UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK

QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY ENHANCEMENT

THEMATIC REVIEW OF ACADEMIC DECISION-MAKING IN UCC

PEER REVIEW PANEL REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR 2018-19

OCTOBER 2018

Context and Scope of Thematic Review

The University has a system of shared governance made up of Governing Body (GB), Academic Council (AC) and the University Management Team (UMTO/UMTS). The role and authority of the Governing Body and of Academic Council are set out in the Universities Act of 1997 and in the University's Principal Statute.

Academic Council is the primary internal body responsible for academic affairs and derives its authority from the Universities Act, 1997 (SI24), Chapter V, §27 and Principal Statute. The term 'academic affairs' is broadly defined to include programmes of study; structures; teaching and learning; research; advancement and dissemination of knowledge; selection, admission, retention and exclusion of students; student discipline; the conduct of examinations, and the awarding of fellowships, bursaries and prizes.

The University is grouped into four Colleges. Each College is further subdivided into Schools/ Departments and has a governance structure and set of rules in a format prescribed by Principal Statute and approved through GB, AC and UMTO. According to Principal Statute, each College's academic responsibilities are owed to Academic Council. Activity in the area of academic decision-making also takes place in ACE, the IMI and with linked and collaborative providers (e.g. CIT joint programmes; TPI Ltd).

The landscape for academic decision-making is complex in breadth and scope and is perceived to have become overcomplicated. This complexity has emerged organically over time in response to the continued growth and evolution of the University. The Academic Strategy (2018-2022) for UCC, centred on the concept of a Connected Curriculum identified a review of the current academic decision-making structures, policies and processes as a key enabling activity to support achievement of strategic objectives for, teaching, learning, research and engagement. The objectives of this review should serve to enable academic innovation supported by institutionally coherent and effective frameworks for academic decision-making, and associated policy implementation approaches.

The University Quality Enhancement Committee approved in May 2018 a proposal for a thematic review of academic decision-making. A thematic approach was chosen to enable a holistic review at multiple levels: University, College, Adult & Continuing Education and School levels. It was agreed that the conduct of the review would be guided by the principle of subsidiarity to ensure appropriate governance; clarify roles and responsibilities, and streamline procedures. It would also consider the applicability of good practice from other comparable institutions.

A review team of senior national and international experts was appointed as detailed at Appendix 1 and the methodology for review followed the accepted model as defined by the European Standards Guidelines, which included
- Documentary submission
- External review by nominated peers
- Site visit
- Report publication and action planning

Thematic Review of Academic Decision-Making in UCC – Panel Report

Background

University College Cork has a long-standing commitment to outstanding research which is connected to learning, and to educating graduates who are locally and globally impactful. The university's Academic Strategy 2018–2022 sets out a range of priorities and actions designed to deliver an outstanding, student-centred teaching and learning experience, with a renewed, responsive and research-based curriculum at its core.

To achieve its goals, the university needs to ensure that appropriate policies and frameworks are in place to enable academic innovation. In its Academic Strategy 2018–2022 UCC specifies that reviewing and reforming academic decision-making is an important priority for the university.

In October 2018 a review panel visited University College Cork to assess the process of academic decision-making and the conduct of academic business within the university. The members of the review panel are listed in Appendix I. The review panel spoke with many staff and students involved in different stages of the academic decision-making process (see Appendix II). The review panel was provided with a Self-Assessment Report completed by the Offices of Academic Affairs & Registry, a staff survey on academic-decision making and a large volume of background documentation (see Appendix III).

The purpose of the review was to assess academic decision-making and the conduct of academic business at University, College, and School levels to ensure appropriate assurance and governance, and clarify roles and responsibilities, and streamline procedures. The self-assessment report listed a number of questions UCC wished the review panel to consider. The review panel focused on the question as to whether the University's organizational and decision-making structure is optimised for transparent academic policy making and the transaction of academic business, in other words whether it is effective and under sufficient control.

The members of the review panel were impressed by the open discussions in each of the sessions, and by the commitment and dedication of staff and students. The panel was also struck by the broad consensus within the university community that the current system of academic decision-making is cumbersome and inefficient, despite the best efforts of all involved. The university seems to be at a pivotal time in its history, with many members of the community committed to modernising the academic governance system within the university, to increase levels of transparency, accountability and effectiveness.

The findings of the review panel are presented in the body of this report. Observations and recommendations which have been grouped under four key headings are based both on the documentation studied and on dialogue with staff and students. The recommendations have been framed in such a way as to indicate a way forward for UCC, rather than be unduly prescriptive in their level of detail. The review panel (or a nominee thereof) are willing to engage with the University through the Quality Enhancement Committee as appropriate, should the basis for or intent of any of the recommendations that follow require further clarification or contextualisation.

Observations

While the main focus of this review was on identifying opportunities for quality enhancement, it is important to reflect the review panels finding that the overarching culture, custom and practice at UCC are widely seen as collegiate, inclusive and building upon strong foundations. The observations that follow are grouped under four key headings to assist the reader in understanding the rationale for the recommendations that follow in the next section of this report.

1. **Decision-making models**

There is an almost universally held view that academic decision-making structures at UCC are complex and time-consuming, meaning that it can take an inordinately long time for academic decisions to be taken and for policies to be finalised and put in place. Concerns were raised that the cumbersome decision-making process can prevent the university from being agile enough to respond to opportunities, e.g. in relation to responding to external tenders for programme offerings, or conducting business efficiently, e.g. responding to student applications quickly enough.

The sheer number of committees and other groups meeting across UCC was a common theme arising in meetings with staff and students. Duplication of these complex structures at University and College level can lead to many staff and student representatives seeing the same policy papers multiple times in various settings.

Concern was expressed regarding the extent of scrutiny at higher levels (mostly Academic Council) of issues previously well considered by expert sub-committees as well as instances of decisions being re-visited without reasonable grounds. The volume of routine business undertaken impinges upon Academic Council's ability to focus on strategic matters of interest to the academic community.

Both Governing Body and Academic Council appear to operate largely on the basis of consensus, with votes at either body reportedly extremely rare. This is however perceived by some staff to reflect a fear of making final decisions, manifested in decisions being delayed or referred back to another committee for re-consideration.

Several interlocutors reported a disconnect between academic decisions and resource allocation decisions. Some reported a lack of expertise in considering the resource implications of academic decisions, others were concerned that it simply was not clear whether or not resource implications were considered early enough in the decision-making process.

Some staff believe that there is a lack of transparency in the decision-making process and in particular in the appointment of committee chairs. There seems to be a blurring of the lines between consultation and decision-making, which may contribute to a perceived lack of trust.

A widely-reported concern was inconsistency in the recording and dissemination of decisions or policies, as well as significant delays in decisions or minutes of meetings being made available after meetings. This may simply be a result of the sheer volume of business currently conducted, combined with a lack of clarity as to when decisions become final.

While there have been previous attempts at devolution of responsibilities, specifically to Colleges, this is not generally perceived to have succeeded. Some have indicated that the process was not properly resourced or supported and that there was insufficient guidance as to how devolution was intended to operate. There is a widely-held view that operational matters relating to curriculum planning and delivery should be devolved to School level, with principle-level frameworks defined at university level.

There was wide agreement that College Councils are not working as they ought to, witnessed by very low attendances and a lack of engagement in particular by academic staff.

Despite broad levels of engagement with the quality review process, the review panel did note a certain level of disengagement from a number of staff who failed to attend scheduled meetings with the panel, some but not all of whom sent their apologies to the Quality Enhancement Unit at the last minute.

2. Institutional culture

The University's Strategic Plan for 2017-22 articulates as a goal the desire to 'implement an academic strategy to deliver an outstanding, student-centred teaching and learning experience…'. It is clear that the university is strongly committed to putting students at the centre of its academic mission.

Students are well represented on committees across the university (with the exception of UMTO) and are viewed as valued participants, although examples were cited where on occasion the attitudes of staff towards student representatives may be perceived as patronising or tokenistic. Equally there are 'student champions' in committee meetings who are supportive of and see the value of student engagement.

Indications are that there is a very positive relationship between the current leadership of the student union and university senior management, although the impression gained by the panel is that this relationship might be vulnerable to changes in personnel on either side of the equation. Some instances of a lack of consultation with student representatives over decisions which would significantly impact the student body, plus instances of decisions being announced by the university during the 'crossover' period between student union sabbatical officers might give the impression that students are not yet seen as full members of the university community.

There is a recognition in many quarters that UCC is emerging from a very difficult period for the Irish HE sector, particularly in relation to public funding and severe external restrictions on staff recruitment. This has led to increased emphasis on activities which generate income, perhaps to the detriment of resources for academic activities and some administrative and policy functions. Some also perceive an increase in 'managerialism' and/or in layers of governance and concomitant paperwork.

We note elsewhere in this report the commitment and a feeling of ownership towards UCC of all the staff and students we met, as well as the generally collegial atmosphere. However, there is a perceptible division between academic staff and professional services staff. In some instances, this is simply a difference in perspective or priority, but in other instances there seems to be a lack of partnership or mutual respect. The former issue can be addressed by better communication of the underpinning institutional strategy, so that different categories of staff have a better appreciation of their respective roles but also of the implications that their decisions or practices have for their colleagues. The latter aspect is more difficult to address, but at a minimum we believe that it is important for university leadership to take steps to foster a culture of mutual respect between academic staff and professional services staff, as well as a better understanding of how their respective roles contribute to achievement of the University strategy. The core mission of the University requires the combined energy of each member of its community to ensure success.

It was reported that the university has invested significantly in recent years in staff development and training particularly in relation to corporate business areas such as budgeting, performance review, health and safety, but perhaps less so on developing and embedding academic leadership models. This gap manifests at a number of levels in the academic decision-making process.

Concern was widely expressed about the varying capacity of committee members and chairs to effectively discharge their responsibilities, arising from a lack of role-specific training other than for members of the Governing Body. A commonly reported issue is that the role of committee membership seems to be unclear, such that staff with apparently representative roles do not necessarily understand or accept this aspect of their role. This is reflected in widely expressed concerns that members of committees often do not report back and/or consult with their colleagues between meetings.

Although academic staffing and promotion issues are explicitly beyond the remit of this review, it is worth reporting that several staff suggested that the promotion system seems to have had unintended and negative consequences for committee engagement. Several staff suggested that some colleagues volunteer for committees in order to demonstrate 'engagement', not necessarily out of interest in the work of the committee. The review panel notes however the dedication and commitment of the three Academic Council committee chairs whom we met and the sterling work that they undertake in the absence of effective decision-making structures or any apparent incentive or reward, beyond demonstrating their commitment to the University.

The issue of trust was raised a number of times by staff, albeit from differing perspectives. In respect of the role of representatives on academic committees, it was reported that some staff do not believe an individual can represent the view of a whole College.

In the context of academic business, while managers felt that it was important to trust people with their responsibilities and allow them do their jobs, some academic staff reported a culture of micro-management which, combined with the fact that policies or other documents are often checked at several levels, could lead to what one contributor described as 'infantilising' staff.

Trust in institutional systems and policies may also be an issue, to the extent that it was reported on more than one occasion that staff sometimes circumvent the proper channels for decision-making out of frustration with its inflexibility and inefficiency. This can leave colleagues, often professional services staff, in a difficult position, either having to 'say no' to an initiative, or then having to undertake considerable remedial work to allow something to move forward.

3. Policy development and implementation

A range of concerns were raised in meetings and in responses to the questionnaire issued as part of this review, regarding the processes and capacity for policy development within the university as well as aspects of implementation of policy.

The issue of ownership of policies was raised by several staff. One concern is that ownership of a policy is seen to lie with the committee where the policy originated, which, given reported variation in approach and styles of different committees can mean that policies lack consistency of format or scope. On the other hand, we heard from other sources that there is generally no single owner of a policy, in the sense of having responsibility for driving it forward or for ensuring its implementation.

Unsurprisingly, given the widely-expressed reservations about the inordinate time taken in some instances to develop university policy, concern was also expressed about the fact that, despite wide and lengthy consultation across the institution, a policy might then be rejected by a College or School and not implemented university-wide.

Reported skills gaps suggest a lack of policy development capacity within the university. There is a general sense that there needs to be greater investment in and training of a professional secretariat unit to co-ordinate and support this function.

4. Information Systems

The current student management information system is widely seen as less than fit for purpose, in terms of its functionality and restrictions on access to information. There is a general sense of the urgent need to upgrade technology systems within the university. UCC is in the process of replacing its current virtual learning environment (Blackboard) with a more up-to-date system (Canvas). This has been widely welcomed and there is a wide expectation that this replacement will make a significant improvement in terms of the student learning experience.

The common concern regarding communication of information and the difficulty of finding current versions of policies, latest decisions, etc., is being addressed via the proposal to create a single policy portal, which could be regarded as a 'one-stop shop' for policy information within UCC. Again, this proposal seems very welcome to staff and students and there will be significant expectations of this development.

Recommendations

Having reflected on the meetings held with staff and students and the documents reviewed, drawing upon a breadth and depth of experience which is informed by national and international perspectives, the review panel has developed a set of recommendations which if translated into a corresponding set of actions should allow UCC to address the key issues and enable effective and efficient academic decision-making. For ease of reference, the recommendations are categorised below under the same four key headings used to describe our observations.

1. **Decision-making models**

- *Reconsider the role of Academic Council to ensure it has a more strategic focus*

    The review panel recommend that Academic Council review the types of decision it is spending time on, and map same to the functions as specified in the Universities Act 1997. Where academic business may more effectively be conducted through a subcommittee, Academic Council should delegate same with associated annual reporting obligations. Where academic business is strategic in nature, it should be retained by Academic Council.

- *The types of decision considered at university level should be to establish principles-based frameworks which allow flexible implementation at College or School level.*

    The review panel notes the current level of complexity, time and effort involved in academic decision-making and recommends that such detail is best delegated to local level (College/School). University level academic decision-making should focus on the establishment of principles-based frameworks (the University Policy Framework is a good example) which can then be translated at College Council/Executive Board level to meet local needs. Delegation of such decision-making authority should be mapped formally in advance of implementation, for example in the form of an academic authority schedule.

- *Clear structures should be put in place for Colleges or Schools to account to Academic Council for the exercise of delegated authority.*

    With delegation comes responsibility and accountability, and so any such devolved model while restoring local autonomy and removing duplication of effort at university level must be supported by a robust system of annual reporting, to ensure consistent application of University level frameworks and to provide a mechanism for identification of implementation challenges and/or any need to revisit decisions in light of unintended consequences or changes in the sectoral environment.

- *Reduce by around a half the number of committees, using a principles-based approach.*

    The review panel finds the UCC academic decision-making structures to be particularly complex and onerous, without any apparent sense from the community that the associated pain is worth the gain. The review panel recommend that Academic Council (through the Deputy President) undertake a principles-based review of academic decision-making structures at peer institutions and reflect on whether a considerably more streamlined model could be applied at UCC. This review should not be constrained by the academic decision-making structures currently in operation at UCC. At a minimum, the review panel recommend that university level committees be reduced by 50%, and that the mirroring of these structures at College level be abolished and replaced by leaner structures and effective representation on university level committees by College Council/Executive Board nominees.

- *Rationalise consultation process to become more inclusive and less rigid.*

The review panel commends the University's efforts to be wholly inclusive in its academic decision-making process, but notes that this practice has evolved over time into a fear of making final and binding decisions. To ensure that all voices are heard but also that all participants are clear on the final decision taken, the rationale for and the obligation to engage with and give effect to same, the review panel recommends that consultation be conducted through the use of more agile and inclusive fora. Good practice examples which may be built upon include town hall meetings and establishment of time limited task forces to undertake specific initiatives. Committees may then take decisions safe in the knowledge that proposals have already been through a robust consultation process which does not need to be re-visited.

2. **Institutional culture**

- *Ensure parity of esteem for all members of the university community (students, professional service staff, academic staff).*

The review panel noted that not all members of the university community were equally confident that their voice would be heard and their feedback on policy issues taken into account. The panel recommends that consultation takes place in such a way that all members of the community have the opportunity to comment on policy issues and have access to the (background) information required to do so. In particular, student union representatives need time to get acquainted with procedures and current state of affairs, and the university should avoid scheduling important decisions during the 'crossover' period. Further, the university should ensure that professional service staff with expertise of the practical consequences of policy measures under discussion are involved in the decision-making process and that their expertise is taken into account at the earliest possible stage. The university should ensure that such discussions take place in an atmosphere of mutual respect and open communication.

- *Invest in induction and training of staff (including academic leadership) and students involved in decision-making.*

Although some academics in leadership roles were offered training focussed on developing business skills, the review panel found that on the whole very little training was available to staff and students involved in different roles in the academic decision-making process. The panel recommends that all those involved in the academic decision-making process are appropriately trained for their roles. Training should include a clarification of what is expected of those involved in academic decision-making, an introduction to current UCC strategy and the considerations that led to adopting this strategy, as well as addressing important external developments driving UCC strategy.

- *Academic leaders should be prepared and equipped to bridge the gap between the university-level and the college or school level and to implement the principle-based frameworks to meet local need, and should be held accountable for same.*

Academic staff in senior management roles play a central position in the university, however an academic career may not fully prepare academics for all aspects of leadership roles. The review panel recommends that UCC initiates academic leadership training aimed at preparing academic staff for leadership roles, thereby making academic leaders more aware of what is expected of them and more effective as leaders. Training should differentiate between the different leadership roles within UCC and address understanding of UCC strategy, both short-term and long-term, understanding of important external developments driving UCC strategy and development of managerial skills.

- *Ensure that staff in representative and management roles are accountable for attending, participating and facilitating two-way communication.*

  The review panel recommends that all members of staff who participate in academic decision-making processes are made aware of the importance of their role. They should be aware that they are expected to represent the interests of their college or their school, which entails being well-informed on how proposed policy measures will affect their college or school. Council and sub-committee members should be held accountable for the way they fulfil that role, including through attendance, active participation and ensuring that information on policy decisions reaches those responsible for implementation.

3. Policy development and implementation

- *Each policy should be sponsored by a senior academic leader*

  The review panel recommends that all policy proposals have a designated sponsor who is a senior academic leader and also a member of the University Management Team. Policy sponsors are responsible for overseeing the drafting of policy proposals, for guiding proposals through the decision-making process, and for initiating policy implementation. Professional services staff in the relevant offices of University Management should be equipped to support this process through policy training initiatives and access to policy development and review toolkits.

- *Each policy should have an implementation plan, including a communications strategy which would depend on the scope and impact of the policy*

  The review panel recommends that every policy proposal is accompanied at approval stage by an implementation plan. The implementation plan should specify what resources are necessary, including HR and financial resources. Decision-making should include a decision on freeing up the resources necessary. Further, an implementation plan should include a communications strategy which differentiates between the different target audiences of the policy, such as professional services staff involved in the implementation, academic staff impacted by the policy, and students impacted by the policy. Policy should be reviewed on an agreed cycle, aligned to the requirements of the University Policy Framework.

4. Information systems

- *Portal for policies/information*

  The review panel notes and strongly endorses plans underway within the Academic Secretariat to develop a centralised portal for all university level policies. This repository should provide both a central repository for approved policy, so that the version in operation and its status is clear to all members of the university community. Consideration should be given to creating a one stop shop which provides toolkits for all users engaged in policy development and review. Such a portal should directly reference the Governing Body approved University Policy Framework developed by OCLA, with the two offices pooling resources to collaborate on its immediate roll out.

- *Access to management information, including student records*

  The review panel strongly endorses the University's plans to invest in a student record system, with associated reporting tools. UMTO should as a priority review existing data access

controls, and develop a data management hierarchy which ensures that all members of staff have access to the dataset required to effectively and efficiently implement academic business decisions. Roll out of the new system must be underpinned by training and ongoing support for all users, if it is to replace current work practices including creative but labour-intensive work around solutions.

Conclusion
The review panel wishes to express its gratitude to all members of the University community who engaged in the quality review process. Through your open and enthusiastic contribution, you afforded us the unique privilege of seeing the University through the eyes of its community. We were struck by the high levels of commitment and pride that exist at UCC, the genuine desire to strive towards quality enhancement through a shared understanding and collegiate partnership, and in this context, sincerely hope that our report will assist you in enhancing how academic decision-making operates into the future.

Appendix I - Members of Review Panel

ACADEMIC DECISION-MAKING

PANEL MEMBERS

Name	Position/Discipline	Institution
Dr Sinéad Critchley	Director of University Governance	University College Dublin
Mr Gerard Madill	International Education Consultant/Policy Advisor	Madill International Consulting (previously EUA/Universities Scotland)
Dr Esther Stiekema	Director of Policy	Utrecht University

Appendix II – Site Visit Timetable

Tuesday, 2 October 2018	
12.00 – 13.15	Arrival and convening of Panel members. Working lunch and outline briefing with Director of Quality Enhancement and Academic Secretary & Assistant Registrar *Briefing meeting on Review of Academic Decision-Making process and underpinning rationale*
13.15 – 14.15	Private meeting of Panel members *Panel agree issues to be explored in meetings with Academic Secretary and Head of Academic Secretariat Office and Staff*
14.15 – 14.45	Meeting with Academic Secretary & Assistant Registrar and Head of Academic Secretariat *Current Academic Council Committee organisation and analysis of decision-making, policy formulation, dissemination & review capacities*
15.00 – 15.45	Meeting with President of University College Cork and Chair of Academic Council *Welcome to University and introductory remarks on the function of the review*
15.45 - 16.30	Meeting with Deputy President and Registrar *Institutional context and developments in Academic Strategy and Curriculum*
16.30 – 17.00	Meeting with Corporate Secretary *Relationship of Academic Council to Governing Body current practices and opportunities for enhancement*
17.00 – 17.30	Private meeting of Panel members
19.00	Evening Meal

Wednesday, 3 October 2018	
09.00 – 10.00	Meeting with Heads of Functional Units in the Office of the Deputy President & Registrar Student Records and Examinations Office of Graduate Studies Academic Programmes and Regulations

	Systems Administration Admissions *Operational context and linkages between academic decision-making processes and key business processes from University level to Colleges and Schools*
10.00 – 10.30	Tea/coffee
10.30 – 11.15	Meeting with College Managers College Manager, College of Medicine and Health College Manager, College of Science, Engineering & Food Science College Manager, College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences *Operational context and linkages between academic decision-making processes and key business processes from Colleges/Schools to University level*
11.15 – 12.00	Meeting with School Managers Hospital & School Manager, Cork University Dental School & Hospital School Manager, School of Pharmacy School Manager, Cork University Business School School Manager, School of Applied Social Studies School Manager, School of Applied Psychology Manager, Department of Computer Science School Manager, School of Chemistry School Manager, School of Law *Operational context and linkages between academic decision-making processes and key business process from Schools to Colleges to University level*
12.00 – 12.45	Meeting with Heads of Schools Vice-Dean, School of Law Vice-Dean, Teaching and Learning, CUBS Head, School of Sociology, Philosophy, Criminology, Government and Politics Head, School of Nursing and Midwifery *Operational context and linkages between academic decision-making processes and key business process from Schools to University level*
12.45 – 13.45	Lunch
13.45 – 14.45	Meeting with Vice-Presidents/Senior Officers Research Officer, Office of Vice President for Research and Innovation Interim Vice President for Teaching and Learning Director of Library Services, Boole Library *Supporting strategy development and implementation and underpinning policy frameworks for Teaching & Learning, Research and Innovation*

14.45 – 15.45	Meeting with Chairs and selected Academic Council Committees Chair, Academic Development and Standards Committee Chair, E-Learning Chair, Exams Appeal Committee *Committee operations and impact: governance and policy processes in practice*
15.45 – 16.00	Private meeting of Panel
16.00 – 17.00	Meeting with Heads of Colleges Head, College of Business and Law Head, College of Medicine and Health Head, College of Arts, Celtic Studies and Social Studies *Balancing local autonomy with institutional accountabilities, optimising academic decision-making processes locally and any impacts on key business processes from Colleges/Schools to University level*
19.00	Working private dinner for members of the Panel to commence drafting the report.

Thursday, 4 October 2018	
09.00 - 10.00	Meeting with Students' Union Officers and selected sample of experienced student representatives Quercus Scholar - BCL (Law and Business) Deputy President & Campaigns Officer Education Officer, Students' Union Student - MA Positive Psychology Coaching *Student participation and engagement in academic decision-making processes from Schools to Colleges to University level*
10.00 - 12.30	Private panel time for discussion with opportunity to schedule any follow-up discussion, if required, from deliberations to date
12.30 – 13.00	Progress review – Director of Quality Enhancement and Academic Secretary & Assistant Registrar *Reviewers will outline progress of review, indicative themes emerging and identify any further documentary inputs or interviews required to complete the review, prior to formulating final report*
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch

Appendix III - List of documents made available to the Review Panel

1. Review of Academic Decision Authority in UCC - Self-Assessment Report by the Offices of Academic Affairs and Registry

   Appendices:
   1) Universities Act, 1997
   2) Principal Statute
   3) Academic Council Handbook
   4) College Rules
   5) ACE Rules
   6) University Policy Framework Document
   7) University Signing Authority and Approval Policy
   8) Schedule of Academic Council decisions 2017/18
   9) Schedule of Academic Board decisions 2017/18
   10) Strategic Plan 2017-2022

2. Staff Survey