



UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND, CORK
QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

SCHOOL OF ENGLISH

PEER REVIEW PANEL REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR 2016-17

OCTOBER 2017

Contents

Contents	2
Overview	3
Peer Review.....	5
Methodology	5
Site Visit.....	5
Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and SWOT.....	5
Benchmarking.....	6
Tour of the Facilities.....	6
Developments since last review.....	6
Findings of the Panel	7
Strategic curriculum planning	7
Teaching, learning and assessment.....	7
Student support (academic and pastoral).....	8
Student achievement and employability	9
Staff development and workload.....	9
Resources and structures	10
Recommendations for the School.....	12
Recommendations for the College.....	13
Recommendations for the University	13
Appendix 1 Timetable	14

List of Panel Members

Name	Position/Discipline	Institution
Dr Louise Crowley	School of Law	University College Cork
Professor Penny Fielding	School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures	University of Edinburgh
Professor Alan Kelly (Chair)	School of Food & Nutritional Sciences	University College Cork
Ms Beatrice McCarthy (student reviewer)	Department of Government	University College Cork
Professor Sue Vice	School of English	University of Sheffield
Professor Claire Warwick	Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)	University of Durham
Dr Kay Taaffe	Panel Secretariat Support	University College Cork

Overview

The School of English has historically enjoyed high standing within the University, on the strength of its national and international reputation for research and scholarship. Since the previous Review (2010), it has undergone a period of significant expansion, not only in the area of English but within the disciplines of Film and Screen Media (FSM) and Digital Arts and Humanities (DAH). However, it is also coming out of a period of austerity which has presented significant challenges, not least in staffing in both academic and administrative areas. In particular, there has been little opportunity for staff promotion across the School, and the vacant Chair in Old English, Medieval and Renaissance has not been filled.

It is noted that, while both FSM and DAH are currently located within the School of English, and consequently included as part of this review, they are co-located within the College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences (CACSSS); FSM with the School of Languages, Literatures and Cultures and DAH with the School of History. Notwithstanding these divisions, the Panel has conducted its review and prepared its report to address issues at School level, except where expressly noted, to support the School in the structural integration of the different disciplines and to foster knowledge-sharing and interdisciplinarity across the School.

Despite recent challenges, the School remains one of the highest performing schools within CACSSS in terms of attracting research funding¹; it has maintained strong graduate recruitment and received a high score in the University's Research Quality Review (RQR) in 2015.

The leadership of the School was highly commended by peers and colleagues, and staff within the School engaged well in terms of collaboration and knowledge exchange. Despite

¹ Data from the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation (OVPRI)

the Panel's concerns regarding excessive teaching loads, feedback from students provided evidence of a highly committed and student-focused academic and administrative staff. The academic team commended the excellent administrative support within the School, despite this area being significantly under-staffed with a staff-student ratio for administrative staff at an unsustainable 150:1.

Despite staffing constraints, the School has had considerable development since the past Periodic Review in 2010, with significant programme expansion *viz.*, the denominated BA in English; BA in Digital Humanities and Information Technology; BA in Film and Screen Media and the MA in Digital Cultures. Presentations by School staff demonstrated some highly commendable teaching initiatives in FSM, DAH and English. The School's curriculum "integrates [the] creative and cultural life of the city, region and nation into its teaching"² and is responsive in collaborating across the creative industries. The positive impact of the artists-in-residence scheme, especially for CK109 students, was noted by the Panel.

The Panel was impressed by the facilities for FSM and DAH, although they were dispersed across the UCC campus. Conversely, there was concern about the lack of appropriate and sufficient space for PhD students and postdoctoral researchers at the School.

It was noted that the developments within the School took place without the benefit of a long-term Strategic Plan for the School as a whole, which had been highlighted as a priority in the previous Periodic Review (2010). In that light, it is envisaged that this Panel Report is coming at an opportune time for the School to take advantage and benefit from the expert advice of academic peers to support the development and implementation of a Strategic Plan.

² English SER p.35

Peer Review

Methodology

The Panel met over three days and the timetable enabled comprehensive engagement with staff, students, stakeholders, and with senior management at University and College level (see Appendix 1 for a copy of the timetable). The composition of the Panel provided good coverage across the disciplines of English, Film and Screen Media and Digital Arts and Humanities. Internal reviewers provided knowledge of the institutional and organisational structures within the University, while the Student Representative brought valuable insights and perspectives on student issues. The Panel commented on the great value of having the involvement of a Student Representative as a full Panel Member. Secretariat support from the Quality Enhancement Unit (QEU) was provided to the Peer Review Panel throughout, to facilitate the conduct of the review and support the Review Panel in formulating and agreeing the final Review Report.

Site Visit

The Panel commended the full engagement from the School in organising the participation of students, academic and administrative staff, and stakeholders. The meeting with the stakeholders provided some additional qualitative information on the external activities of the School, and highlighted current links, as well as new information about possible career directions for graduates and the capacity for greater engagement with stakeholders.

Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and SWOT

The School of English at UCC has a long and distinguished history of scholarship and creative practice, enjoying a very good international reputation, as well as high esteem within the College and University, in the future of which it plays a crucial part.

The SER was helpful in a descriptive way, showing the extent of the School's recent diversification and growth, and revealing it to be at a transitional moment in relation to the future of some of its constituent parts. The Panel gained a clear sense of the democratic process by means of which the report was arrived at. In this way, the SER assisted the Panel in gaining a valuable preliminary sense of the significant issues. These included the very notable successes of the School and its expansion into new areas since the last Review, in the context of economic and demographic challenges which have created new challenges in relation to governance, workload, budget and space.

However, the Panel considered that there could have been more signposting in relation to the rationale for including certain elements to better demonstrate the challenges and successes of the School, while the report would have benefitted from more analysis and integration of the facts and figures which were included in the Appendices. By presenting separate sections for English, Digital Arts Humanities and Film and Screen Media, the SER testifies to a central issue for the School – namely the challenge for integrating the different disciplines within the School, which is significantly exacerbated by the bilocation mentioned above and uncertainty as to the permanent “home” of these emerging disciplines

The Old English case study provided insight into one aspect of the School's activity, revealing remarkable successes in this area, arising from the very small team's ability to make this material appealing to BA students and to attract PhD students. The Panel's positive impression was borne out by high praise expressed in the meetings with undergraduate and postgraduate students, the latter in particular praising the excellent community of Old English researchers. However, the case study would have benefitted from more analysis and reflection; in particular, it lacked context as to how the case study came to be chosen, while

some reflection on the potential learning from this example of good practice for the wider School would have been useful.

The SER ended rather abruptly without any concluding remarks or summary and the Panel relied on the SWOT document (presented separately) to coalesce the issues discussed in the SER. The SWOT analysis was useful and perceptive, presenting a good synopsis of the main issues for the School and a clear sense of self-awareness, highlighting factors which fitted well with those noted by the Panel. However, the exercise of completing the SWOT is to inform the SER rather than as a stand-alone activity, and the SER would have benefitted from the outcomes being integrated into the main document.

Benchmarking

The Panel found the benchmarking with NUI Galway (NUIG) to be useful in that, by identifying the differences between the two Schools, it also highlighted many of the challenges for the School at UCC. However, the Panel was of the view that the discussion on the benchmarking lacked comparative reflection in terms of impact for the School at UCC. While the DAH benchmarking exercise with the Humanities Advanced Technology and Information Institute (HATII) at the University at Glasgow was also helpful, the differences in structure and institutional location between the respective departments meant that the disparities were less revealing in relation to the School at UCC. The FSM benchmarking exercise with Leeds Trinity was also useful, albeit rather too briefly related to offer extensive points of comparison with the teaching of film and visual media at UCC.

Tour of the Facilities

The Panel visited the area within the O’Rahilly Building which houses the main offices of the School of English. The tour also revealed impressive facilities for FSM and DAH, although these were situated in separate buildings and dispersed across a wide area within the University, with one office reportedly being completely off-site and not anywhere near the location of the other facilities. The Panel acknowledges the high cost involved in maintaining these facilities but urges that the resources and equipment required for supporting the creative, technical and practical aspects of the programmes be safeguarded.

Developments since last review

The Panel commends the considerable progress and the varied and successful developments which have occurred since the last review in 2010. However, this development appears to have taken place without the benefit of a long-term plan for sustainability and consistency, and the Panel recognises the urgent need to consolidate and rationalise these initiatives within an overall Strategic Plan for the School.

Findings of the Panel

Strategic curriculum planning

The Panel reflected on the School's strengths, needs and challenges, balancing the pressing gaps which have arisen in relation to recent developments with long-standing successes. Many of the new developments are supported primarily by small numbers of mostly junior colleagues (presumably unavoidable given the staff profile of academic members), providing excellent managerial and leadership experience, but at the expense of these early career lecturers' ability to develop fully their own research profiles.

The Panel noted that the Chair in Modern English was filled following the last review, and acknowledges the contribution of the Chair in Old English, Medieval and Renaissance (OMR), which is currently vacant, to the School's historical international status. If the School agrees that this is the foremost priority, the Panel recommends recruitment of a Chair which targets the area of Old English within the span of OMR. In this context, the Panel also recommends that the School should consider the potential for greater interdisciplinarity in this appointment, for example, through recognising the area of Digital Arts and Humanities in the context of OMR.

The Panel recommends rebalancing and readjusting the relationship between core and optional modules by, for example, introducing core modules at BA level in second and third years, which represent the crucial blocks of learning, whilst reducing the number of optional modules, and increasing the minimum number of students required for a module to run (currently 6, the Panel suggests 10). The Panel had concerns about the School's adherence to the practice of chronological historical coverage, rather than consolidating strengths in certain areas, but acknowledges its importance in relation to other institutions in Ireland and the goal of ensuring curricular coherence.

At MA level, the Panel suggests considering the institution of a single MA programme with one core research methods module, as is indeed the current practice across many third level institutions, accompanied by a limited range of defined pathways. In this way, areas which are no longer offered as discrete MA degrees could be reintroduced, allowing for a return to PhD recruitment in these areas. In undertaking this exercise, the Panel suggests that the School should examine how a range of other universities structure similar three-year BA degrees and MA programmes.

In the case of the MA in Digital Arts and Humanities, where specialist content is necessary, the Panel suggests that the School reconsider the proportion of core modules to electives, and that the students be offered the choice of taking relevant optional modules from other disciplines (e.g. Music, Theatre Studies, Sciences, BIS). DAH may also want to consider the possibility that some students may come from a technical background, and thus would benefit from being able to take an optional module from a pure humanities discipline.

Teaching, learning and assessment

In the interests of encouraging research-led teaching, and taking advantage of College and University facilitation and support, sabbaticals should be made part of annual strategic planning rather than the exception, to be further facilitated by planning within the School for co-teaching and consolidation of modules.

The Panel recommends that the School address the need for historical coverage through genre and theme rather than relying solely on period, and include team teaching in the

delivery of these modules. This would make the absence of individual staff members, e.g., by reason of sabbatical research leave, easier to manage.

The Panel was of the view that some modules are over-assessed, which is not in the interests of either students or staff. It also seemed that there was a variable over-reliance on particular kinds of assessment, such as final exams in some areas and continuous assessment in others. The School should consider the balance of assessment methods across all programmes, taking into account the learning from the benchmarking exercises and recommendations of external examiners where relevant, especially in the case of DAH. The Panel noted the School's record of responding positively to External Examiner recommendations, which, in some cases, has resulted in detailed and concrete changes to assessment practice.

There was very clear evidence of research-led teaching undertaken at a high level throughout the School, and the Panel gained a full sense that BA and MA students are not only fully aware of this practice, but also extremely appreciative of it.

Student support (academic and pastoral)

Students commented on the generally high quality of the teaching they receive, and the equally high level of staff commitment to their students. However, some students, especially at postgraduate level, were of the opinion that high workloads meant that staff were not always accessible and did not have the time for individual meetings or responses to communication. Students are aware that this is the result of high workloads, and the phrase 'spread thin' recurred in this regard. Although the BA students spoke extremely highly of their degree and School staff – the Panel were impressed to hear such encomia as 'amazing', 'superior', 'eye-opening' – there was equally evidence of some gaps in communication, for instance information on first-year examination practice and the chance to request exam feedback, as well as advice on referencing conventions, marking schemes, and registration matters.

In relation to PhD teaching assistants, the Panel commends the measures taken to ensure oversight of marking, so that no module is entirely the responsibility of an assistant tutor. The School's interface with the CACSSS Graduate School in relation to doctoral training is clearly successful. While new mentoring arrangements for PG tutors have been put in place within the School, the Panel is of the view that teaching practice instruction should be compulsory for all who contribute to the delivery of BA classes, and that a conservative limit be placed on the number of hours any PhD student takes on. While assigning second supervisors in all cases of PhD supervision is appropriate, the Panel was not convinced that this system is yet fully functional such that all staff and students are aware of and benefitting from it. In relation to doctoral recruitment, the Panel observed that the graduate student body shows a fitting combination of national and international students, and was impressed by the School's fruitful links with the Fulbright and ERASMUS foundations and high level of Irish Research Council (IRC) funding gained for PhD students.

The Panel gained a favourable impression of the conduct of student feedback and evaluation, given the evidence presented from survey questionnaires, year committees and the Panel's own meetings with students, some of whom were year representatives. It was apparent that the student voice is taken seriously and that feedback and suggestions are generally acted upon promptly at every level.

Student achievement and employability

The Panel noted positive engagement on the part of the external stakeholders and alumni with whom they met, and noted that many of these individuals were very eager to become more involved with the School. This is a valuable resource for the School to draw upon in terms of providing information to students, and for broadening the students' horizons around career possibilities and pathways, particularly those other than school-teaching. The Panel noted excellent and innovative relationships of this kind which are already established in the form of exchanges and relationships with external institutions, for example, involving students competing to contribute soap-opera serials to a local newspaper, as well as opportunities for working with Cork theatres and at arts festivals. Clearly there is capacity for these resources to be exploited more.

There was a perceived need among some students in the School to be made more aware of career options. While there is a generic work placement module available for CK101 students, this is not "owned" by any one discipline and consequently not widely supported at programme level, leading to poor uptake. It seemed to the Panel that a less generic offering, particularly for single-honours English students, could usefully be provided within the School itself and supported by external stakeholders.

Since employability is of such importance to students, links with stakeholders could alleviate pressure on staff to provide this support. The Panel suggests that an advisory committee could be set up, and the stakeholders themselves expressed enthusiasm for such an idea. There seems at present to exist a variety of methods for students to identify placement opportunities, including their establishing these themselves, with varying degrees of success. It is suggested that a database of placements could be established with the oversight of staff, to ensure a more consistent and productive experience for students, and that, where students have responsibility for securing their own placement, they ought to receive structured support from the School.

The Panel commends DAH and FSM for their successful practices in the area of work placements and for providing external links to industry, which is in each case an integral part of the programme content and student experience.

The School as a whole could more effectively track the job destinations of their graduates, and set up an alumni network for English graduates using, for example, the University's Development and Alumni Office or through LinkedIn as an option.

Staff development and workload

The Panel acknowledges the high workload pressures on School staff. This has been compounded by existing low staff numbers and the relative lack of senior colleagues. The majority of the School's staff, alongside its professoriate and a senior lecturer, are at the level of College lecturer, including individuals who undertake significant management and leadership roles. While important appointments in new areas have been made, including a post in Victorian literature, there have also been several retirements and departures, for the most part at senior levels. In other cases, staff have been drawn to new commitments or appointed to other Schools within UCC.

The Panel recognises the very high standards and commitment to student experience and welfare among administrative and academic staff alike. Equally, the Panel recognises the existence of impressive levels of collegiality and good will during the recent very busy and

pressured times experienced by the School. The Panel observed the existence of effective infrastructural support with well-distributed responsibilities, including at the senior management level, where directors of each subject area are represented on the executive committee. However, the distribution of roles could usefully be examined across the School to ensure that there is equally shared administrative responsibility and to avoid duplication of effort.

While there are workload pressures across the whole School, with a heavy reliance on goodwill for developmental work, this is particularly evident in DAH, a situation which requires immediate attention. The Panel and staff members themselves concluded that the low numbers of staff relative to students, and resulting high workload with little access to time for research, creates a risk of this important area becoming unsustainable for the future. This is despite the high regard in which DAH is held throughout the College and University.

External Panel members noted the success of effective staff review procedures at their own institutions, and recommend this process take advantage of UCC's recently reactivated review process across the School. They were of the opinion that mentoring for colleagues in DAH might well be found from outside the School itself. The Panel also welcomes the news of research mentoring structures being put in place following the RQR, which has been conducted separately, and urges the School to ensure that this is fully instituted, particularly for the benefit of early career colleagues.

The Panel also recommends instituting a transparent and wide-ranging workload model within the School, to ensure the equitable distribution of administrative and teaching loads, including MA teaching and PhD supervision. It was noted that a very high proportion of current PhD registrations are in DAH, a situation that requires close monitoring for the sake of students and staff alike. The School should ensure application of university-wide guidelines on the numbers of PhD students that any one member of academic staff can supervise.

Resources and structures

As noted, there have been many successful initiatives within the School in recent years involving significant programme development and expansion, despite the staffing constraints. These include: the denominated BA in English; BA in Digital Humanities; BA in Film and Screen Media; and the introduction of Creative Writing, which is part of the distinctive and highly commendable Creative Practice strand of the School's activities. The latter includes the presence of a screenwriter in residence, a role unique in the Irish university system, as well as that of Lord David Puttnam as Adjunct Professor of Film. In the case of the three new areas of growth, high demand has placed particular pressure on the colleagues concerned, and further expansion ought not take place in the short term.

It is essential that discussions at College level are held to achieve clarity on the position of DAH and FSM within the School. This is required for stability and sustainability in relation to planning, staffing, teaching and learning, as well as in relation to physical locations. The School's English curriculum itself cannot be reviewed until the future of these disciplines is decided. It is very important that, in any restructuring, significant courses are not lost to the School as a whole and that the current successful level of interdisciplinary activity is maintained. However, it is also important to balance any future developments with

reasonable capacity in terms of staff workload, particularly where colleagues work as part of a small team.

The lack of promotion opportunities for junior staff and the associated risk that talented colleagues will leave is a central challenge for the School. This is a matter to be addressed at University and College level, as well as by the School itself. In addition, several of the recent developments rely extensively on temporary staff, a position which needs to be consolidated and regularised to enable future planning and development. The Panel recommends that such temporary, short-term posts in these new areas of growth are now established on a permanent basis.

The Panel suggests that the School explore possible philanthropic investment through alumni and also industry, perhaps building on existing links to relevant industry to support developments in DAH and FSM. There are further research grant opportunities to emerge in relation to Horizon 2020.

The Panel noted the pressure on space in relation to the School, which has no capacity for extra staff offices, nor to offer suitable accommodation to PhD students, postdoctoral fellows and visiting fellows and writers. While the School has taken temporary measures to address this, including housing visitors in the offices of colleagues who are on leave, a longer-term strategy on the part of School and College to assess and address accommodation needs is required. The PhD students are aware of a recent reduction in space available to them, since one of the rooms at their disposal had to be returned to the use of academics.

The Panel noted that the School does not have the benefit of access to a dedicated Humanities Research institute, as do other comparable institutions. While the foundation of such an institute is a valuable long-term aspiration, the Panel suggests, that in the short-term, the College considers a virtual institute to encourage interdisciplinary collaborations, perhaps in conjunction with the planned UCC Creative Hub.

Recommendations for the School

The following section identifies the key recommendations for the School arising from the Panel's meetings, discussions, deliberations and reflections as outlined above. The Panel recommends that the School:

1. Develops a Strategic Plan for the School as a matter of priority, with a practicable long-term vision for the next ten years, while also making clear in specific detail the more immediate central priorities. This strategy must include the following:
 - Address the future location and strategy for both DAH and FSM, to be agreed with strategic input from the College and in consultation with the School of History and the School of Languages, Literatures and Cultures;
 - Identify a shared vision across all the disciplines of the School;
 - Identify and secure senior appointments, on the basis of an informed assessment as to where the greatest needs lie;
 - Lessen the administrative and teaching loads to facilitate time for research.
2. Adopts a transparent workload model for the rationalisation of staff workload, taking account of equitable distribution of administrative and teaching workloads, and the School should investigate different practices in comparable departments both nationally and internationally to achieve this.
3. Maintains and implements structures to support and mentor staff across all disciplines within the School as regards their career objectives, by providing better supports to facilitate research and sabbaticals, the management of which should be included as part of annual strategic planning.
4. Considers how best to frame the vacant Chair in OMR, in order to preserve interdisciplinarity within and beyond the School.
5. Undertakes a review addressing curriculum and assessment at all levels with a view to utilising resources to best effect by, for example: avoiding replication of module content; examining curriculum coverage across theme and genre; examining assessment methodologies and assessment load; and rationalising module choices and elective options for both BAs and MAs.
6. Institutes a single MA programme with core research modules and the possibility of a range of defined pathways.
7. Tracks the destination of their graduates and engages with external stakeholders for guest lecturing, mentorship of students and identification of career paths, potentially leading to the establishment of an Advisory Group of external stakeholders.
8. Develops structures to support and advise students on work placement (especially within CK109), career and employment opportunities.
9. Ensures that established systems which provide oversight of marking are applied across all modules and programmes, and that PhD students engaged as tutors have uniformly structured preparation for teaching and learning.
10. Implements the University's policy in relation to second supervision of PhD students and the numbers of PhD students that any one academic staff member can supervise.
11. Enhances its communication, information and supports for first year students, and in addition ensures consistency of formative feedback to support student learning across all programmes and years.

Recommendations for the College

The Panel recognises the importance of aligning the strategic planning for the School in the context of the overall strategic plans of the College and University, and envisages that the College will play a key role in advising and supporting the School through the current period of transition and development. In that light, the Panel recommends that the College:

1. Supports the School in finding a resolution to the issue of the location of DAH and FSM, as a matter of priority, by establishing appropriate, permanent academic bases for each within CACSSS.
2. Supports the School in the application of a space policy to resolve its current space issues, especially in light of decisions about the structural and physical location of DAH and FSM, and taking account of the needs of PhD students and postdoctoral fellows.
3. Works with the School to address the unsustainable staff-student ratios across the School.
4. Regularises the contractual positions of temporary staff on short-term contracts and in crucial roles throughout the School on to a permanent basis.

Recommendations for the University

Having considered the key recommendations for the School and the critical role that the College will play in supporting these developments, the Panel recommends that the University:

1. Acts to ensure the appointment of key Chairs that have become vacant and expedite promotion opportunities to ensure academic leadership and succession.
2. Considers the development of a dedicated Humanities Research Institute as part of the plan for a Creative Hub.
3. Supports the School in exploring possible philanthropic investment through alumni and industry.

Appendix 1 Timetable

SCHOOL OF ENGLISH

PEER REVIEW PANEL SITE VISIT

Tuesday 10 October 2017	
12.00 – 13.30	Convening of Panel members. Briefing by 2 x representatives of the Quality Enhancement Unit, followed by lunch.
13.30 – 14.30	Private meeting of Panel
14.30 – 15.30	Meeting with Head, School of English <i>(to be joined by the School Administrator at 15.10)</i>
15.30 – 16.00	Tea/coffee
16.00 – 16.50	Meeting with Head of College <i>(to be joined by the College Financial Analyst at 16.30)</i>
17.00 – 18.00	Meeting with Stakeholders Editor, The Well Review Representative from Ó Bhéal Poetry Graduate, MA Creative Writing; co-director Fiction at the Friary Editor, Evening Echo Artistic Director, Everyman Theatre Representative from Coláiste Choilm School, Ballincollig Director, Nano Nagle Place Cork City Librarian Graduate MA Film Studies; Filmmaker, Teacher Graduate MA Creative Writing; Director, Kinsale Literary Festival <i>The Panel meets with 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>
19.00	Informal dinner for members of the Panel & staff members of the School

Wednesday 11 October 2017		
09.00 – 09.15	Convening of the Panel	
09.15 – 10.15	Meeting with School staff	
10.15 – 10.45	Tea/coffee	
10.45 – 11.30	<p>Enhancing Student Learning Experience</p> <p>Film and Screen Media – 2 x representatives Digital Humanities – 2 x representatives Representative from Film and Screen Media English – 2 x representatives</p>	
11.30 – 12.30	<p>Tour of School facilities</p> <p>11.30 – Digital Humanities in the Food Building 12.00 – Film and Screen Media in the Kane Building</p>	
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch and private meeting of the Panel	
13.30 – 14.00	<p>Representatives of 1st and 2nd year students</p> <p>1st Year: BA – 2 x student representatives BA DAH – 2 x student representatives BA English BAINT</p> <p>2nd Year: BAJ – 2 x student representatives BAINT BA DAH – 3 x student representatives BA English BA FSM</p>	<p>Representatives of 3rd and 4th year students</p> <p>3rd year: BAJ – 3 x student representatives BA DAH – 2 x student representatives BA FSM BA English</p>
14.00 – 14.30	<p>Representatives of Postgraduate students:</p> <p>PhD candidate – 2 x student representaties PhD DAH – 2 x student representatives MA DAH – 2 student representatives MA Film and Screen Media MA Modernities</p>	

14.45 – 15.15	Private meeting of the Panel
15.15 – 15.45	Tea/coffee
15.45 – 16.30	Meeting with Senior Officers of the University: Vice President for Research & Innovation Vice President for Teaching & Learning
16.30 – 17.30	Meeting with Programme Directors/Chairs of Boards of Studies Programme Director CK109, BA in English Co-Heads, Film and Screen Media Head, School of English and Chair of Board of Studies, Digital Humanities Programme Directors, Digital Humanities <i>Discussion on monitoring and review of programmes to include indicatively, student progression, assessment, External Examiner reports, external accreditation/ recognition (where appropriate), supports for learners, placement (where appropriate).</i>
19.00	Working private dinner for members of the Panel to commence drafting the report

Thursday 12 October 2017	
08.45 – 09.00	Convening of the Panel
09.00 – 09.30	Private meeting of the Panel
09.30 – 10.30	Meeting with Head, School of English <i>Clarification and discussions of main findings by Panel.</i>
10.30 – 11.00	Tea/coffee and private meeting of Panel
11.00 – 11.30	Exit presentation
11.30 – 15.00	Private Panel Meeting to draft Panel Report Lunch
15.00	Panel Depart