Maynooth, Dean, Faculty of Science and Engineering
- Mr Dave Magee, UCC, (SEFS College rep) Student Representative
- Prof. Teresa McCormack, Queen's University Belfast, Director of Research, Cognition Development and Education Cluster
- Mr Paul Moriarty, UCC, Head of Student Counselling and Development (Chair)

## **TIMETABLE OF THE SITE VISIT**

- See Appendix A
- The timetable that was arranged for the visit allowed the Peer Review Group to explore a full range of perspectives across the School and University over two days of meetings. This level of involvement was sufficient to allow the group to understand the contribution, history and prospects of the School within the College, University, and in a national and international context.

## **PEER REVIEW**

- Methodology

Members of the Peer Review Group each took initial responsibility for certain areas of the report, interviews and other group meetings. However, all sections of the report were finalised and agreed by the whole group. The review group felt that the opportunity to combine analysis of paper submissions with the chance to discuss issues that arose from it with stakeholders was very useful.

- Site Visit

The site visit was exceptionally well organised and made possible a thorough review of the School, and a series of meetings with staff and students across the institution, in two full days. The meeting with stakeholders was very well-attended despite the inclement weather conditions and provided an important additional perspective on the School's work outside of the academic context.

- Peer Review Group Report (PRG)

A first draft of the report was produced before the PRG left UCC. Subsequent drafts were produced by an iterative process through email correspondence. The final version was approved by the PRG as a team.

## OVERALL ANALYSIS

- Self-Assessment Report (SAR)

The PRG was very impressed by the SAR and judged that a great deal of time and thought had been spent in ensuring that it was a well-structured, concise, and helpful document. The balance of information between the SAR and the accompanying appendices was noted as being particularly helpful to the PRG. It was also clear that the report had involved input from a number of individuals and the PRG was impressed with this collective effort.

However, the PRG felt that it would have been useful to have included more detail on the following:

- The key performance indicators for research at School/College level;
- Information on the staff appraisal system;
- Information on students with disabilities and how support and access is provided for such students.

- SWOT Analysis

The PRG agreed with most of the strengths highlighted in the SWOT analysis. However, it felt that at this point in its development, it might be an opportune moment for the School to reflect on its continued use of the term 'applied' as a descriptor of its profile. Such reflection could consider whether it remains beneficial for the School to present itself as one of applied psychology, in terms of research, attracting future appointments, and its implications for potential student markets. Several weaknesses might have been better classed as threats and the SWOT analysis tended to collapse strengths and opportunities, and weaknesses and threats, into two categories.

The SWOT emerged from discussion at an off-site away-day led by an independent Facilitator. It involved all academic, administrative, and support staff in the School. The PRG was impressed with this level of involvement and the high quality of processes in place to support the analysis.

The PRG strongly agreed with the analysis, both implied in the SWOT and evident elsewhere in the SAR, that the single greatest threat to the School's future would be failure to maintain a staff:student ratio (SSR) that is acceptable for Psychological Society of Ireland (PSI) accreditation of the undergraduate degree programme, a threat requiring immediate steps to address it.

- Benchmarking

The PRG felt that the benchmarking exercise carried out with NUI Galway was a useful exercise, particularly with regard to comparison of SSRs and research outcomes. However, it felt that the University of Birmingham was not a useful comparator because of the large differences between its School of Psychology and that of UCC in terms of type of research profile, finances, and size.

## FINDINGS OF THE PEER REVIEW GROUP

Comment, as appropriate, on any of the details in the Self-Assessment Report. The headings that the department/school were specifically asked to address were:

- School Details

Useful details on the School were provided as an appendix on CD-ROM and served as helpful contextual information for the PRG. The details covered physical facilities, staff profile, and succession planning amongst others. The School will be 50 years old next year and currently is engaged in teaching around 1,400 students.

- School Organisation & Planning

The PRG was of the opinion that many of the challenges relating to organisation and planning stemmed from the staffing situation in which there is a very low proportion of senior academics to provide leadership and mentoring to younger/newer staff. This has been exacerbated by the loss of a number of senior members due to staff turnover and retirement, and the PGR noted that an additional senior staff member is due to retire in the near future. The staffing situation has led to other problems in recent years, e.g. the discontinuation of successful counselling courses because staffing numbers meant that accreditation would be difficult, if not impossible. The loss of the portfolio of accredited counselling courses was arguably a missed opportunity for the School to maintain a niche within the country's professional psychology provision.

The ability to plan has also been affected by frequent changes in leadership in the School, although there are encouraging indications that this is now changing under new leadership. However, the lack of a clear appointments strategy and limited resources means that it remains unclear how new posts will be generated and filled. (See 'Staffing' below.)

The PRG noted that while most meetings are minuted, some meetings are currently not formally minuted because of a shortage of administrative support. Nonetheless, it recommends that all meetings are formally recorded and minuted to provide an accurate record of discussions and an on-going record of actions.

The PRG had some reservations as to the proposed constitution of the School Executive Management Committee and would suggest that the School consider if elected membership is the most appropriate way for managing a School of this size in what is set to be a period of considerable challenge and change. It also suggests that the School consider carefully the relationship between the School Executive Management Committee and the School Council to ensure that the role of each is clear and that there is no overlap of purpose.

The Self Assessment Report recognises the need for improved and formally constituted staff–student communication through liaison committees. The PRG deals with this matter under 'Communications.'

The PRG noted and commended the considerable effort involved in monitoring and agreeing workloads and suggests that efforts continue to ensure parity between staff perceptions of workload and model data.

- Teaching & Learning

The PRG congratulates the School on the excellent teaching being carried out in many areas of the School despite the huge challenges faced in relation to the SSR and resources. Students spoke enthusiastically of the quality of teaching, in particular citing exceptional teaching in Research Methods and Statistics. Placements for Masters programmes and final year projects were also commended by students with whom the PRG met. The external stakeholders with whom the PRG met also noted students' excellent research skills and effective use of placements.

The PRG also noted the high quality intake of students. Additionally, the PRG felt that, particularly when considering the international perspective, there is huge potential for growth in the School's portfolio of programme and income. While there are immediate threats to the School's future (if SSR is not immediately reduced) there is a very positive landscape if opportunities can be taken.

The general student experience is extremely positive, with students reporting that staff are perceived as welcoming, friendly and as taking an interest in students and their future study/plans.

The PRG found it difficult to detect a guiding rationale for the new programmes that the School has developed, particularly at Masters level; it recommends the development and implementation of a more overarching strategy for developing a portfolio of courses. Notwithstanding this, clearly the MA in Applied Psychology has tapped a rich seam of interest and offers a stepping stone to clinical and further training opportunities. The PRG was impressed that 79% of these students have graduated with the equivalent of upper class second honours or above. The School might consider the success of this programme, and the lower numbers on the MA Coaching Psychology/ Practice which overlaps with a programme already offered within the institution, when considering any overarching strategy.

The PRG noted that administrative support for the Early Years and Childhood Studies has been cut and is felt by some to be becoming unsustainable. More generally, it suggests that the School think about its role as service teachers across combined and integrated degree programmes. While clearly this is a source of income and has positive benefits, potentially there are also negative consequences for single honours Psychology students and for the variety and level of what can be taught as part of main Psychology provision.

Data from student surveys reflect a very positive experience of teaching in the School. Several issues to do with teaching and learning arose in the PRG's discussion with students, however. These were:

The perception that there is repetition of some content in lectures delivered to the same student cohort in different years. While occasional repetition of *key* content may be pedagogically sound, the PRG recommends that the School's curriculum review considers this issue to ensure there is no unnecessary overlap in students' studies and that there is both vertical progression and horizontal balance in programmes.

Students were unhappy about the timing, format and amount of feedback they received. Feedback was often received too late to take it on board in time for the next piece of assessment, and it is often offered in different formats. Some students reported not receiving feedback on essays, only on laboratory reports; while it is clear from discussions with staff that such feedback is provided, it would seem that some students are uncertain as to how to access it. The PRG recommends that the School reviews its

policy on feedback to consider these matters and to ensure that students have realistic expectations for feedback that can be met by the School.

The PRG was informed of some variability in teaching and marking in the case of postgraduate tutors involved in teaching tutorials and labs. It strongly recommends that training becomes mandatory for all those involved in tutorials, marking, and teaching within the School (see also 'Staffing'). It also encourages the School to improve its induction for Masters and PhD students who did not take their first degree at UCC. The PRG recommends that the School appoint a postgraduate research student coordinator or director to oversee and support PGR students.

A pastoral support and mentoring scheme is in place but some students did not appear to be aware of the formal structures that deal with aspects of student support. The PRG suggests that the School explores why some students are unaware or do not avail themselves of the opportunities for such support, and then seeks to address the problems that this might cause.

The PRG was of the opinion that the School could engage further with the internationalisation agenda, particularly with regard to PG taught programmes. This should offer the School opportunities for increased income..

- Research & Scholarly Activity

The PRG believes that the School is to be congratulated on its maintenance of a research profile given the current funding situation and SSRs. However, there is still some work to be done to ensure that all members of staff feel fully included in the research activity of the School. The PRG recognises the very limited opportunities for securing significant new research income in the current funding environment but would encourage the School to develop a more structured relationship with the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation (OVPRI). The PRG noted that an important consequence of the current lack of research income is the absence of Research Assistants and Post-doctoral researchers in the School, which will inevitably have an effect on its research culture and productivity.

The PRG recognises the potential for engaging with other disciplines in the University in terms of research and funding in the future. However, it recommends that the School decide upon a structure for internal research groups and has a clear vision for strengthening the research portfolio within the School that can inform its appointment strategy. (See 'Staffing' below).

The PRG strongly believes that reflection on quality of research as well as quantity is crucial. In addition, engagement with external stakeholders and the applied character of the School are assets that place the School in a strong position to build up the broader impact of research into areas of application, practice and policy.

The PRG recommends that the School and the OVPRI develop together a plan for identifying and securing sources of research funding and collectively develop strategies that will maximise funding opportunities.

- Staff Development

The PRG felt good research mentoring is provided for incoming staff and that a broader, structured, induction for incoming staff in general would be useful. As

mentioned above, it recommends that postgraduate tutors/ teachers are offered training to carry out the role. (See also 'Staffing'.)

- External Relations

The PRG commends the School for its excellent variety of placements and links with external stakeholders. It suggests that the School ensure their continuing excellence by capitalising on these and coordinating and consolidating them to increase their impact on the student experience. The placement arrangements are a positive and distinctive feature of the school but the PRG's impression was that these are too reliant on links forged by individual members of staff. The PRG felt that the School would benefit still further from the coordinated management of placement links and that this should be regarded as an administrative responsibility within the School rather than as a set of separate initiatives organised by individual members of staff.

The PRG noted some strong international collaborations with regard to research but felt that these could be strengthened especially in relation to EU funding. The PRG encourages the School to consider how to enhance its international research profile and establish productive links with overseas researchers.

- Support Services

The PRG enjoyed a tour of the library facilities which it found to be excellent. Psychology is currently well-resourced and well-led and it would be important to maintain this level of support. The PRG suggests that the School encourages students to attend the library induction sessions, which are particularly well-organized and likely to be highly beneficial to undergraduate and postgraduate students. The PRG also noted that students and staff have access to extensive electronic resources that have been made available via the Irish Research eLibrary (IREL), and that continued access to these resources is vital.

The PRG would have welcomed more information about how the School or College interacted with and supported students with disabilities. This is an important area regarding student support and the PGR would have welcomed more information on how the School follows the guidelines issued by the Disability Support Office. The University also ought to monitor the impact of being on different "sites" on students with physical disabilities in terms of timetabling and access to all the School's facilities.

- Departmental/School Co-ordinating Committee & Methodology employed in the preparation of the Self-Assessment Report

The PRG was impressed by the team effort involved in the preparation of the Self- Assessment report. It was clear that all staff members had been afforded opportunities to engage with the process. The PRG noted the methodical manner by which decisions around completion of the SAR had been made; these had been carefully documented through a series of minutes. In addition, the PRG commended the Committee for the balance achieved between the main body of the report and the appendices in the final SAR.

The Peer Review Group is asked to comment specifically on the department/school under the following headings:

- Governance

As mentioned above, the PRG felt that the School's approach to the Quality Review was excellent and resulted in a clear and transparent self-assessment report. This is to be particularly commended given the challenges to staff workload caused by a very high SSR, as well as a number of recent changes in leadership within the School. Nonetheless, there is a clear recognition in the School of the need for a strong team spirit.

However, the PRG was concerned to note that accreditation was achieved so successfully in 2011 and yet three years later the SSR in the School had deteriorated significantly. The PRG felt that systems should be in place to ensure that sudden and dramatic changes in the staffing or student profile of a School are flagged at an early stage. The PRG strongly recommends that the University look carefully to ensure that such matters are monitored regularly and communicated effectively to senior management level.

As noted above, the PRG was of the view that the election of staff onto the School Executive Committee was not an effective mechanism for a relatively small School. It also recommends that the relationship between the Executive Committee and the School Council be reconsidered to allow for the efficient operation of its functions.

The PRG discussed the location of the School in the College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Science. This was felt not to be unusual, although several psychology departments are within science faculties and this may open up some further, practical opportunities for regular collaboration. The PRG noted that the School's members of staff appear happy with the current arrangements and their College membership. However, across the College and the University there appears to be a lack of awareness of what Psychology is and the contribution it can make in terms of impact and funding. The PRG felt that there was "public relations" work to be done, internal to the University, by the School to define and communicate the contribution that Psychology could make across the institution. It also suggested that the School consider the degree to which the word 'applied' is appropriate or is assisting the School in the achievement of its goals.

- Staffing

This is an extremely problematic area and one which presents a serious risk to the School, College, and University. There is an immediate and urgent need to address the matter but this has to be done strategically in terms of the appointments made.

The PRG noted a need for mandatory training for PhD students who are teaching..

It is essential that at least the current administrative structure is maintained and there should be recognition of the constraints under which these members of staff are working. The number of technical staff is also low and it is vital to maintain that provision.

The PRG noted a need for a strategy for academic appointments and resourcing so that research careers can be established quickly. The PRG recommends that an appointments strategy be developed by the School's leadership.

- Accommodation

Accommodation is generally good with some space that may require review so that it is fully utilised. The distance from main campus is not seen as a significant problem by staff, although there are some issues of access for students and staff with disabilities and some timetabling problems. A larger lecture theatre on site would be beneficial.

The PRG felt that the facilities for biological research were less than ideal and pointed to a need to build laboratory considerations into the appointment process and strategy (see above).

- **Financing**

The PRG understands that budgeting is extremely constrained. Nonetheless, the School needs to ensure that the College is fully aware of the laboratory-based nature of its requirements as a scientific discipline.

The PRG also suggests keeping under review the substantial proportion of non-pay budget that is provided to support PhD students and to consider whether there may be better ways to spend these funds to build research and teaching capacity in the medium term.

The PRG was very impressed by the transparent information available to the School and found the interview with the College Financial Analyst to be hugely useful, informative and clear.

However even bearing in mind the adverse economic situation, the PRG was concerned that mechanisms were not in place across the University that would allow sufficient longer-term financial planning for the School so as to maintain an appropriate SSR.

- **Communications**

Many of the issues around communication have already been mentioned. It is important to ensure that pathways of communication are in place throughout the organisation. Although communication is generally working well, the effectiveness of communication between the Head of School, the Head of College and senior management ought to be re-evaluated in light of the issues raised in this report.

It is also necessary to remember the importance of efficient communication between academic staff and the School Office and administrative team who can provide support and structure to staff workloads.

Lastly, some aspects of staff–student communication were problematic. There is a need for a staff–student liaison committee to deal with the information flow to and from students; the PRG noted that, currently, some students are unaware of the support structures of the School and are not sure to whom they should speak if they have a problem or want to raise an issue about teaching-related matters. The School also ought to consider how all students can be made aware of the opportunities for support and representation available to them.

## **Commendations**

The PRG commends the School on the following:

- The clear engagement with the Quality Review process and the reflection of this in the production of a clear, well-written and balanced self-assessment report;
- The School's relationship with its external stakeholders and the quality of the placements provided for students;
- The standard of recruitment at both undergraduate and postgraduate level;
- The excellent Research Methods and Statistics teaching;
- The engagement of students and staff in the final year projects;
- The maintenance of a research profile in the current economic climate; and
- The excellent library provision.

## **Implementation of recommendations for improvement made in Peer Review Group Report arising from last quality review**

The recommendations made by the (then) Department of Applied Psychology and endorsed by the PRG in the 2005 review have been implemented for the main part; the commitment to service teaching should continue to be reviewed. It is clear that the SOAS has developed open and transparent procedures for the management of the School.

The PRG also made a number of specific recommendations in the 2005 review report, which have been addressed:

1. A mentoring scheme for junior staff has been put in place. Some additional induction might be considered, specifically for those coming into the Irish system for the first time;
2. There would seem to be greater clarity around issues of contract; however, some confusion may still remain as regards length of contract and these should be addressed on an individual basis;
3. A workload allocation model is in place;
4. It is clear that some progress has been made around the recommendation to develop a shared research agenda and identify core research priorities. Further reflection on this issue will be required.
5. The Department had been asked to consider developing a higher research profile in clinical and health science areas. While recent appointments would suggest that this recommendation has been followed, priorities as regards an appointments strategy require further refinement. The PRG noted the Department's concern, in the QIP follow-up, that appropriate physical resources be put in place to support research in clinical and health science areas. Further support is required if these areas are to be developed.
6. The Department has, as recommended, begun to establish systems for research management which provide targets and record progress; further consideration of appropriate ways of monitoring research productivity, particularly with regard to the quality of research outputs, would be advised.
7. The Department considered Science faculty entry, as was recommended, but did not find it to be appropriate.
8. The Department considered the need to rationalise the profile of postgraduate courses, and has made many changes in this area since the last quality review.
9. The Department considered the recommendation to introduce a Practitioner Doctorate and implemented such a course, which, it would seem, has since been discontinued.
10. It was recommended that the Department consider developing a research strategy which would enable staff and postgraduates to target specific high impact peer reviewed journals. While some consideration has been given to this recommendation, a review of the School's research strategy would seem timely, giving the many recent changes in personnel. The Department did not consider it appropriate to set a minimum number of papers to be submitted for publication to peer reviewed journals before the award of higher degrees; the current PRG are in agreement with this position.

11. The Department has, as recommended, focused its activity on a single site in order to ensure coherence.
  12. The Department noted, appropriately, that a review of promotional structures was outside of its remit.
- Compliance with European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area – especially relevant sections of Part 1 of the ESG

The School of Applied Psychology adheres to the standards set out in Part 1 of the ESG.

- The Peer Review Group is also asked to comment specifically on developments and actions taken since the last quality review undergone by the Department/School.

Since the last Quality Review was held in 2005, the PRG noted that the most significant developments that the School has been dealing with have been changes in leadership and in the general environment in which it is operating. The PRG noted the particularly difficult economic climate that currently prevails and the impact that this is having, in particular on the recruitment of academic posts.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Recommendations for improvement made by the department/school

The School makes a number of recommendations for improvement in the SAR. These recommendations fall into the areas of: staffing and SSR, staff development; teaching and learning; research; internationalisation, communication and contribution to society; environment; and organisation. The PRG agree that most of these recommendations are appropriate. In particular, there is an urgent need to address the SSR which, if it continues to deteriorate, will lead to the loss of accreditation for the School's undergraduate programmes. The School's recommendations should be pursued with a concrete plan for action that addresses shortcomings and promotes areas of success for the future. The PRG recommendations, below, emphasise some of the points already listed in the document, some of the School's own recommendations, and introduce some additional points.

Recommendations for improvement made by the Peer Review Group:

- That the College consider some form of annual monitoring for Schools on key KPIs such as SSRs and that this is communicated upwards to and acted upon by University senior management;
- That the School develops an appointments strategy linking with existing expertise or to strategically develop new areas, sustainably, which it has the resources to support;

- That the School considers how the School Executive Committee should be constituted in relation to the School Council to allow for the efficient operation of its functions;
- That all School meetings are formally minuted to provide an accurate record of discussions and on-going actions;
- That the School set up a regular schedule of staff–student committee meetings for each year group or programme and takes steps to ensure that a culture of student representation and consultation is formally embedded into School structures;
- That the School keeps under review its portfolio of taught programmes and takes this opportunity to think strategically about how those programmes can develop;
- That the School set up an annual curriculum review process;
- That the School review processes for providing feedback to students;
- That the School ensures that existing opportunities for pastoral support are communicated to all students;
- That appropriate induction is provided for those who are involved in teaching;
- That the School and OVPRI develop together a plan for identifying and securing sources of research funding and collectively develop some strategies that will maximise research opportunities and income;
- That the School appoints a postgraduate research tutor/Director to oversee and provide support for postgraduate research students;
- That the School decides upon a structure for research groupings and a clear vision for strengthening the research portfolio within the School that can inform its appointment strategy.

## APPENDIX A

### SCHOOL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY

#### PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT TIMETABLE

##### In Summary

- Monday 3 February: The Peer Review Group (PRG) arrives at the River Lee Hotel for a briefing, followed by an informal meeting with School staff members.
- Tuesday 4 February: The PRG considers the Self-Assessment Report and meets with school staff, student and stakeholder representatives. A working private dinner is held that evening for the PRG.
- Wednesday 5 February: The PRG meets with relevant officers of UCC. An exit presentation is given by the PRG to all members of the School. 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 6 February: External PRG members depart.

| <b>Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2014</b> |  |
|--|--|
| 16.00 – 18.00                              | Meeting of members of the Peer Review Group.<br>Briefing by: Ms. Fiona Crozier, Director of QPU.<br>Group agrees final work schedule and assignment of tasks for the following 2 days.<br>Views are exchanged and areas to be clarified or explored are identified.<br><b>Venue: Tower Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, River Lee Hotel</b> |
| 19.00                                      | Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group & Head of School including the School Co-ordinating Committee.<br><b>Venue: The Weir Bistro, The River Lee Hotel</b>   |

| <b>Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2014</b>                                   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Venue: CEC – Peter Dempsey Room</b><br><i>(unless otherwise specified)</i> |  |
| 08.30 – 08.45   | Convening of Peer Review Group   |
| 08.45 – 09.30   | Professor John McCarthy, Head of School  |
| 09.30 – 10.30   | Group meeting with all School staff<br><b>Venue: Peter Dempsey Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Applied Psychology</b>  |
| 10.30 – 11.00   | Tea/coffee   |
| 11.00 – 13.00   | Private meetings with individual staff members   |
| 13.00 – 13.45   | Working lunch  |
| 13.45 – 14.20   | Visit to core facilities of School, escorted by Professor McCarthy, Head of School and Dr. Samantha Dockray.   |
| 14.20 – 15.00   | Professor Caroline Fennell, Head of College  |
| 15.00 - 15.40   | Representatives of 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Students   |
| 15.40 – 16.20   | Representatives of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year and Higher Diploma Students  |
| 16.20 – 16.55   | Representatives of Graduate Students   |
| 17.10 – 18.00   | Representatives of stakeholders, past graduates and employers<br><b>Venue: Staff Common Room, North Wing, Main Quadrangle</b>  |
| 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.<br><b>Venue: Tower Room, River Lee Hotel</b> |

| <b>Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> February 2014</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Venue: Tower Room 2, North Wing, Main Quad</b><br><i>(unless otherwise specified)</i> |   |
| 08.30 – 09.00  | Convening of Peer Review Group  |
| 09.00 – 09.30  | Professor Paul Giller, Registrar and Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs |
| 09.30 – 10.15  | Dr. David O'Connell, Research Officer, Office of VP Research & Innovation       |
| 10.15 – 10.55  | Ms. Anne Marie Cooney, College Financial Analyst<br>Tea/coffee                  |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| 11.00 – 11.45 | Visit to UCC Library, meeting with Ms Margot Conrick, Head of Information Services and Subject Librarian, Boole Library.  |
| 11.45 – 13.30 | Working lunch   |
| 13.30 – 16.15 | Preparation of first draft of final report  |
| 16.15 – 16.45 | Professor John McCarthy, Head of School   |
| 17.00 – 17.30 | <p>Exit presentation to all staff, to be made by the Chair of the Peer Review Group or other member of Peer Review Group as agreed, summarising the principal findings of the Peer Review Group.</p> <p>This presentation is <u>not</u> for discussion at this time.</p> <p><b>Venue: Council Room, North Wing, Main Quadrangle</b></p> |
| 19.00         | <p>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.</p> <p><b>Venue: Tower Room, River Lee Hotel</b></p>  |