

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

**QUALITY IMPROVEMENT/QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

**DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS**

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2007/08**

**Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2008**

<b>Members of Peer Review Group</b>
Professor Mark Humphries Professor of Ancient History, Swansea University, UK <i>(Chair)</i>
Professor Anna Chahoud Professor of Latin, Trinity College Dublin
Ms. Rosalie Moloney School Principal, Cork
Professor Alan Titley Department of Modern Irish, UCC
Professor Kathy Hall Department of Education, UCC

#### **TIMETABLE OF THE SITE VISIT**

The timetable for the Site Visit is attached as Appendix A.

#### **PEER REVIEW**

#### **METHODOLOGY**

Each meeting was preceded by the formulation of specific questions to be addressed to UCC representatives by individual members of the Peer Review Group in the course of the proceedings. During the proceedings members of the Peer Review Group took detailed notes that formed the basis for the present report. Each session was reviewed at some stage during the day. Requests for additional information (e.g. Students Handbooks) were dealt with promptly and efficiently by the Quality Promotion Unit. All members of the Peer Review Group contributed to all meetings, to the drafting of the recommendations for improvement, and to the drafting of the final report. The report was drafted initially on site during the visit and was finalised by e-mail communications immediately following the review visit.

#### **SITE VISIT**

The timetable was comprehensive and covered all the areas that would be expected in such a review, although time constraints ensured a busy schedule, and we found that some of the time allocations were rather tight. The visit to the Library facilities and meetings with staff,

students and officers of the University all assisted in informing the reviewers of the current situation of the department.

We note, however, our disappointment at the fact that the Registrar was unable to meet the Peer Review Group, especially in view of the fact that his predecessor had equally been unable to participate in the previous Quality Review in 2002. The Quality Promotion Unit facilitated a response by forwarding the Peer Review Group's questions to the Registrar in writing at the end of the exercise; these questions invited comments on the following issues:

- (i) the future of Classics, including the future of the Chair in Greek and Latin;
- (ii) criteria for evaluating the success of the Classics Department;
- (iii) policy on sabbatical leave, especially in relation to the University mission statement concerning excellence in research;
- (iv) implications for Teaching and Learning in a Department teaching three distinct subjects (Greek, Latin and Greek and Roman Civilization);
- (v) potential for growth in numbers of postgraduate students;
- (vi) University's responsibility in the response to, and implementation of, the Peer Review Group's recommendations;
- (vii) the Registrar's and Vice-President for Academic Affairs' philosophical position on the role of Classics in the Institution.

The Registrar's response came four weeks later, on 8 April 2008, and much as we were pleased to acknowledge it - along with the complementary clarifications offered by the Quality Unit concerning point (vi) - we regret that detailed discussion of the Registrar's comments among the members of the Peer Review Group has not been possible at such a late stage. Our reaction to some key points is incorporated in the present report.

In general we were satisfied with the representation of other categories at UCC, although we noted with concern that two representatives of the University Management Group were unable to be present for the full time allocated to their meeting with the Peer Review Group.

It was especially regrettable that Professor Keith Sidwell, officially the Head of the Department of Classics, was unavailable to meet with the reviewers. Prior to formal implementation of the Quality Review of the Department, he had applied for, and been granted, sabbatical leave. This circumstance raises doubts as to the clarity of information made available to the Department concerning the precise time framework for the Review, and wider concerns for the University as to the suitability of allowing sabbatical leave to senior staff for a Review period. As it happened, Professor Sidwell was not present during the visit of the Peer Review Group. We requested to speak with him on the telephone, an opportunity that was readily afforded by the Quality Promotion

Unit in collaboration with the Department and that proved to be most valuable to the exercise. We wish to acknowledge this opportunity with grateful thanks.

### **PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

While the Peer Review Group concentrated on the review period 2002–2008 it also considered the longer-term history of the Department and the extent to which this has informed Departmental culture in terms for instance of staffing, teaching and learning, and research activity. It is clear that for much of its history the Department of Classics at UCC has experienced problems of staffing, curriculum development, and strategic planning. Since 1998, with the re-establishment of the Chair in Greek and Latin, the Department has visibly had a more coherent strategy overall. Evidence for this is provided by a number of facts: the Summer School in Greek and Latin; the Centre for Neo-Latin Studies and its associated activities including the Neo-Latin seminar, postgraduate students and a programme of research and publication that will shortly come to fruition; collaboration with other Departments; the impressive research output of some staff; the continued and sizable number of students who take Greek and Roman Civilisation particularly in First Year; the high standard of teaching and learning indicated by the exceptionally positive reports from external examiners and by the enthusiastic responses of present and past students; promotion of Departmental research through the hosting of international conferences; and a renewed general sense of purpose and direction in the Department. Largely owing to staffing uncertainties and questions of institutional support, the Department's capacity for strategic planning at present is limited; consequently, the recommendations for improvement made by the Peer Review Group address the University as well as the Department.

### **OVERALL ANALYSIS**

#### **Self-Evaluation Report**

The Self-Evaluation Report gave some causes for concern about the Department in respect of the level of staffing and of institutional support and these particular issues informed the activity of the Peer Review Group. We were pleased to note, however, that during the site visit our view of the Department's fortunes - and, indeed, the Department's own view of its situation - gave grounds for more optimism than might have been surmised from the Self-evaluation Report. In general, we noted a tendency on the part of the Department not to focus on its manifold strengths; in particular, we were able to identify, and would like to emphasise, a number of strengths which were neither mentioned in the self-evaluation SWOT analysis nor sufficiently emphasised throughout the Self-Evaluation Report.

## **SWOT Analysis**

### **Strengths**

We agreed with the five following strengths identified by the Department:

1. Good relations between staff;
2. Summer School flourishing financially and academically;
3. Relatively good student numbers in First Year Greek and Roman Civilization;
4. All staff engaged in major research projects;
5. All staff highly skilled and able to teach three subjects: Greek, Latin, Greek and Roman Civilization.

In addition, we would wish to draw attention to the following strengths as identified during the Peer Review Group's own information-gathering and deliberations:

1. Open and approachable character of staff members and of the Department as a whole;
2. Dynamic and inspirational quality of teaching;
3. Enthusiasm engendered in students;
4. International aspect of research;
5. Continuity of research activities and international significance of contributions made;
6. Library collection of Transmission and Transformation of Ancient World;
7. Flexibility as a measure of collective expertise;
8. Ability to organise significant international conferences;
9. Excellence of student handbooks, containing precise information on course contents and helpful methodological guidelines.

### **Weaknesses**

We agreed with the following weaknesses singled out in the self-evaluation SWOT analysis:

1. Low student numbers in language courses - although it was noted that such small figures are in line with comparable courses in most Classics departments in Ireland and the UK;
2. Poor retention rate from First into Second Year among Greek and Roman Civilization students;
3. Lack of key specialisms (Greek history, Classical art history and archaeology) among staff within the Department.

We would like to add the following:

1. Lack of an efficient system of communication and collaboration with the Library, such as may be created with the appointment of a Departmental Library Liaison other than the Head of Department.

## **Opportunities**

In response and in addition to the Department's analysis, we wish to single out the following:

1. 'Schoolification' as an opportunity to develop new relationships and to enhance the vitality of the Department's research culture and teaching and learning, leading to the reinvigoration of the Department's vision for the immediate and distant future;
2. Potential for cooperation and linkage with other undergraduate programmes (e.g. History of Art, Medieval History, Renaissances Studies);
3. Ability to provide fundamental training in language requirements for postgraduate programmes in cognate disciplines;
4. Potential of the Centre for Neo-Latin Studies to deliver significant benefits for the department as a whole in terms of both publications and research students;
5. Ability to provide major input in the continuation of the work of the Centre for Neo-Latin Studies and of the Neo-Latin seminar in cooperation with the SIF Chair of Renaissance Studies;
6. The strength of the Summer School raising the possibility of further development;
7. Potential for collaboration in scholarly work with academic units within and outside UCC;
8. Potential for joint appointments of academic staff with departments of cognate disciplines (e.g. History of Art);
9. Potential of the current proposed changes to the timetable for enhancing student full-time equivalents while facilitating such natural subject combinations as have been proved to be successful in other institutions;
10. Active engagement with popular culture and contemporary perceptions of the classical world.

## **Threats**

1. Cessation of Evening Arts/Outreach programmes, which would further reduce student FTEs;
2. Failure to fill the Chair of Greek and Latin, which would diminish the standing of the discipline, lead to an impoverishment of the qualifications offered, enervate the remaining staff of the department, and lead to a lack of academic leadership within Classics both within the University and abroad;
3. Failure to appoint replacements for its two Tenure B lecturers, which would have serious consequences for the viability of undergraduate programmes;
4. Inaccurate and inappropriate measurement of the Department's research and scholarly activity by the University.

### **Benchmarking Exercise**

The decision by the Department to benchmark itself against Ancient Classics at NUIM was deemed to be appropriate owing to the comparability of the two departments in terms of staff complement, course offerings and institutional context (both Departments belong to NUI). The benchmarking exercise was carried out thoroughly and usefully highlighted areas where the Department of Classics at UCC might wish to develop. The exercise accurately identified the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two Departments in such a way as to give UCC Classics a useful indication of goals to which it might aspire and of the means through which these goals might be best achieved. It also highlighted problems and difficulties faced by Classics Departments elsewhere. This can be seen to have influenced the recommendations for improvements contained in the Self-Evaluation Report.

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

#### **Department Details, Organisation and Planning**

We were very impressed to see how seriously the Department has taken the recommendations put forward by the last Quality Review. Student handbooks are now available for the various levels of study of the three subjects taught in the Department - Greek, Latin, and Greek and Roman Civilization - containing detailed and neatly presented information about courses, and guidelines for the production of coursework. The Department has engaged in continued curriculum development during the review period, and offers a varied and engaging programme on which all students participating in the Review Process have commented favourably. The integration of the College language teacher into the physical space of the Department is a reflection of the valuable teaching role played by this member of staff. The Department is engaged in interdisciplinary activity in both teaching and research. We would also like to note the vital support and cohesion offered by the Departmental Secretary. Liaison with the Library should be improved urgently in order to give both staff and students the opportunity to make the most of the impressive collections acquired during the review period.

#### **Teaching and Learning**

Classics as a discipline and as academic department plays a central role in the Faculty and the University. The high quality of teaching and learning in Classics at UCC is abundantly evident from the commitment of every single member of staff to high-quality teaching, which students describe as both challenging and inspirational; from the impressive range of material covered in the course; from the successful use of Blackboard as an integrated teaching aid; from the President's Award for Excellence in Teaching awarded to a member of the

department; and, last but not least, from the good relations that by all accounts characterise the exchanges between staff and students.

The development of the Greek and Roman Civilization programme is important but has to be seen in the context of timetabling issues and of staff resources. A need for modules in Classical art and architecture and material culture is particularly felt. The Department ought to take an imaginative and flexible approach to improve certain aspects of teaching and learning, and we have identified a few areas where this exercise can be carried out most effectively. These suggestions are highlighted in the Recommendations below.

### **Research and Scholarly Activity**

Several members of staff have been very active in research and publication and in the very near future all staff will have published significant work of international importance. The Review Team was seriously concerned about the inaccurate and negative representation of the Department's scholarly output and engagement, which was given in the documents supplied by the Office of Vice-President for Research - for example, failure to mention one of the Department's major research strengths (Late Antiquity); incorrect numbers of staff factored in the calculation of research output; inadequate weight assigned to the UK RAE deadline of 2007 in the graph intended to visualize the publication pattern in the review period. We would like to rectify this picture with the findings of our Review, as follows: research awards, grants and the impressive record of international conferences hosted in the Department during the review period, not least the hosting of the major international Celtic Conference in Classics in July 2008; the importance of the Centre for Neo-Latin Studies, with its research activity at postgraduate and staff level, graduate seminars, PhDs completed and in progress, and forthcoming publications.

In terms of research strategy, the Department has succeeded in creating a unique and international resource through the acquisition of the "Transmissions and Transformation of the Ancient World" collection with the support of PRTLTI funding, although the limited accessibility of this collection is highly problematic (see below). We also note that concerns about staffing raise wider concerns about future research productivity. The question of Sabbatical Leave, which is key to the full integration of research and teaching in the Humanities, still needs to be addressed at University level. The current position of UCC, with its emphasis on replacement-teaching costs, appeared to us out of line with the policy of a research-driven institution.

We also point out that while the number of PhD students is commensurate with the output of similarly sized Classics departments in Ireland and in the UK, the Department needs to look at



graduate recruitment strategies and improve the visibility of research options in Classics for prospective students within the University, in the country and internationally.

### **Staff Development**

In context of current staffing uncertainties the University must be pressed to fill the forthcoming vacancies, otherwise the Department will not be able to fulfil its functions. The lack of senior ranking staff in the Department is a reason for serious concern that should be addressed at University level as a matter of extreme urgency. The Department needs to be supported in seeing the relevance of staff development in teaching and learning and a more formal system of staff mentoring, including the production of a staff handbook. We noted that the special skills of the College Language Teacher are crucial to the functioning of the Department.

### **External Relations**

Extramural activity is carried out by the Department most satisfactorily. The setting up of courses on outreach programmes is highly commendable, especially given the Department's limited staffing resources, and has been commented on very favourably by some of the stakeholders involved in the Review process. Some members of the Department are actively involved in the work of the Classical Association of Ireland, including the editorship of the journal *Classics Ireland*. The Summer School is a meritorious and hugely successful undertaking, which has the added value of attracting international visitors to UCC.

Provision of modules that can be taken with other Departments and of language training for undergraduates and postgraduate students across the Faculty and indeed the University is a strength that should be publicised more effectively.

On the whole the Department still needs to work on marketing and recruitment strategies, on periodic attendance at local guidance counsellor meetings and on other activities that would bring about an awareness of its presence within and beyond the boundaries of the University.

### **Support Services**

Undoubtedly teaching and learning activities in the Department suffer from serious problems of resource availability, especially owing to the organization and accessibility of the material in the Library. The acquisition of the "Transmission and Transformation of the Ancient World" collection, which comprises an extraordinary range of up-to-date teaching material and international research tools, was a major achievement that placed UCC in a position of unique strength in Ireland. Library policy, however, appears to have been implemented

imperfectly. The shelving of texts is inadequate to meet either staff or students needs, failing to give a comprehensive view of contemporary scholarly work on the various subjects of Classics as a discipline: up-to-date texts, translations, commentaries and studies (the “Transmission and Transformation” collection) are kept on restricted or closed access in the basement (in spite of original intentions, as evidenced by the collection’s bookplate, to integrate the collection with other holdings on open access), and can only be borrowed or photocopied using a system of ‘concessionary loans’, by which staff may apply to borrow a book (the system requires the sub-librarian responsible for the collection to read and approve every application); similarly while staff and students may not photocopy books themselves, there is a system by which library staff will photocopy a limited amount of material (depending on date, condition, etc.) for a charge; the open shelves on the third floor do not display a full set of Loeb’s, and present the viewer with old school editions of classical texts (Macmillans) and a very limited number of critical studies, thus misrepresenting the current state of research in Classics; closely related material is scattered in different sections and sometimes different floors in the Library (e.g. medical Latin and late Roman history). The sense of waste is particularly felt when examining the “Transformation and Transmission” Collection, which is a most impressive and enviable resource, resulting from the vision which informed the implementation of the last Peer Review Group’s recommendations about a research library. The proposed plan of purchasing duplicates of works relevant to undergraduate studies struck this Peer Review Group as both unrealistic and unnecessary, when greater liaison between the Library and the Department would easily solve the problem of provision, organization and accessibility. Whilst fully appreciating the difficulties of accommodating a valuable collection of considerable size (and purchased under a separate budget) into the permanent display on the third floor, we felt that Library policy directed towards the creation of a truly effective resource for UCC students and staff - and, it was noted, a magnificent resource for Classics researchers from all over Ireland and the UK - would be in the interest of everyone involved.

The report received by the Peer Review Group concerning research activities in the Department strongly suggests that there needs to be greater clarity and liaison between the office of the Vice-President for Research and the Department. Serious inaccuracies in the representation of the Department’s research areas and publications would indicate that the University does not fully appreciate the contribution of the Classics Department to the research culture in the College and in the University as a whole.

### **Staffing**

The Department has been functioning on very limited staff resources, nevertheless covering a wide range of subject areas in their teaching and research activities (Latin and Greek languages and literatures, Roman history, mythology, reception). The recent departure of the Professor and imminent retirement of two Lecturers jeopardise the continuity of such activities, unless positions are preserved and filled as soon as possible. No doubt exists as to the priority of appointing a new Chair in Classics and as to the primacy of Greek and Latin language teaching; at the same time, the Department should explore the possibility of joint appointments with cognate departments, for instance History of Art.

### **Accommodation**

We noted that the quality of physical space in the Department remains unsatisfactory, especially with regards to sound proofing of rooms. We were also made aware of existing uncertainties about the retention of the office space following the imminent departure of permanent members of staff. The lack of a dedicated space in the Department that could host seminars and events was noted as a regrettable obstacle to the visibility of Classics initiatives within the University.

### **Financing**

Like other academic units in the Arts and Humanities, Classics is a strategically 'non-profit' department. The evaluation of its viability subject to RAM (Resource Allocation Model) and related support at College level are at the discretion of the Head of College. The College of Arts, Celtic Studies & Social Sciences is in a surplus situation. The University currently protects the Department by charging a mere 10% of gross fee income as the contribution towards university overheads for the Summer School, which initiative makes a good profit every year. It is hoped that the College and University will maintain their subsidizing support to the most significant area of staff pay by ensuring base levels through the replacement of staff at this particular moment in the history of the Department.

### **Communications**

The Department does not have a comfortable relationship with the College at the moment, mainly owing to the lack of formal transparent procedures for engaging with the College and the University at the appropriate decision-making level. The absence of the Professor appears to have been particularly damaging.

## **Departmental Co-ordinating Committee and methodology employed in the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report**

The Peer Review Group was satisfied that the Self-Evaluation Report was a comprehensive, well-structured and easily accessible document presented with clarity and wealth of detail. The amount of work that went into its preparation was much appreciated, as the document provided a firm basis for the discussions and interviews conducted by the Peer Review Group. The organisation of the Self-Evaluation Report and the collaborative process followed in its preparation assisted the reviewers in appreciating the perspective of staff, and the detailed appendices gave an opportunity to see how the Department and its activities are viewed by the students.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

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

The Peer Review Group discussed in detail all recommendations made in the Self-Evaluation Report and endorsed the following, with some amendments:

1. **Chair:** Management should reach a firm decision concerning the future of the departmental Chair as soon as possible, in order to facilitate proper planning within the Department (see also below, Peer Review Group's Recommendations, No. 1);
2. **'Schoolification':** Management should encourage the Departments of History and English to reconsider their position not to accept the Department of Classics as part of a larger school, however named (see also below, Peer Review Group's Recommendations, No. 3);
3. **Support of Language Departments:** Management should reach a firm decision as soon as possible concerning the degree to which they will allow non-language departments within the College of ACSSS to support the activities of language departments, so that language departments are set clear and feasible financial targets;
4. **Flexibility in Module Offering:** (a) that there should be a mechanism in place to allow a change in some of the modules offered by a department even at a relatively late stage, so as to facilitate new or temporary staff to teach within their broad areas of expertise, thereby ensuring the quality of the teaching and learning process for all concerned (see also below, Peer Review Group's Recommendations No. 6); (b) that departments or disciplines have the option of not running undersubscribed modules if in line with standards recommended by College policy;

5. **Leave of Absence for Research:** it is highly desirable that the University develop an efficient system of sabbatical leave so that all members of staff in smaller departments can afford to avail of it (see also below, Peer Review Group's Recommendations, No. 4);
6. **Interdisciplinarity:** the management of the College of CACSSS should actively encourage joint-appointments between different departments or disciplines, even where these are finally located in different schools (see also below, Peer Review Group's Recommendations, No. 5);
7. **Timetable:** the management of the College of ACSSS should consider such adjustments to the college timetable as would demonstrably increase student numbers in First Year;
8. **Space:** the space committee should allow the Department (a) to retain the office due to be vacated by C. McCallum-Barry as a Part-Time Lecturer' Office; (b) to retain the office due to be vacated by Professor K. Sidwell for the continued use of whoever should act as Head of Department; (c) to use the room released by the staff member acting as Head of Department as the Departmental Postgraduate Room. It would be highly desirable that the space committee also allocate the half-office vacated due to the resignation of Dr. D. Caulfield to a member of a cognate discipline.

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

#### **1. Chair of Classics**

The Department needs a Chair. The physical absence of the Chair creates immediate and longer-term problems of strategic planning, weakens the perception of subject leadership, and undermines the Department's influence in the University and beyond. We would recommended that the title be changed from 'Professor of Greek and Latin' to 'Professor of Classics', so as to give a clearer and fuller representation of the research and teaching activities of the Department, and to produce a leadership figure that would be more immediately identified with the Department.

#### **2. Staffing**

The University must give firm commitments about staffing levels within the Department.

### **3. 'Schoolification'**

This question needs to be addressed urgently. There must be a commitment to language teaching in whatever arrangement is made about the progression from Department to Discipline within a School. It is vital that the Department of Classics as part of a School retain its prerogative to teach languages as an essential part of its role and contribution to the School. The centrality of the classical languages in the Humanities makes this contribution relevant to whatever School the Department goes into.

### **4. Research support**

Sabbatical leave is key to the healthy development of a research-driven Department and its successful integration in an institution committed to excellence in Research and Innovation in Teaching and Learning as stated in the University Mission Statement. We would strongly recommend that the University view sabbatical leave for research as a buttress, rather than a privilege, in the building of high-standard academic profiles.

### **5. Centre for Neo-Latin Studies**

Given the amount of investment in this initiative, which established UCC Classics as leaders in the field of Neo-Latin studies in the country, possibilities should be actively explored as to how the Department might bring this project forward in collaboration with the new Professor of Renaissance Studies. We note our disappointment that the mandatory requirements for this position have been significantly tempered. We would strongly recommend that the holder of the position should have appropriate qualifications and expertise in the Classical languages and in the specialised skills that are necessary for advanced research on the original texts in this area. The Department should continue to play an active role in the cooperation between classical and historical scholarship that is necessary to advance, promote and publicize the work of the Centre. The collection, translation, interpretation and digitisation of literary texts and historical sources written in Latin - the language of scholarly communication in early modern Europe - is an invaluable contribution to our understanding of the Classical tradition and its relevance to Ireland within a European context.

### **6. Curriculum Development**

We give a number of recommendations concerning improvements of course curriculum:

(a) **A research project element**, in the form of an extended essay on an assigned historical or literary topic, may be offered in Third Year in place of a taught module. This format would achieve a number of desirable results such as wider choice to Final Year students and identification of potential postgraduate students;

(b) **Module descriptions** in the College Calendar need not be as prescriptive as they currently are, to allow for greater flexibility; full details of course content would be provided in the Department's Student Handbooks;

(c) Possibilities of **combined teaching of shared elements in literature and language modules** should be explored with a view to enabling further flexibility; cyclical teaching should be investigated, but should bear in mind issues of academic progression, especially relevant in philological and historical subjects;

(d) The relevance of Classics subject to other disciplines should be emphasised by formalizing the **offer of Greek and Roman Civilization modules (e.g. ancient history) to other departments**; potential for reciprocal arrangements with other Departments should also be explored, while bearing FTE considerations in mind.

## **7. Library**

It is of paramount importance that the Department entertain closer liaison with the library in order to resolve issues of accessibility and organisation of fundamental resources. The appointment of a departmental Library Liaison person other than the Head of Department is desirable.

## **8. Recruitment Strategy**

The Department must develop a system of proactive recruitment of students into Second and Third Year programmes and into postgraduate programmes. The highly positive feedback given by students to the Peer Review Group suggests that current and former students would provide an ideal source of 'marketing resources', to be entered in promotional packs and/or engaged in orientation sessions. Such information should also indicate how Classical subjects can contribute to career options.

## **9. Summer School**

The Greek and Latin Summer School is always heavily oversubscribed, a fact which is testament to the international success of this Cork initiative. We would

recommend that the Department consider expanding the Summer School, subject to feasibility in terms of staffing, finance and space.

#### **10. Publicity**

The Department needs to be more active in promoting its own activities within and outside the University.

#### **11. Support from the Institution**

The University needs to take seriously the support it offers to the Department of Classics, not least in view of the reputation of the University in wider terms: it is the University's academic responsibility to treasure UCC's inheritance and to guide its students towards a better understanding of the Europe of which it is a part.



## Appendix A

### DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

#### PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT TIMETABLE

##### In Summary

- Sunday 9 March: The Peer Review Group arrives at the Kingsley Hotel for a briefing from the Director of the Quality Promotion Unit, followed by a meal with the Departmental Co-ordinating Committee.
- Monday 10 March: The Peer Review Group considers the Self-Evaluation Report and meet with departmental staff and student and stakeholder representatives. A working private dinner is held that evening for the Peer Review Group.
- Tuesday 11 March: The Peer Review Group meet with relevant officers of UCC. An exit presentation is given by the Peer Review Group to all members of the Department. A working private dinner is held that evening for the Peer Review Group in order to finalise the report. This is the final evening of the review.
- Wednesday 12 March: External Peer Review Group members depart.

<b>Sunday 9 March 2008</b>	
16.00 – 18.00	Meeting of members of the Peer Review Group Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion Unit, Dr. Norma Ryan. Group agrees final work schedule and assignment of tasks for the following 2 days. Views are exchanged and areas to be clarified or explored are identified.
19.00	Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group and Head of Department and Departmental Co-ordinating Committee.  Departmental Co-ordinating Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dr David Woods</li><li>• Mr John Barry</li><li>• Ms Carmel McCallum-Barry</li><li>• Dr Carl O'Brien</li><li>• Dr. Konstantin Doulamis</li><li>• Ms Olive O'Flaherty</li><li>• Ms Vicky Janssens</li></ul>
<b>Monday 10 March 2008</b>	
<b>Venue: Bearra Room, Áras na Mac Léinn</b>	
08.30 – 09.00	Convening of Peer Review Group and consideration of Self-Evaluation Report
09.00 – 09.30	Dr. David Woods, Acting Head of Department

09.30 – 10.30	<u>Meeting with all Departmental Staff</u> Mr. John Barry Ms. Carmel McCallum-Barry Ms. Olive O’Flaherty Dr. David Woods Dr. Konstantin Doulamis Dr. Carl O’Brien Ms. Vicky Janssens
10.30 – 11.00	Tea/coffee
11.00 – 13.00	<u>Private meetings with members of staff</u> 11.00: Dr. Konstantin Doulamis 11.30: Ms. Carmel McCallum-Barry 12.00: Ms. Olive O’Flaherty 12.30: Ms. Vicky Janssens 11.15: Dr. Carl O’Brien 11.45: 12.15: Mr. John Barry
13.00 – 14.00	Working private lunch for members of Peer Review Group
14.00 – 14.30	Professor David Cox, Head of College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences
14.30 – 15.00	Professor Peter Kennedy, Vice-President for Research Policy & Support
15.00 – 15.30	<u>Representatives of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Students</u> Eileen Hegarty (LT2) Jerry O’Dwyer (GR2) Reynold Lomardi (GR1001) Brigid Walsh (LT1001)
15.30 – 16.00	<u>Representatives of 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Students</u> Mariliis Roos (GR3) John Keating (LT3)
16.00 – 16.30	<u>Representatives of Graduate Students</u> Sarah McAndrew (MA) Nienke Tjoelker (PhD)
16.30 – 16.50	Professor Paul Giller, Registrar & Senior Vice-President
17.00 – 18.30	<u>Representatives of external Stakeholders – all recent graduates</u> Mr. Gerry McCarthy Ms. Anne McCarthy Ms. Geraldine Ni Cathain Ms. Jennifer O’Donoghue Ms. Aoife O’ Farrell Mr. Michael O Geallabhain Mr. Diarmuid O Cathain Mr. Darragh Ryan Ms. Mary Doyle Mr. David Kiely
19.00	Meeting of Peer Review Group to identify remaining aspects to be clarified and to finalise tasks for the following day, followed by a working private dinner.
<b>Tuesday 11 March 2008</b>	
<b>Venue: Bearra Room, Áras na Mac Léinn</b>	
08.30 – 09.00	Convening of Peer Review Group
09.00 – 09.30	Professor Grace Neville, Vice-President for Teaching & Learning
09.30 – 10.00	Visit to core facilities of Department, escorted by Dr. David Woods, Acting Head & Ms. Olive O’Flaherty, Senior Executive Assistant

10.00– 11.00	Visit to UCC Library, meeting with Ms. Margot Conrick, Head of Information Services, Ms. Olivia Fitzpatrick, Subject Librarian & Mr. Crónán Ó Doibhlin, Sub-Librarian Special Collections, Archives & Repository Services
11.00 - 11.15	Tea/coffee
11.15– 11.30	Ms. Carmel Cotter, Finance Office
11.30 – 12.00	Conference call to Canada to talk with Professor Keith Sidwell (Head of Department)
12.00 – 12.30	Preparation of first draft of final report
12.30 – 13.00	Dr. David Woods, Acting Head of Department
13.00 – 14.00	Working Lunch
14.00 – 17.00	Preparation of first draft of final report
17.00 – 17.30	Exit presentation made by Professor Humphries, Chair of the Peer Review Group, summarising the principal findings of the Peer Review Group.
19.00	Working private dinner for members of the Peer Review Group to complete drafting of report and finalisation of arrangements for completion and submission of final report.