QUALITY REVIEW

PEER REVIEW PANEL REPORT

CORK CENTRE FOR ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION (CCAE)

March 2021

Joint Review – University College Cork (UCC) and Munster Technological University (MTU)

Contents

Peer Review Panel Members

Name	Position/Discipline	Institution
Professor Dr Oya Atalay Franck	Director, School of Architecture, Design and Civil Engineering	Zurich University of Applied Sciences
Dr Roberto Cavallo	Department of Architecture	Delft University of Technology
Ms Sheila Kelleher *(Student Reviewer)*	MSc student, Cork University Business School	University College Cork
Dr Breda Kenny	Head, School of Business	Munster Technological University
Mr Nuttawad (Zack) Nutchanat *(Student Reviewer)*	MSc student, Department of Organisation and Professional Development	Munster Technological University
Professor Mark Poustie *(Chair)*	Dean, School of Law	University College Cork
Ms Tina Saaby	City Architect	Gladsaxe, Denmark
In attendance from the Quality Enhancement Unit, UCC		
Ms Deirdre O'Brien *(Review Co-ordinator)*	Administrative Officer, Quality Enhancement Unit	University College Cork
Ms Marie O'Regan *(IT & Logistics Co-ordinator)*	Executive Assistant, Quality Enhancement Unit	University College Cork

Part 1 - Overall Analysis

1.1   Context

The Cork Centre for Architectural Education (CCAE) was established in 2006 through a partnership between Cork Institute of Technology (now Munster Technological University, MTU) and University College Cork (UCC). The partnership arose in response to requests from architectural practices in Cork who were experiencing difficulty in recruiting staff during the construction boom at the beginning of the millennium. The 4-Year BSc (Honours) Degree in Architecture (Level 8) and 1-Year Master of Architecture (Level 9) are jointly offered by MTU and UCC through CCAE. The overall 5-years of architectural education is accredited by The Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland (RIAI) and prescribed in Irish law. In June 2018 CCAE moved from the Copley Street site to a purpose-built building in Douglas Street in Cork city centre.

The CCAE Mission Statement: the mission of Cork Centre for Architectural Education is to create a nexus where interested members of the public, students and architects and can cooperate to achieve a better understanding of our built environment and develop the skills to work together to improve

it. CCAE will engage with local needs amenable to design solutions, and collaborate with partners, local and international, in education, the profession, industry and research to benefit from best of current practice in architectural design, and to contribute to this, through research that will inform Teaching & Learning, particularly through student project work.

The CCAE mission will contribute to UCC School of Engineering and Architecture mission "to contribute through engagement with industry to the development of a sustainable future for Ireland." CCAE's action-oriented mission is also consistent with MTU's mission "to lead change and, through education, empower people for a successful future in a globalised world". CCAE aspires to provide a unique contribution to the UCC vision "to be a leading university of independent thinkers" and their mission of "creating, understanding and sharing knowledge and applying it for the good of all".

The review took place during the Covid-19 emergency. The Panel acknowledged that CCAE staff and students worked under difficult circumstances during the previous year. Despite the challenges presented by the Covid-19 crisis, both staff and students engaged productively and positively with the review.

1.2 Methodology and Site Visit

As CCAE is run jointly by Munster Technological University (MTU) and University College Cork (UCC), the quality review was a joint endeavour. To enable completion of Quality Reviews under the prevailing public health restrictions due to Covid-19, a model for conducting site visits virtually was developed. This model ensures continuity in the operation and delivery of quality review and enhancement activities. Development of the revised model was informed by emerging practices for quality review nationally and internationally under Covid-19 arrangements. Core principles which guided the redesign were the need to:

- Achieve completion of the review process whilst recognising the significant impact of Covid-19 adaptations for teaching, learning and assessment for academic units;
- Uphold the overall integrity of the review process and maintain comparability by ensuring that the objectives for review could be achieved under adapted circumstances;
- Coordinate the sequence of the site visit to ensure coherence and retain all the relevant meetings with staff, students and stakeholders;
- Manage the process of Review Team establishment and working ethos.

In place of the usual physical site visit at the University over a 2.5-day period, the virtual visit was configured to take place over a 5-day period spread over two weeks in March 2021. Microsoft Teams was used as the virtual platform for all meetings. The longer timeframe of the site visit provided for increased flexibility, whilst retaining all the relevant meetings with staff, students and stakeholders and so ensuring that the objectives of quality review would be fulfilled.

The timetable was comprehensive and enabled consultation with key stakeholders, including senior management of both UCC and MTU, students, staff, and internal and external stakeholders. The sequencing of meetings was organised so as to ensure coherence and progression in the conduct of the site visit. The timetable for the site visit is included in Appendix B.

The Panel brought together national and international peer reviewers. Internal reviewers provided knowledge of institutional and organisational structures within UCC and MTU, with the external Panel

members contributing their peer expertise in Architecture. The student Panel members brought valuable insights and perspectives on student issues. Despite the remote nature of the site visit, the Panel engaged constructively with all participants. At the end of the site visit, the Panel presented its initial findings, both commendations and recommendations, to CCAE.

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 site visit. Review coordination was provided throughout by a Review Co-ordinator from QEU, UCC 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.

1.3   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 CCAE 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.

1.4   Overall Analysis of Self-Evaluation Process

1.4.1   Self-Evaluation Report (SER)

The Panel commended the volume of work undertaken on the Self-Evaluation Report (SER). However, the Panel found the SER to be too large, lacking in cohesion and relevant context. While the pertinent material was contained in the SER, the prioritisation of information could have been improved, overall, it was considered a missed opportunity for CCAE.

1.4.2   SWOT Analysis

The SWOT analysis process was well executed and resulted in a valuable analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities for CCAE; however, the Panel found a disconnect between the analysis and the findings within the overall report. Greater connection and elaboration between the SWOT analysis and the final report would have been helpful for the Panel in its deliberations.

1.4.3   Benchmarking

CCAE did not undertake a benchmarking exercise due to Covid-19 and potential sensitivity surrounding data sharing in an online exercise. The Panel considered the benchmarking exercise to be an essential

component of the review process and recommended that CCAE undertake a benchmarking exercise as a matter of priority. This benchmarking exercise should form part of CCAE's strategy development and is vital for the development of a strategy that differentiates CCAE from other providers of architectural education.

1.4.4   Developments since last review

CCAE's response to the recommendations of the previous Quality Review (2012/13) was appended to the Self-Evaluation Report. The updates to the recommendations were comprehensive and outlined the progress of the recommendations across several years - 2013, 2015 and 2017. The main development since the last review is the construction of a purpose-built building for CCAE.

1.4.5   Good Practice Case Study

CCAE did not undertake a Good Practice Case Study for the purpose of the review. The Panel received a number of presentations to highlight how staff are seeking to enhance student education in the centre. It was evident to the Panel that CCAE are seeking to enhance student education in a variety of ways.

1.5   Facilities

In June 2018 CCAE moved to a purpose-built, 2,500 square metres building located close to Cork City centre rather than on the campus of either UCC or MTU.

The new building provides spacious resources for a studio-based model of learning. Students are provided with an individual working space for undertaking design work, and for studying individually and in teams. The CCAE building is set back from the street forming a new landscape to the existing street. The main entrance is distinguished by a cut in the north western corner. Beyond the entrance foyer is a three-storey atrium void topped by clearstory glazing. At this level a canteen and two flexible lecture spaces are backed by glazing which exits to an internal shared courtyard. The courtyard is part of a new landscape that leads through the Nano Nagle Place complex. The open plan accommodation arranged around the atrium void aims to encourage an intergenerational experience and sharing of knowledge across the building. The atrium is also located to maximise natural daylight and encourage the use of natural ventilation strategies.

The new building has expanded exhibition areas and a workshop which accommodates a new staff appointment from MTU to provide technical support and increase the use of the digital fabrication machine donated by a local business. This introduction of digital fabrication was one of the recommendations of the last Quality Review report, and that has resulted in visible benefits in terms of complex model-making, and increased enthusiasm from students.

The CCAE building also has public design review spaces, an atrium exhibition facility and a Board Room for meetings. There is an architectural library in the nearby MTU School of Music. The CCAE building was designed by JCA Architects in Cork, who had a special insight into the operation of the Centre as they employ senior architects who teach in CCAE, as well as graduates of the Centre.

Due to Covid-19, the Panel was unable to view the facilities in person but was provided with a visual tour. The Panel was impressed with the new building and agreed with CCAE's assessment that it will help attract students in the future and facilitate a wider role for CCAE in increasing social engagement with the citizens of Cork.

Part 2 – Findings of the Panel

2.1 CCAE Overview

The Panel was impressed with CCAE's committed staff and student body. The new building has generated a sense of pride and community and will enable CCAE to further enhance and develop both its programmes and community over time.

CCAE has a home in two universities. While this dual identity, and CCAE's city centre campus, can impact on students' sense of belonging to either university, it was clear to the Panel that students feel a strong sense of belonging to CCAE in its own right and that this should be harnessed and developed. The Panel have made a number of recommendations to enhance student responsibility in particular and capitalise on the benefits of CCAE's unique city centre location, thereby further enhancing a sense of belonging which ultimately benefits both CCAE and its students.

CCAE is in the unique position of being able to draw upon and leverage the expertise and talent available in both universities. The Panel recommended that CCAE works to ensure that it is leveraging such benefits and develop its connections in both universities through interdisciplinarity in particular. The Panel commended the staff of CCAE on their collegiality and flexibility despite the inherent frustrations and difficulties associated with the collaboration of staff from different institutions. Staff displayed commendable loyalty and commitment to the discipline of Architecture, and an obvious pride in what they have built together in CCAE.

While CCAE has a Mission Statement that is appropriate and useful, it was apparent to the Panel that CCAE needs to develop a Strategic Plan as a matter of priority. It was clear to the Panel that staff are drawing on best practice and collaborating effectively between institutions, however, there are many opportunities open to CCAE that cannot be pursued due to current resource limitations. A Strategic Plan would help to harness the existing commitment and talent in a focused and prioritised way. The Mission Statement should be enlarged and expanded upon and should form the starting point for the development of a strategy. CCAE requires a strategy to ensure the implementation of many of the ideas explored with the Panel which need to be prioritised and implemented in a coherent and timed fashion. Many of the actions will need to be worked into a business plan with costed priorities to access the requisite resources.

Part-time lecturers form a vital part of CCAE and ensure that connections with local architectural practices remain strong, however, the balance between part-time and full-time staffing needs to be addressed. The Panel acknowledged the unsustainable administrative burden that falls on the small

cohort of full-time staff as a result of this staffing profile. The Strategic Plan should have an accompanying Staffing Plan, linked to the Business Plan, to address the issue of part-time hours and develop a strategy for staffing that will ensure the continued development of CCAE.

2.2 Commendations

In an ethos of quality enhancement, whereby good practice is acknowledged and disseminated, the Panel notes the following areas for commendation:

- Committed staff delivering high quality education and administration.
- Excellent collegiality among staff.
- Strong sense of allegiance and identity among staff and students to CCAE.
- Very positive and engaged alumni and wider community/practitioners.
- Design and use of the new building.
- Strong community engagement.
- Response to Covid-19 – staff have worked hard to minimise the impact on students, for example, keeping the studio open as long as possible and developing a 'buddy system' in the MArch.
- The innovative and inspired MArch.
- Engaged and committed student body.
- Honest and open engagement with the review processes.

2.3 Recommendations

The Panel have formulated the following recommendations with the aim of enhancing culture, core identity and sustainability for CCAE.

Strategy and Governance

- The Panel recommended that CCAE develops a **Strategic Plan**. The Strategic Plan should be developed as a matter of priority, ideally within 6 months of receipt of the final Panel Report.

  The CCAE mission statement should form the basis of the strategy. The Strategic Plan should articulate CCAE **Core Values**, **Vision**, **Unique Selling Points (USPs)**, and articulate plans with prioritised actions in key areas including **research**, **programme development, student experience, external engagement and communication.**

  The following should be undertaken as part of the development of a CCAE Strategic Plan:
  - Consult with *students*.
  - Conduct a *benchmarking exercise*. This benchmarking exercise is vital for the development of a strategy that differentiates CCAE from other providers of architectural education.
  - Develop a supporting *Business Plan* to cost out actions and identify other sources of income, for example, non-EU students, HCI, National Forum, July Stimulus, and any additional national funding mechanisms for CPD.

- Develop a supporting *Staffing Plan* to underpin actions (this may include some of the following: outlining the academic & administrative needs to fulfil these actions, bundling some part-time contracts into full-time contracts, diversifying part-time panel to meet changing requirements, use of students as demonstrators and staff development supports).
- Constitute an *External Advisory Board* to provide a regular systematic means of engagement with different branches of the academia and the profession in Ireland, Europe and beyond. The External Advisory Board would be a source of advice on strategy and developments in the profession.

Facilities
- The Panel recommended that CCAE engage with both universities via the Joint Board regarding the need for additional IT support. IT support is a matter of critical importance for CCAE and this recommendation should be implemented as a matter of priority.

- The Panel recommended that CCAE consider maximizing income generating opportunities presented by the new building.

Programme Development
- The Panel recommended that CCAE consider the appointment of a *Director of Learning and Teaching* to provide overall leadership in that field, take forward new programme offerings and ensure the management, review and development of existing programmes; as well as to lead in the scholarship of teaching, learning and assessment in architectural education. This would relieve the Director and Co-Director and allow them to address staffing, overall strategy and external engagement.

- The Panel recommended further promotion of the existing MArch to a wider audience and in particular, to existing final year students annually in a timely and coordinated fashion.

- The Panel recommended that CCAE develop a new Masters programme. The Panel supported CCAE plans to introduce a new programme and having reviewed the proposals provided, the Panel had a strong preference for *Immersive Environments* which appeared to be a viable and innovative programme with great potential.

- The Panel recommended that CCAE widen collaboration within both universities. The Panel encouraged exploration of interdisciplinary linkages in existing curriculum with appropriate units and disciplines such as ERI, Engineering and Crawford College of Art and Design and the existing entrepreneurship and innovation ecosystems in MTU and UCC.

Student Experience
- The Panel recommended that CCAE ensure that students have access to necessary software using the most practical and cost-effective solutions. The Panel was aware that current conditions are not normal, but CCAE must ensure that students are not financially impacted by having to procure software licenses during the Covid-19 period.

- The Panel recommended that CCAE enhance student responsibility and sense of belonging in a number of ways:

- Build upon the partnership with the student Architecture Society. CCAE should continue to include a member of the Architecture Society on the Staff-Student Committee and broaden the agenda to include partnership issues. The partnership could consider ideas such as 'buddy systems' and career events organised by students.
- Student representatives should continue to be included as often as possible in CCAE meetings and committees. The Panel recommended that CCAE work to enhance and formalise student communication routes to ensure that student concerns are addressed at all levels. CCAE should also ensure that student representatives are closing the communication loop and feeding back information from the meetings to the wider student body.
- Explore the potential use of student demonstrators.

Staffing

- The Panel recommended that the current vacant staff post is advertised as a matter of priority. The Panel recommended that CCAE review the current vacancy with a view to upgrading it to Senior Lecturer if possible, in order to dovetail with the recommendation on creating a Director of Learning and Teaching.

- The Panel recommended that regular part-time staff meetings take place, at least once a semester to enhance part-time staff engagement with CCAE.

External engagement

- The Panel recommended that CCAE harness the potential of their positive and willing alumni and consider the development of a Lifelong Learning Strategy. Alumni are a potential source of philanthropy, work placements, mentoring and career advice for students. The Panel recommended that CCAE consider setting up an alumni group and explore opportunities with Alumni and Development Offices in both institutions to secure support.

- The Panel recommended that CCAE build on its current engagements with local community and develop and enhance existing linkages, in particular with their neighbour Nano Nagle Place.

- The Panel recommended that CCAE intensify its network of international bodies including ARENA, EAAE and Erasmus Partners.

2.4   Observations to UCC and MTU (via the Joint Board)

- It was apparent to the Panel that CCAE has an urgent need for increased IT support. The Panel was aware that some support is provided by UCC at present but encouraged both universities to work together via the Joint Board to resolve this issue. IT support is a matter of critical importance for CCAE and this recommendation needs to be addressed as a matter of priority.

- It was clear to the Panel that there was a communication disconnect between CCAE and the Joint Board. The Panel requested that the Joint Board consider current communication pathways; ensuring that a representative from each programme has a presence on the Joint Board would be one possible solution.

- The Panel requested that the Joint Board consider the access rights of current UCC PhD students to MTU facilities as a matter of priority. UCC PhD students cannot currently access the Architecture Library in the MTU School of Music.

- The Panel requested that the Joint Board support the upgrading of the current academic staff vacancy and ensure that the vacancy is progressed swiftly.

Appendix A – Panel Profiles

Professor Dr Oya Atalay Franck Zurich University of Applied Sciences	Professor Dr Oya Atalay Franck is an architect, architectural historian and educator. She is the Dean of the School of Architecture, Design and Civil Engineering in Winterthur, at ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences of Switzerland. She acts as an expert in various scientific bodies, such as the Swiss National Foundation of Research (SNF), Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT), the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO), as well as in peer review committees and in quality audits. She is the President of EAAE, European Association for Architectural Education and a founding member of ARENA, Architectural Research European Network Association.
Dr Roberto Cavallo Delft University of Technology	Dr Roberto Cavallo is an associate professor at the Department of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture & the Built Environment of the Delft University of Technology. Since 1996 he has taught and researched at the Delft University of Technology where he has been vice dean of education between 2014-2019. He chairs the section of Theory & Territory as well as the group Architectural Design Crossovers and is a member of the Department of Architecture Research Steering Team. Educated as an architect at the schools of architecture of Naples (IT) and Delft (NL), he successfully rounded up his Ph.D. in 2008 at the Delft University of Technology. After his MSc graduation in 1991, he worked for the offices of Cees Dam & Partners (Amsterdam) and Studio di Architettura (Amsterdam) where he became a partner in 1996. As a practitioner, he has been in charge of several projects and he collaborated with the office of Aldo Rossi for the realization of his Dutch projects (among others, Bonnefantenmuseum in Maastricht and Slachthuisterrein in The Hague). In 1999 he co-founded the office Studio-AI in Amsterdam. He is a council member of the EAAE (European Association of Architectural Education), member of the Architectural Research Network ARENA and editor of AJAR, Arena Journal of Architectural Research. Since 2013 he collaborates as a Built Environment expert at the European Commission, advising and assessing EU projects (a.o. Horizon 2020). In 2019 he has been appointed as an expert for the Dutch Architects Registration Bureau. On behalf of the Faculty / Department of Architecture, he has been leading several education and research activities as well as initiatives in The Netherlands and abroad. His particular research expertise is about the interactions between infrastructures and cities in relation to urban transformations. In 2013 he worked as visiting professor at the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences (SASS), Centre for Urban and Regional Studies (CURS), at the Faculty of Architecture of Hong Kong University (HKU), and in 2014 at the College of Architecture & Urban Planning (CAUP) of the Beijing Technical University (BJUT). Currently, he is visiting professor at the Department of Architecture and Urban Studies, Polytechnic University of Milan. He has extensive experience in organizing and coordinating international

	workshops, symposia, and conferences and is often a member of scientific committees in international academic events in The Netherlands and abroad. His various scientific publications are ranging from the urban to the architectural project.
Ms Sheila Kelleher University College Cork	Ms Sheila Marie Kelleher is a postgraduate student in the Cork University Business School, UCC. She is currently studying a master's degree in Co-operatives, Agri-Food and Sustainable Development. She completed her undergraduate studies in the College of Arts, studying Social Science. Ms Kelleher has played an active role in UCC's extra-curricular roles. She is currently the Secretary of the Societies Executive and the representative for Political & Activism Societies and has played a key role in adapting society events to adhere to Covid-19 restrictions and Health & Safety guidelines. Ms Kelleher has been involved with the 'Macra na Feirme' Society since starting her undergraduate degree and has held several positions on their committee, including Chairperson, Secretary and Events Officer. She has also volunteered with the University's Peer Support programme and Nightline, a confidential listening service for students. Thanks to these experiences Ms Kelleher has gained valuable insights into student needs, both academic and non-academic, which will make her contribution unique and assist her in performing the role of Student Reviewer for the Quality Review.
Dr Breda Kenny Munster Technological University Cork	Dr Breda Kenny, BBS, MMII Grad, MBS, PhD, (2009) is Head of School of Business at Munster Technological University Cork, Ireland. She is responsible for the effective general management of the School and its constituent departments. She was the former Head of the Hincks Centre for Entrepreneurship Excellence and has over 25 years lecturing, and research experience in entrepreneurship and international business. Breda has led and project managed several EU funded programmes under Interreg NPA, Interreg Europe, Erasmus Plus, Daphne and Leonardo da Vinci in the areas of entrepreneurship education, business development, regional innovation strategies, senior and female entrepreneurship. She is involved in research supervision and external examining to PhD level. She is Editor in Chief of the International Journal – Small Enterprise Research. She has published in international peer reviewed journals such as R & D Management, International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, Industry & Higher Education, The Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development and Small Enterprise Research. At a European level, Breda was an elected member of the board of the European Council for Small Business and Entrepreneurship (ECSB) from 2013 – 2019 with responsibility for collaboration and industry engagement. From 2018 - 2020, she was appointed as external expert evaluator and rapporteur for the European Institute of Innovation & Technology (EIT). In 2019, Breda was appointed by the European Commission as an Evaluator for the H2020-SwafS-2019-1 single submission call. In Ireland, Breda is a Chair of the Campus Enterprise & Entrepreneurship Network (CEEN)

	Initiative. On industry experience, Breda is co-founder and director of Surecom NS Ltd, and director of the Rubicon Innovation and Incubation Centre.
Mr Nuttawud (Zack) Nutchanat Munster Technological University Cork	Mr Nuttawud Nutchanat is a postgraduate student studying a Masters in Human Resource Management. He completed his bachelor's degree in Business Administration. Mr Nutchanat is currently the Vice President of Education at MTU Cork Students' Union, following from his previous roles as Students' Union Representative to the Academic Council and class representative. Throughout his studies, he has had an active role in the LGBT* Society, acting as Vice Chairperson and Secretary. He has held many roles as part of ENACTUS, including Project Manager, Chief Financial Officer & Team Leader. He also represented MTU at the Board of Irish College Societies (BICS) as the Networking and College Representative. He served as a delegate for MTU in the European Youth Event (EYE), Union of Students in Ireland (USI) and Pink Training which is the largest LGBT student training event in Europe. Mr Nutchanat has gained a valuable perspective through his numerous roles and looks forward to acting as a Student Reviewer on this panel.
Professor Mark Poustie (Chair) University College Cork	Professor Mark Poustie was appointed as Dean of UCC School of Law from 1 May 2019. Prior to that he served as a Thousand Talents Scholar at Shanghai University of Finance and Economics Law School from 1 September 2016. He previously worked at the University of Strathclyde Law School, Glasgow, Scotland, UK from 1992, serving as Head of School from 2007-2013 and thereafter as Vice-Dean (Internationalisation) for the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences from 2013-2015. Professor Poustie remains an Honorary Scholar at Strathclyde. He also qualified as a solicitor in Scotland in 1993 and served as a linguist for the UK Government in 1986-87. Professor Poustie has extensive experience teaching and researching area in the environmental and land use planning law fields at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. He has published many books and articles in these fields. He has to date supervised six PhDs successfully to completion. Professor Poustie has also conducted funded research for and served in an advisory capacity to government bodies, notably the UK Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, the former Scottish Executive, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency and the Environment Agency. He was invited by the Scottish Government to convene a Working Group reviewing the penalties imposed for wildlife crime and he authored the Group's report (November 2015).

Ms Tina Saaby Gladsaxe, Denmark	Ms Tina Saaby is City Architect of Gladsaxe, Denmark and was the Chief City Architect of Copenhagen from 2010 – 2018. She was Partner at WITRAZ architects, during which time, she strengthened the company's architectural profile, and held a key role in creating a holistic image surrounding the projects that they were involved in. The company's focus was to contribute with a position to society and a broad image of the fact that the built environment should have a focus on both buildings, urban spaces as well as citizens. Ms Saaby is currently a board member of the International Theatre of Copenhagen, at 'LOA, Lokale- og anlægsfonden' (Danish Foundation for Culture and Sports Facilities) and 'Holbæk Kunsthøjskole' (Folk Art School), which is a self-governing and independent institution. Ms Saaby is also on the Advisory board for Helsinki University and government. Through this role, she has acquired knowledge and understanding of the relationship between theory and practice. Ms Saaby served as Chair from 2013 – 2020 on the recruitment panel for the School of Architecture, Design and Conservation at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, where she has also been a Member of the Society of Artists since 2010. She served on the Committee of representatives for the Danish Town Planning Institute from 2010 – 2019. In 2018, she was made an honorary member of the UK's Academy of Urbanism, and in 2019, to the Association of German Architects, (BDA). She has held numerous positions as architectural judge and continues to act as an external examiner. She is also an educator of young architects with the Danish Association of Architects and coaches them on urban planning, regulatory matters and communication.
In attendance from the Quality Enhancement Unit	
Ms Deirdre O'Brien *(Review Coordinator)*	Deirdre O'Brien works as Administrative Officer in the Quality Enhancement Unit where she manages projects such as the institutional Research Quality Review and the Annual Quality Report to QQI. Deirdre started her in career in third level in the Faculty of Arts Office in University College Dublin, progressing to Programme Manager for the BA Degree before moving to work in UCC. She graduated with a BA from UCC in 1997, followed by a Postgraduate Diploma in Heritage Management (UCC).
Ms Marie O'Regan *(IT and Logistics Coordinator)*	Ms Marie O'Regan is an Executive Assistant in the Quality Enhancement Unit. Marie worked in Health Insurance for several years and completed APA (Accredited Product Adviser) and CIP (Certified Insurance Practitioner) exams during this time. She studied at UCC, completing a BA, in Geography and Psychology. Her interests include environmental sustainability and she is the Secretary and Social Media Officer of the newly formed committee, 'Inchydoney Dunes Conservation Group', which aims to conserve the sand dunes, protect their rich biodiversity and preserve them as an amenity for the community and wider public.

Appendix B – Peer Review Panel Remote Site Visit Timetable

Tuesday 23 February 2021	
16.00 – 16.30	Briefing meeting for the Chair with Review Co-ordinator, UCC.
Wednesday 24 February 2021	
11.00 – 13.00	Briefing/Planning meeting for the Panel with: Acting Dean of Graduates Studies, MTU Director of Quality, UCC Review Co-ordinator, UCC IT and Logistics Co-ordinator, UCC

Wednesday 3 March 2021	
09.00 – 09.45	Convening of Panel members – preparation for day ahead
09.45 – 09.55	Greeting from President UCC and President, MTU
09.55 – 10.15	Break for Panel Members
10.15 – 11.30	Meeting with Director, CCAE and Head, Department of Architecture, MTU (to be joined by the Senior Administrator, CCAE, at 11.10) *Discussion regarding developments to date, strategic priorities of CCAE and overview of educational provision.*
11.30 – 12.00	Break for Panel members
12.00 – 12.45	Meeting with: Head, College of Science Engineering & Food Science, UCC Head, School of Building & Civil Engineering, MTU Head of Faculty, Faculty of Engineering and Science, MTU Head, School of Engineering & Architecture, UCC (to be joined by College Financial Analyst, UCC, and Senior Management Accountant, MTU, at 12.30) *Panel discuss strategy and priorities, financial resource allocations process, staffing resources and infrastructure.*
12.45 – 14.00	Break for Panel members
14.00 – 14.30	Meeting with Senior Officers

	Acting Dean of Graduate Studies, MTU Vice President for External Affairs, MTU Vice President for Learning & Teaching, UCC Director of Research Support Services UCC *(deputising for Vice President for Research and Innovation, UCC)* Head of Research, MTU
14.30 – 15.00	Meeting with MTU/UCC Joint Board Acting Dean of Graduate Studies, MTU Head, College of Science Engineering & Food Science, UCC Senior Management Accountant, MTU Student Union Education Officer of UCC Head, School of Building & Civil Engineering, MTU Acting Registrar and Vice President for Academic Affairs, MTU Head of Biological Sciences, MTU Academic Secretary & Assistant Registrar Dean of Graduate Studies, UCC
15.00 – 15.30	Wrap-up meeting

Thursday 4 March 2021	
09.30 – 10.00	Convening of the Panel – preparation for the day ahead
10.00 – 10.30	Meeting with Interim Deputy President & Registrar, UCC and Acting Registrar and Vice President for Academic Affairs, MTU *Discussion of UCC and MTU's Strategic Plans and Academic Strategy*
10.30 – 11.00	Meeting with Education Director, RIAI
11.00 – 11.30	Break for Panel members
11.30 – 12.15	Meeting with undergraduate students: Architecture (1st Year) Architecture (3rd Year) – 2 x student representatives Architecture (4th Year) – 2 x student representatives
12.15 – 13.00	Meeting with postgraduate students: MA in Architecture (5th Year) – 5 x student representatives PhD in Architecture (3rd Year) –2 x student representatives
13.00 – 14.15	Break for Panel members

14.15 – 15.00	Meeting with external stakeholders Former graduate, O'Mahony Pike Architects Director, Henry J Lyons, Cork Chief Executive, Nano Nagle Place, Cork City Architect, Cork Former graduate Former graduate, McCullough Mulvin Architects Senior Architect Cork County Council
15.00 – 15.30	Wrap-up meeting

Tuesday 9 March 2021	
10.00 – 10.30	Convening of the Panel – preparation for the day ahead
10.30 – 11.40	Meetings with CCAE Staff 10.30 - 10.40 Chair's address and Panel's introduction to all staff 10.40 - 11.30 Group discussion (in max of 3 break-out rooms in MS Teams): - What is working well in CCAE? - What has potential? What should be improving? - What is the one thing that needs to change? 11.30 - 11.40 Conclusion and close of meeting by the Chair
11.40 – 12.15	Break for Panel members
12.15 – 13.15	Meeting with Programme Directors/Chairs of Boards of Studies Chair of Board of Studies BSc Coordinator Director, M.Arch Programme *Discussion on monitoring and review of programmes to include indicatively, programme & module approval processes, student progression, External Examiner reports, external accreditation/recognition (where appropriate), supports for learners, placement (where appropriate) and, implementation of Academic Strategy.*
13.15 – 14.30	Break for Panel members
14.30 – 15.15	Enhancing Student Learning Experience, topics include: Local Authority and Tenant group engagement Fostering Studio Culture in times of social distancing Alternative to lectures & Exams: Assessment 'for' and 'as' Learning Integrating Design Studio & Technology Teaching & Learning Staff-student collaboration in design & build Enhancing student experience on the M.Arch Introducing new digital resources and methodologies *Opportunity for CCAE to showcase good practice and enhancements to the student*

	learning experience.
15.15 – 15.45	Wrap-up meeting

Wednesday 10 March 2021	
10.00 – 11.30	Panel meeting to draft the report recommendations and commendations
11.30 – 12.00	Break for Panel members
12.00 – 12.30	Meeting with Director, CCAE and Head, Department of Architecture, MTU
12.30 – 13.15	Panel meeting to draft the report recommendations and commendations
13.15 – 14.30	Break for Panel members
14.30 – 15.30	Panel meeting to draft the report recommendations and commendations

Thursday 11 March 2021	
10.00 – 10.30	Convening of the Panel – preparation for day ahead
10.30 – 11.15	Meeting with Director, CCAE and Head, Department of Architecture, MTU *Clarification and discussions of main findings by Panel*
11.15 – 11.45	Break for Panel members
11.45 – 13.30	Panel meeting to finalise drafting the report recommendations and commendations/ formulate closing presentation
13.30 – 14.30	Break for Panel members
14.30 – 15.00	Panel meeting to formulate closing presentation
15.00 – 15.30	Closing Presentation *Closing presentation to all staff, to be made by the Chair or other member(s) of Panel as agreed, summarising the principal findings of the Panel. This presentation is <u>not</u> for discussion at this time.*
15.30 – 15.45	Final meeting / wrap-up