



# UCC

University College Cork, Ireland  
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

## Fheabhsú Cáilíochta Quality Enhancement



QUALITY REVIEW

PEER REVIEW PANEL REPORT

SCHOOL OF THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

*“To support the University’s mission and strategy for excellence in learning, research and related services through developing and embedding a culture of quality enhancement based on the outcomes of robust expert peer review and informed by ongoing analysis of key quality indicators.”*

(UCC Quality Enhancement Committee Aim)

November 2023

## Contents

Context.....	3
Methodology and Site Visit.....	3
Panel Members.....	4
Objectives of Quality Review.....	4
Commendations and Recommendations.....	5
Commendations.....	5
Summary Recommendations.....	5
Recommendations – Further Detail.....	6
Observations to the Head of the College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences.....	8
Overall Analysis of Self-Evaluation Process.....	9
Self-Evaluation Report (SER).....	9
SWOT.....	9
Benchmarking.....	10
Good Practice Case Study.....	10
Pilot Programme Review.....	11
School Overview.....	12
Facilities.....	13
Conclusion.....	13
Next Steps.....	13
Appendix A – Panel Profiles.....	14
Appendix B – Timetable.....	17

## Context

In 2007 the Departments of Archaeology and Geography formed the School of the Human Environment (SHE) in the College of Arts, Celtic Studies, and Social Sciences (CACSSS). In 2013 the Department of Classics became part of the school.

This is a department-based discipline-focused school currently comprising a Head of School (HOS) and three Heads of Department (HOD). There are defined departmental management structures with School Rules last updated in 2013 with the addition of Classics.

The three departments are based in different parts of UCC. Archaeology is based in the Connolly Building off main campus and consists of a series of staff offices and small teaching spaces. Classics is based in the O'Rahilly Building (main campus) and consists of staff offices only. Geography is located in the Geography Building on the main campus and consist of staff offices, a number of teaching and research laboratories of various sizes and two basement equipment stores. There is no current shared School space.

## Methodology and Site Visit

A model for conducting site visits virtually was developed in 2020 to enable completion of Quality Reviews under the prevailing public health restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This model ensured continuity in the operation and delivery of quality review and enhancement activities. In 2022 the model moved to a hybrid review comprising of a 2 day on-campus site visit and 2 half-day virtual meetings.

This review took place under the hybrid review process over 2 weeks during October/November 2023. During the site visit the Panel met with staff, students, senior officers and relevant stakeholders. During the virtual meetings the Panel focused on writing the Report with a particular emphasis on the commendations and recommendations. The sequencing of meetings was organised to ensure coherence and progression in the conduct of the review. The platform used for the virtual meetings was MS Teams. The timetable for the site visit afforded appropriate time to engage with the broad variety of stakeholders. The timetable is included as Appendix B.

The Panel brought together internal and international peer reviewers (Panel profiles can be found in Appendix A). The internal reviewer provided knowledge of institutional and organisational structures with the external Panel members contributing their peer expertise. The student Panel member brought valuable insights and perspectives on student issues. At the end of the site visit, the Panel presented its initial findings, both commendations and recommendations, to the staff of the School.

To support the Peer Review Panel and facilitate effective engagement throughout the site visit, additional guidance and support was provided by staff of the Quality Enhancement Unit (QEU) in UCC. This included technical support, as well as briefing and advisory support prior to and throughout the review. Review coordination was provided throughout by a Review Coordinator to facilitate the review process and to support the Peer Review Panel in formulating and agreeing the final Panel Report. The Report was compiled collaboratively, and the entire Panel contributed to the production of the final Report.

## Panel Members

Refer to Appendix A for detailed Panel profiles.

Name	Position/Discipline	Institution
Professor Per Ditlef Fredriksen	Department of Archaeology	University of Oslo
Professor Paul McSweeney (Chair)	Vice President for Learning and Teaching	University College Cork
Ms Taragh O’Sullivan (Student Reviewer)	HDip in Social Policy	University College Cork
Professor Peter Van Nuffelen	Department of History	Ghent University
Professor Louise Waite	School of Geography	University of Leeds

<b>Review Coordinator</b>		
<i>Ms Deirdre O’Brien</i>	<i>Quality Enhancement Unit</i>	<i>University College Cork</i>
<b>IT and Logistics Coordinator</b>		
<i>Ms Sheila Ronan</i>	<i>Quality Enhancement Unit</i>	<i>University College Cork</i>

## Objectives of Quality Review

The overarching objectives of academic quality review at UCC are to enable Schools, through evidence-based self-evaluation, to:

1. Reflect on and promote the strategic enhancement of their academic activities to ensure an outstanding learning experience for all students (enhancement dimension);
2. Evaluate the effectiveness of their processes for assuring academic standards and provision, in line with the University’s academic mission and strategy (assurance dimension).

Thus, peer review goes beyond quality assurance to also embrace continuous quality enhancement. The Peer Review Panel Report reflects these objectives in the recommendations and commendations outlined to support the School of the Human Environment in further refining its priorities and optimising its activities in the pursuit of its ambitious drive for excellence within the international and national arena of higher education.

## Commendations and Recommendations

### Commendations

Based on the information obtained from the Self-Evaluation Report and meetings with multiple internal, as well as external stakeholders to the School of the Human Environment, the Panel commends the School for the following:

1. The Panel commends the level of engagement with stakeholders from industry and various relevant professions, particularly at postgraduate level.
2. The Panel was impressed with the level of community involvement and outreach displayed across all disciplines within the School.
3. The Panel was impressed with the obvious care for students displayed throughout all three Departments and heard feedback from students that they feel part of a 'homely atmosphere'. It was clear to the Panel that student welfare is a core concern of the School.
4. The Panel found the staff of the School to be dedicated, enthusiastic and committed.
5. The Panel commends the excellent work undertaken on fieldtrips; the fieldtrip experience clearly makes the programmes more rounded and enriching for students.
6. The Panel commends the examples of innovative and inclusive teaching within the School and their commitment to developing students as active learners.
7. The Panel commends the commitment to supervision across all three Departments within the School.
8. The Panel wishes particularly to commend the strong commitment displayed to teaching the entire range of topics within Classics, despite limited staff.
9. The Panel commends the focus on artefact studies in Archaeology, a unique strength within Ireland, and fieldwork training.
10. The Panel commends the engagement of the Department of Geography with UNIC, an innovative alliance of ten universities across Europe, and also its engagement with the Human Capital Initiative leading to the Postgraduate Diploma in Geographical Information Systems (GIS).

### Summary Recommendations

1. The Panel recommends that a School administrative structure be introduced to capitalise on the benefits of Schoolification.
2. The Panel recommends that the School develops a School Plan.
3. The Panel recommends that the School pursues an Athena Swan Bronze Award.
4. The Panel recommends that the School ensures that students can articulate the transversal skills developed during their study.
5. The Panel recommends that the School develops a policy on feedback and marking criteria for students.

6. The Panel recommends that the School continues to encourage interdisciplinary connections.
7. The Panel recommends that the School reconsiders its name.

## Recommendations – Further Detail

### 1. The Panel recommends that a School administrative structure be introduced to capitalise on the benefits of Schoolification.

- The Panel recommends that a School Executive Committee is established and that School rules are agreed.
- The Panel recommends that School level committees (for example, Learning and Teaching, Student Experience Committee etc.) are established.

School level committees will allow for the creation of School level policies and procedures, reducing both duplication and the administrative burden at departmental level while providing opportunities for more staff to demonstrate leadership.

School level committees will allow for synergies, interdisciplinary work and research collaborations to flourish and should be supported administratively at School level.

- The Panel recommends that centrally required reports (such as Health and Safety and Risk Management) be undertaken at School level, thus reducing the administrative load on departments.
- The Panel recommends that the Head of School takes an active role advocating for the School as a whole and should ideally not undertake the role of Head of Department while Head of School.

This recommendation should be led by the Head of School and supported by the School Manager. This recommendation is of **high priority** and should be implemented within one year following receipt of the Panel report.

### 2. The Panel recommends that the School develops a School Plan.

The School Plan should highlight the opportunities that the School structure will bring to staff. The Panel recommends that the following topics should be considered for inclusion within the plan:

- Community building through research and social events (for example, reactivating the annual School lecture series).
- Continued and enhanced engagement with digital education initiatives.
- Clarification of reporting lines within the School and upwards to the College.
- Exploration of new programme initiatives, for example the proposed MA in Environmental Humanities.
- Marketing/raising profile of disciplines, this is linked to School visibility and the recruitment of students to programmes.

- Enhancement of the School website; disciplines should be described with the intended audience in mind and transversal skills highlighted.
- Opportunities for closer physical cohabitation explored, particularly with an emphasis on joint lab facilities for Geography and Archaeology.
- Develop an Internationalisation strategy for student recruitment and research partnerships.
- Develop a plan for increasing PhD numbers.

A key metric of success for the Plan will be the involvement of all staff, and School staff input should be sought at regular intervals.

This recommendation should be led by the Head of School and the School Executive Committee. This recommendation is of **high priority** and should be initiated within 6 months of receipt of the Panel report and completed within 18 months following receipt of the Panel report.

### **3. The Panel recommends that the School pursues an Athena Swan Bronze Award.**

The Panel are in agreement with the School's own recommendation to pursue an Athena Swan Bronze Award. Undertaking the Athena Swan exercise as a School will be an opportunity for the School to work collaboratively. In committing to the principles of the Athena Swan charter, the School will join a global community with a shared goal of addressing systemic inequalities and embedding inclusive cultures in higher education.

This exercise should be led by the Head of School; the administrative burden will be greatly reduced through the support of the School Manager.

This recommendation is of **high priority** and should be initiated within six months following receipt of the Panel report and an application submitted within 18 months following receipt of the Panel report.

### **4. The Panel recommends that the School ensures that students can articulate the transversal skills developed during their study.**

The Panel recommends that work is undertaken by the School to ensure that students can articulate the transversal skills gained during their studies.

The School should engage with the Graduate Attributes Programme as part of this work. Transversal skills should be articulated on the School website and in student handbooks. Career pathways and opportunities should be embedded in the curriculum and made explicit to students.

This recommendation should be led by the Head of School and Heads of Departments. This recommendation is of medium-term priority and should be implemented within 2 years following receipt of the Panel report.

**5. The Panel recommends that the School develops a policy on feedback and marking criteria for students.**

The Panel are in agreement with the School's own recommendation on the need for consistent approach to feedback and marking criteria across the School. The Panel recommends developing a policy on student feedback to address this concern. This policy should include timelines for feedback, consistency in feedback and marking criteria for different assessment types across the School. The process of developing a policy will also allow for opportunities to share good practice of innovative assessment types.

This recommendation should be led by the Head of School and Heads of Departments. This recommendation is of medium-term priority and should be implemented within 2 years following receipt of the Panel report.

**6. The Panel recommends that the School continues to encourage interdisciplinary connections.**

The School should continue work to ensure that interdisciplinary linkages are encouraged and supported both within and outside of the School, including publicising existing networks. This may include the development of initiatives at School level to further support interdisciplinary collaboration across UCC and with external stakeholders.

This recommendation is ongoing and should be a recurring item for consideration on the agenda of the School Executive Committee.

**7. The Panel recommends that the School reconsiders its name.**

The Panel heard of a general apathy regarding the name of the School; staff did not feel that it adequately described the disciplines or the breadth of work undertaken within the School. The Panel thus recommends that the name of the School be reconsidered by staff.

This recommendation should be led by the Head of School with the input of all staff. This recommendation is of low-priority and at the discretion of the School; the Panel recommends that a discussion is initiated with staff within one year following receipt of the Panel report.

**Observations to the Head of the College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences**

Additional to the recommendations, the Panel identified certain observations for consideration, which the Panel believes fall outside of the School's remit. The Panel suggests that these observations be shared with the appropriate units to agree on a plan for addressing these observations accordingly.

1. The Panel wishes to draw attention to an issue of significance for students. Both the staff and students of the School have described the considerable pressure that students on fieldtrips experience, with deadlines and/or exams from other Schools arising during residential fieldtrips. The Panel recommends that the Head of College opens discussions within the College with the aim of finding workable solutions for these students (potential suggestions include asking other Schools not to hold exams during a particular week or reasonable accommodations such as deadline extensions).



2. The small number of Professors and the consequent impact on leadership within the School is of concern to the Panel. The Panel recommends that this issue remains high on the College agenda and observes that the School will not operate effectively into the future without senior leadership.
3. The Panel noted the considerable gender imbalance within the School, and recommends that the College strive for gender balance, particularly at senior level.
4. The Panel recommends that the College considers permitting more flexible opportunities for students to take credits across School boundaries. This would benefit smaller disciplines and have a negligible impact on the FTEs of the larger Schools.
5. The Panel recommends that the College considers developing BA programme-level learning outcomes (PLOs). A pragmatic approach might be to articulate a number of generic transversal skills in addition to subject level learning outcomes for each subject, which could then be combined to form PLOs.

## Overall Analysis of Self-Evaluation Process

### **Self-Evaluation Report (SER)**

The Panel found the Self-Evaluation Report to be concise and informative although it was more descriptive than analytical and self-reflective.

The Panel appreciated the work that the School undertook to produce the SER and noted that many staff reflected that it was a useful team bonding exercise.

### **SWOT**

The School of the Human Environment SWOT exercise was facilitated by Dr Anne Gannon, Department of Human Resources, UCC. The exercise was well attended by the three constituent departments and the Panel heard that staff felt the exercise was a positive experience and a welcomed opportunity for the staff of all three departments to discuss common concerns.

The School identified their main strengths, mainly focused on the experienced and professional staff across all categories, academic, administrative and technical. Another key strength outlined was the strong commitment to learning and teaching within the School; the School has a clear disciplinary focus while also offering interdisciplinary teaching.

Each of the constituent departments continues to concentrate on student experience through strong mentoring, while offering a diversity of innovative assessments for a wide range of learning needs. There is also a long-term commitment to field and experiential learning.

The weaknesses identified centred around the lack of senior staff across the School along with poor gender balance; more pronounced at senior levels. Also, large class sizes across first year in all three disciplines consistently challenge learning opportunities and engagement.

The opportunities identified by the School included more engagement in EDI initiatives and to promote diversity among new staff members, along with further collaborations between new and

existing staff. There is also potential, across the disciplines, for the development of CPD for primary/secondary teachers and professional sectors. The appointment of a School Manager will undoubtedly streamline future operations and administration within the School. There is potential for new programmes, in particular a school-branded PG programme in Environmental Humanities, and offering short, accredited courses under the banner of IUA Micro-credentials programmes.

The threats outlined included the increasing financial pressures on students which has led to a fall-off in both student engagement and numbers. Falling student numbers, cyclically or otherwise, will have a potential negative impact on academic positions. Other threats discussed included the reduced visibility of Geography at Junior Cert level, the challenges of generative AI, the challenge of doing interdisciplinary work across Schools and Colleges in UCC and finally core government funding for Higher Education in persistent decline.

The Panel concurred with the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats identified by the School.

### **Benchmarking**

Given the tripartite structure of the School with three distinct departments it was not possible for the School to identify one other unit that had the same makeup for benchmarking. As a result, Archaeology and Geography were benchmarked together with Queen's University Belfast and Aberdeen University. Classics was benchmarked against Maynooth University.

Undergraduate performance, Doctorate activity and the provision of laboratory facilities were chosen as the areas to be benchmarked. A short questionnaire covering the three topics was used to elicit responses from the benchmarked universities.

The Panel commended the School on the benchmarking exercise and found it to be relatively thorough, although uneven and of varying practical value for the three departments.

### **Good Practice Case Study**

Fieldwork has been a central pillar of student learning in Geography and Archaeology at UCC for over a century. There are a total of thirty-four modules within the School, both core and elective, that have a fieldwork element. Fieldwork allows students to engage with real-world learning and put into practice the theories learned in lectures and academic literature. Students collect their own data for subsequent analysis and experience the joys and challenges of working in a variety of different environments. Indeed, it is the practical experiences which both attract students into the disciplines, and which remain in their memories long after the completion of their degrees. It is therefore incumbent on staff leading the Geography and Archaeology programmes to have an ongoing practice of reflection on fieldwork, to ensure it is both innovative and inclusive for students.

In the last two decades the disciplines of both Geography and Archaeology have been responsive to the significant changes in technology, a more diverse student body, and concerns around sustainability and social inclusion with respect to fieldwork practice. These developments were tested by the Covid-19 pandemic, which prompted further thought, reflection and change. With the closure of UCC, and subsequent national lockdowns in March 2020, just prior to several residential fieldtrips, fieldwork projects, and fieldwork placements over the Easter period, an immediate pivot to online learning was

required. The lessons learned and feedback from the students, proved valuable for changes made subsequently, several of which remained in place or were adapted after the return to in-person learning. More recent developments in AI have further highlighted the importance of fieldwork in terms of academic authenticity.

The case study considered several examples of recent good practice with regards to fieldwork across the School, targeting all year groups as fieldwork is a progressive practice with each year building on previous experiences. Numerous academic and technical staff are involved in leading and supporting different field activities, ranging from day trips in the vicinity of Cork to residential trips across Europe. The case study initially summarised the importance of fieldwork in the degree programmes and how it aligns with the ambitions of UCC's *Strategic Plan* and *Academic Strategy*, particularly the Graduate Attributes. It details recent developments that were first borne out of responses to Covid-19 restrictions, but which have resulted in significant innovation in fieldwork practice. This includes further utilisation of technology that has enhanced inclusivity for students with disabilities, health issues, caring responsibilities, and financial limitations while ensuring that the fieldwork experience is relevant and equivalent for all students. It also looked at the significance of fieldwork as a form of authentic assessment and the importance of building students' technical skills in terms of future employment.

The overall feedback from students, staff and external examiners, as well as input from other stakeholders suggests that the use of technology in the field is invaluable, and that having the opportunity to develop a wide range of soft skills in small groups is something that can be done extremely effectively in the field. Staff have been commended on their responsiveness to making changes, and for their willingness to adopt new practices to facilitate student learning.

The Panel was very impressed with the case study and the level of dedication shown to including and promoting fieldwork within the School.

### **Pilot Programme Review**

Under the QQI Core Statutory Quality Guidelines, all Higher Education Institutions (HEI) including UCC, are required to demonstrate they possess effective mechanisms which facilitate the development and approval of new programmes and their subsequent ongoing self-evaluation, monitoring and quality review.

To further strengthen UCC's periodic quality review process and support the enhancement and development of programmes in the context of the University's Academic Strategy and responsibility for quality assurance, a Pilot Programme Review of the BA Hons Degree Programme was implemented as part of the self-evaluation activities required for the quality review of the School of the Human Environment.

The primary goal of the process is to review the effective delivery and operation of the programme with reference to the stated programme outcomes and ensure its continued currency in terms of:

- disciplinary expectations;
- the needs and diversity of learners;
- wider social, public and economic requirements and
- its alignment with the University's Academic Strategy.

The pilot programme review was undertaken via a programme dialogue approach whereby core members of the programme team came together to discuss and carry-out a reflective self-evaluation exercise. The ongoing operation and enhancement of the programme was considered in terms of the stated programme outcomes, and evidenced by student data and feedback, external examiner reports, external reference points, and ongoing programme monitoring activities.

The programme review took place in July 2023, facilitated by Dr Dug Cubie from the School of Law in UCC, and a set of outcomes was developed which led to a plan for the assurance and on-going enhancement of the programme. This was included as an appendix in the Self-Evaluation Report.

The Panel considered the programme review exercise to be timely and useful and observe that the inclusion of the External Examiners would make for a more rounded exercise.

## School Overview

The Panel was impressed with the staff of the School of the Human Environment, their dedication to both their disciplines and their students is to be commended. The Panel heard fulsome praise from all stakeholders, particularly students, and it was clear that student welfare and student academic attainment is at the heart of the School.

Internal stakeholders were clear that the School has much potential, staff have been exemplary in their engagement with Learning and Teaching courses and have shown leadership in this area. Staff are considered very responsive in their engagement with funding calls and have good international collaborations in postgraduate research. There was perhaps a concern for staff within the School that this work isn't as visible within the College as it could be.

The School operates as three separate departments under the banner of the School name. The Panel heard that the departments have not operated fully as a School since its inception though there has always been a Head of School; the School operates in a 'School light' fashion. Nevertheless, the Panel found a willingness among staff to work together as a School in terms of research collaborations and in the areas that would benefit them administratively.

The Panel heard that, while initially unwelcome, Schoolification has perhaps achieved more traction with staff with the passage of time. With the evolution of more burdensome College and University level administrative requirements (e.g., Health and Safety Reports, Risk Assessment etc), it was evident that a migration of such work to a School structure would remove an administrative burden on departments. The development of a suite of School level policies (e.g., Reasonable Accommodations Policy) would remove the need for departmental level policies, reducing administrative duplication.

The Panel heard much enthusiasm from staff on the prospect of interdisciplinary work and staff were very willing to continue working closely together on interdisciplinary projects where such work would raise the profile of both the disciplines and the School. Early and mid-career staff in particular welcomed the promotional and leadership opportunities presented through involvement in School-level committees. The Panel considered the matter carefully, cognisant of the wishes of staff. The Panel has made recommendations which focus on the School structure being utilised to both the advantage of the departments and their staff.

The Panel believes that this is an exciting juncture for the School with the recruitment of a new School Manager and Head of School. The Panel has made recommendations that focus on the benefits to the departments of adopting the administrative structure of a School and using it to their advantage. The School is comprised of three distinct departments and the Panel has formulated the recommendations with this in mind.

### **Facilities**

The Panel visited the facilities of the School during the site visit. Due to time constraints the Panel split up for the visit to the facilities, with the disciplinary experts leading separate visits to the Departments of Classics, Geography and Archaeology. The Panel wish to thank the School for the hospitality shown during the site visits. The Panel found the facilities to be satisfactory for core teaching and research activities, though greatly separated by distance and lacking in adequate laboratory facilities for Geography and Archaeology.

## Conclusion

The Panel found the review process to be enjoyable and insightful. The Panel appreciated the direct assistance provided by the QEU in supporting their meetings, note-taking and ensuring the logistics of the meetings ran smoothly throughout the review; the Panel was also appreciative of the QEU support provided to the School to enable the work of the pilot programme review.

The enthusiastic and collaborative engagement of staff with the self-evaluation process was greatly appreciated by the Panel; the Panel also wish to thank the School Self-Evaluation Committee for their work on the self-evaluation process and the pilot programme review, culminating in the Self-Evaluation Report.

The Panel greatly enjoyed their time in UCC and meeting the staff and students of the School. The Panel was impressed with the regard for students and the standard of academic endeavour and collaboration demonstrated by the School and wish the School well with their activities into the future.

### **Next Steps**

The Panel Report will next be approved by the Quality Enhancement Committee (QEC), chaired by the President, and published on the Quality Enhancement Unit (QEU) website.

The School will implement the recommendations within the timeframes outlined and provide a detailed report on their progress via a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The QEP will be considered and approved by the QEC and published on the QEU website.

## Appendix A – Panel Profiles

<p><b>Professor Per Ditlef Frederiksen</b></p>	<p>Per Ditlef Fredriksen is Professor of Archaeology at the Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History (IAKH) at the University of Oslo, Norway. Having served in various leadership positions, panels and working groups at his institution since 2013, he is currently the Head of Research and Deputy Head of Department (2021–24) and the Director of <i>Dialogues with the Past – the Nordic Graduate School in Archaeology</i> (2022–). His leadership experience includes several externally funded research projects, including <i>Historical Ecology and State Formation</i> (2014–17) and <i>ARCREATE. An Archaeology of Creative Knowledge in Turbulent Times</i> (2023–28).</p> <p>Professor Fredriksen is a founding member of the multi-disciplinary initiatives <i>Oslo School of Environmental Humanities</i> (OSEH) and <i>The Heritage Experience Initiative</i> (HEI) at the University of Oslo. He is an experienced teacher, examiner and supervisor at PhD and MA levels, and is widely used as a panel member and reviewer by various funding agencies and research/teaching institutions in Europe and southern Africa.</p>
<p><b>Professor Paul McSweeney (Chair)</b></p>	<p>Professor Paul McSweeney is Vice-President for Learning and Teaching in University College Cork. His office coordinates the activities of the University’s Centre for the Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning (CIRTL), Adult Continuing Education (ACE), Centre for Digital Education, Skills Centre, Examinations Appeals, the Language Centre the university’s Library system and Cork University Press, together with responsibility for delivering aspects of the University’s Academic Strategy and strategic plan.</p> <p>As Professor of Food Chemistry, he has an active research profile in dairy chemistry and cheese science. He is the co-author or co-editor of 15 books and about 275 research papers and reviews with a h-index of 77 with nearly 27,000 citations (Google Scholar; May 2023). He was awarded the Marschall Danisco International Dairy Science Award of the American Dairy Science Association in 2004 and in 2009 a higher doctorate (DSc) on published work by the National University of Ireland.</p> <p>Since 2009 he has been a member of Academic Board, the senior university standing committee of Academic Council responsible for the formulation of strategy and policy to meet the university’s education and research objectives. He has chaired the university’s Examinations Appeals Committee and for over five years ADSC, the university’s main academic policy committee. He is also a member of the board of the National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.</p> <p>Prof McSweeney has considerable leadership experience in higher education. He was vice-head of school, vice-head of the College of Science, Engineering and Food Science, interim Head of College, a governor of the university (2015-2018) and member of its Finance</p>

	<p>Committee and head of the School of Food and Nutritional Sciences. He was appointed Vice-President for Learning and Teaching in 2018 and acted as Vice-President for External Relations for five months in 2020.</p>
<p><b>Ms Taragh O’Sullivan</b> (Student Reviewer)</p>	<p>Ms Taragh O'Sullivan is currently a Higher Diploma in Social Policy student, as well as a graduate of the BA (Sociology and Religion and Global Diversity). She has been a proactive member of the Mature Students Society, working closely with the SU Mature Student Rep and has served in various student representation and support functions within the University.</p> <p>As part of this, she was SU Class Representative for the last three academic years for both the Sociology and Study of Religions Departments, working closely with large student groups and engaging in regular student experience meetings with the Department of Sociology. Moreover, having acted as a Peer Support Leader for three consecutive years, she was recently appointed as a Student Liaison for Peer Support, entrusted with the task of facilitating Reflective Learning Meetings for other Peer Support Leaders.</p> <p>She will be completing her term as the elected undergraduate representative for CACSSS on the University's Academic Council where she has stood as a voice for students within CACSSS. Finally, Ms O'Sullivan has worked with the Admissions Office on a fixed-term contract, having previously gained work experience with the Events team at the University for the last two years, mainly supporting the organisation of the President's Town Halls and Graduations.</p> <p>Thanks to these experiences with the University's Students Union, Societies, Peer Support Programme and institutional academic structures, Ms O'Sullivan has gained valuable insights into students' needs, expectations and operations of the University, which will assist her in the role of Student Reviewer for the Quality Review of the School of the Human Environment.</p>
<p><b>Professor Peter Van Nuffelen</b></p>	<p>Peter Van Nuffelen is Professor of Ancient History at Ghent University, Belgium. He studied in Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve, and was a Lecturer in Ancient History at the University of Exeter (U.K.). His research interests are ancient religion and philosophy, and the history of Late Antiquity. Recent publications include <i>Penser la tolérance dans l’Antiquité tardive</i>, Paris: Editions du Cerf, Paris, 2018, and, with L. Van Hoof, <i>The Fragmentary Latin Histories of Late Antiquity (AD 300-620): Edition, Translation and Commentary</i>, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, and <i>Jordanes: Romana and Getica</i> (Translated Texts for Historians 75), Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2020. These last two volumes are part of the output of an ERC Consolidator Grant (2013-2018).</p> <p>Professor Van Nuffelen is and has been member of panels of various research funds and currently is Director of Studies and Deputy head of Department in the Department of History at Ghent University.</p>
<p><b>Professor Louise Waite</b></p>	<p>Louise Waite is Professor of Human Geography at the University of Leeds, UK. Her research interests span migration and contemporary slavery, with a particular focus on discourses of ‘modern slavery’, unfreedom in</p>

	<p>labour relations, and the politics of solidarity. She has published widely in these fields and has received sizeable research income thus far; totalling c.£4m. Professor Waite has been a member of many grant reviewing panels for UKRI and other bodies; notably serving as the Deputy Chair on ESRC's Grant Awarding Panel A (Geography, Demography, Environmental Planning, Psychology) from 2018-2022. She is a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences.</p> <p>Professor Waite has held various leadership positions, including Director of Student Education in Geography, Acting Head of School Geography and she is currently Director of the interdisciplinary and cross-campus Leeds Social Sciences Institute (LSSI). In this role she has leadership responsibility for LSSI's main areas of activity (developing interdisciplinary research for the social sciences, maximising impact and skills training &amp; capacity building) and oversight of all governance, financial and communication matters. She is also the Principle Investigator for LSSI's ESRC funded Impact Acceleration Account (£1.2m).</p>
--	---



## Appendix B – Timetable

### Prior to site visit – online meeting

<b>Wednesday, 11 October 2023</b>	
11.30 – 13.00	Briefing by Director of Quality Enhancement, Quality Enhancement Manager and Review Coordinator.  <i>Panel discussion – initial thoughts on SER.</i>

### Site Visit to UCC – first week

<b>Tuesday, 24 October 2023</b>	
During the day	Panel members arrive in Cork
19.00	Dinner for Panel members hosted by the Director of Quality

<b>Wednesday, 25 October 2023</b>	
09.30 – 10.00	Private meeting of Panel
10.00 – 11.00	Meeting with Head, School of the Human Environment
11.00 – 11.30	Private meeting of the Panel (coffee break)
11.30 – 12.15	Meeting with Heads of Department in the School
12.15 – 13.00	Meeting with Undergraduate Students
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00 – 15.00	Meeting with Head, College of Arts, Celtic Studies & Social Sciences
15.00 – 16.30	Meeting with Staff of the School
16.30 – 17:00	Private meeting of Panel
17.30	Dinner for members of the Panel

<b>Thursday, 26 October 2023</b>	
09.00 – 09.20	Convening of the Panel – preparation for the day ahead
09.20 – 09.55	Meeting with Deputy President & Registrar ( <i>online meeting</i> )
09.55 – 10.15	Meeting with HR Business Manager, College of ACSSS

10.15 – 11.00	Meeting with Postgraduate Students
11.00 – 11.45	Private meeting of the Panel (coffee break)
11.45 – 12.30	Meeting with Senior Officers and key internal stakeholders of the University
12.30 – 13.00	Private meeting of the Panel
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch break
14.00 – 14.45	Meeting with Programme Directors/Chairs of Boards of Studies
14.45 – 15.30	Enhancing Student Learning Experience Meeting
15.30 – 16.15	Case Study of Good Practice Meeting
16.15 – 17.00	Tour of facilities (Archaeology, Geography and Classics)
19.00	Informal dinner for members of the Panel ( <i>those who have not departed</i> )

#### Online Meetings – second week

<b>Wednesday, 1 November 2023</b>	
09.30 – 09.45	Convening of the Panel – preparation for the day ahead
09.45 – 10.30	Meeting with External Stakeholders
10.30 – 11.30	Panel meeting to draft the recommendations and commendations
11.30 – 12.00	Break for Panel
12.00 – 13.30	Panel meeting to draft the recommendations and commendations

<b>Thursday, 2 November 2023</b>	
09.30 – 10.30	Meeting of Panel to finalise recommendations and commendations
10.30 – 11.00	Meeting with Head, School of the Human Environment
11.00 – 11.30	Break for Panel
11.30 – 12.30	Panel meeting to discuss feedback from Head of School; consider the closing presentation
12.30 – 13.00	Closing presentation to all staff
13.00 – 13.30	Panel – wrap up meeting