

**University College Cork  
National University of Ireland, Cork**

**Quality Improvement/Quality Assurance**

**Peer Review Group Report**

**The Language Centre**

**Academic Year 2001/02**

**Confidential**

14 May 2002

## **Members of the Peer Review Group:**

### **Name**

1. Professor Dermot Keogh, Department of History, UCC (Chair)
2. Professor Matthew MacNamara, Department of French, UCC
3. Ms. Anne Gallagher, Director, Language Centre, NUIM
4. Mr. Ray Satchell, Director, Language Centre, University of Bristol, UK

### **Short curriculum vitae of the four board members**

Ms. Anne Gallagher, Director of Language Centre, NUI Maynooth, Secretary, Irish Association of Applied Linguistics (IRAAL), Republic of Ireland representative on Executive of Association of University Language Centres in the UK and Ireland (AULC), member of Coimisiún na Gaeltachta.

Mr. Ray Satchell, Director, University of Bristol Language Centre, Chair: Association of University Language Centres in the UK and Ireland (AULC), Vice-President: European Confederation of Language Centres in Higher Education (Cercles), National Representative for EFL (English as a Foreign Language) on the University Council for Modern Languages (UCML), Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts.

Dr. Matthew MacNamara, Associate Professor of French, University College Cork

Dr. Dermot Keogh is Professor of History and Jean Monnet Professor of European Integration Studies at University College Cork. He is a member of the Royal Irish Academy.

## **Timetable for conduct of Peer Review Group Site Visit**

The Timetable for the conduct of the site visit is attached as Appendix A.

## **History of the Language Centre**

The Language Centre at University College Cork was opened in 1994. The Peer Review Group (PRG) sought access to a full range of relevant documents from the following sources:

Office of the Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs

Office of the Secretary & Bursar

Office of the Dean of Arts

Language Centre

Language Centre Board minutes

Language Centre Board Annual Reports

Decisions of the Faculty of Arts, Academic Council and the Governing Body

The Peer Review Group discovered that there was no central archive containing all relevant documents on the origins and development of the Language Centre. The documentation retrieved from the sources listed above was fragmented and not a comprehensive record of the planning and of the history of the centre. Notwithstanding the absence of a central archive, the PRG, using what was supplied, traced in outline the planning process leading to the establishment of a Language Centre at UCC. The documents are discussed in chronological order below and reproduced as appendices.

There is a report of a meeting held on 12 December 1984 with the Heads of Modern Language Departments and the Registrar, Dr. Michael Mortell and the Finance Officer, Mr. Michael Kelleher. The report is attached as Appendix B.<sup>1</sup>

It is understood, from a reference in an email to Dr Norma Ryan from Mr. Dodd (copy attached in Appendix C) on 15 March 2002, that there were visits by UCC staff to language centres in Ireland and possibly abroad. Those visits, Mr. Dodd wrote, took place in the 1980s and early 1990s.

On 17 January 1991, a report was prepared and signed by the then Dean of Arts, T.J. Dunne, J.K. Beug (Department of German), W.A. Perrott (Audio Visual Services), A.M. Ryan (Department of French) and Goodith White (Department of English). The Chair was T.W. O'Reilly (Department of Spanish). The report is attached as Appendix D.<sup>2</sup>

The Academic Council adopted this report on 8 March 1991. The minute read: "It was agreed to refer the report on the proposed establishment of a Language Centre to the Finance Committee and to the APDC [Academic Planning and Development Committee]".

No documentation has been supplied to the PRG to indicate the next stages in the planning and development of the centre from 8 March 1991 to 24 May 1993.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Peer Review Group is grateful to the Office of the Secretary & Bursar, Mr Michael Kelleher, for providing the above report.

<sup>2</sup> This document was supplied to the Peer Review Group by the Office of the Secretary & Bursar, Mr Michael Kelleher.

There is a letter from An tOllamh Éamonn Ó Carragáin, 24 May 1993, which is attached as Appendix E. The text of the draft proposal referred to in An tOllamh Ó Carragáin's letter is attached as Appendix F.<sup>3</sup>

Members of the PRG asked the Director of the Language Centre, through Dr Norma Ryan, to provide a UCC mission statement on the establishment of the LC and any subsequent policy or administrative directions. He replied that he had three relevant documents on file: The first was "inherited from a 1993 Academic Council discussion;" The second was "work-in-progress draft used by the Language Centre Board in its discussions in 1996;" and the third was "the current list that ensued." These are attached in Appendix G.

The Language Centre moved to the O'Rahilly building in the autumn of 1997.

The Professor of Hispanic Studies, David Mackenzie, following a meeting with the four members of the PRG, kindly supplied the Group with the text of a "Report from Academic Council Sub-Committee on matters raised by Standing Committee of Academic Council" (attached as Appendix H). The report, which was made on 19 October 1998 did not give the names of the members of the sub-committee.

The PRG noted the change in reporting procedures introduced by the adoption of the report, the uncoupling of the Language Board from the Chair of the School of Languages and Literature. It also noted the introduction of a three-year term for the Chair of the Language Board.

The PRG, upon request, was supplied with a set of minutes of the Language Centre Board from 24 May 1995 to 16 November 2001 (attached as Appendix I). The PRG was also given the annual reports of the Language Centre Board from 1996/7 to 2000/1.

With the help of the minutes it was possible for the PRG, to construct further aspects of the history of the Board and of the Language Centre. In the minutes of the Language Centre Board of 10 July 1998 it is recorded that

the Director produced the original Presidential letter establishing it [Board of Management of Centre], which effectively functioned on the basis of representation of the Administration and the Centre itself, plus one member from each Department of the School of Language and Literature likely to be involved in use of the Centre's technical facilities or to have a need for Centre staff on secondment in order to deliver their courses.

The Director noted in the minutes that the Spoken Irish unit and the Department of Ancient Classics were both already or soon to be in this status, and consideration might be given to extending the Board to include them. At the same meeting, consideration had been given to the fact that the board was made up entirely of "contributing Departments." There was no representation, the minutes recorded, of "consuming Departments." The suggestion was made to set up a "user group" that would meet annually together with members of the Language Centre Board.

---

<sup>3</sup> Letter and document supplied to the Peer Review Group by the Office of the Faculty of Arts, UCC

Under ‘matters arising,’ the minutes of the Language Centre Board on 24 November 1998 (see text in Appendix I) recorded that the Chair, Professor Mackenzie, had met with the Registrar and the Dean of Arts, “and having established the new arrangements for lines of responsibility, with the ‘decoupling’ of the Chair of the Board of the Language Centre from the Chair of the School of Language and Literature, which will be put before the Academic Council in due course.” The minutes further recorded that “representation on the Language Centre Board ought to be extended to Ancient Classics by right, as a consequence of the probable addition to the Centre’s staff of a CLT (College Language Teacher) in Classical Languages, and perhaps also to Spoken Irish.”

The PRG has been led to believe that previous to that policy change the Director of the Language Centre reported to the President or his nominee.

The PRG remains unclear about the reporting procedures of the Language Centre Board both before and after the Chair was decoupled from the Chair of the School of Language and Literature. The PRG is unsure of the answers to the following two critical questions:

Did the Chair of the Board report to the Faculty of Arts and/or to the President, or to the Registrar or to the Secretary?

Did the Dean of Arts or any other Dean play any role in the supervision or the policy development of the Centre since its foundation?

### **Initial comments of the PRG**

The PRG was impressed by the dedication of the Director and of the staff of the Language Centre.

The PRG concludes that the composition of the Language Centre Board (LCB) was far too narrow to provide the best leadership to enable the rapid growth and expansion of the Centre. It was a fundamental policy mistake to constitute the Board in a manner that prevented the inclusion of all user departments.

The PRG concludes that the manner in which the Language Centre Board was constituted impeded the independent development of the Language Centre.

The PRG concludes that the substantial investment in the Language Centre was not reflected in its development and that the Language Centre had failed to make adequate progress relative to the teaching resources at its disposal.

The PRG further concludes that the inclusion of user departments in the composition of the LCB should ensure the kind of leadership that ought to bring about the sustained growth and expansion of the Centre.

### **Self-Assessment Report**

The PRG noted the following passage in the guidelines<sup>4</sup> provided to each Department/Centre head participating in the Quality Assurance exercise.

“A co-ordinating committee of the department/unit/academic programme course team will prepare a Self-Assessment Report. The purpose of this report is to provide a succinct, but comprehensive statement of the department’s/unit’s activities and, in the case of an academic department, will include an analysis of its teaching, learning and research. It will help the department/unit to identify its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOTs) and will allow it to suggest appropriate remedies where necessary. Some of the data for the Self-Assessment Report will be collected in the form of questionnaires completed by staff, students, graduates and employers.

As the primary goal is Quality Improvement the formulation of strategies and recommendations for improving the work of the department/unit should be highlighted.

The Quality Promotion Unit will provide detailed guidelines for the format of the self-assessment report. The guidelines will emphasise the goal of quality improvement and the necessity to bring forward strategies and recommendations for how improvement can be effected. The guidelines will indicate the information that should be supplied in addition to the recommendations. This information will include a summary of the staff profile of the department, the workloads of staff, and, in particular for the academic staff, a breakdown of the distribution of effort between teaching responsibilities and research. All academic staff will be asked to submit a brief summary of their research activity, including publications for the past five years, number of postgraduate students supervised, number of postgraduate students supervised with degrees conferred, research income etc.”

The PRG noted that there was a perception among the teaching staff that formal consultation had not taken place with them. There was also the perception that the Director was the sole author of the Self-Assessment Report. The PRG noted that the staff were asked their views and completed staff questionnaires prior to the drawing up of the SAR but they appeared to have had no input into the actual writing of the report. The PRG noted the claim by many staff members that they had not been shown the SAR prior to submission.

The PRG were made aware that Staff questionnaires were not sent with the Self-Assessment Report. The PRG received copies of the questionnaires filled in by individual staff members after the Director of the Quality Promotion Unit asked Mr. Dodd to forward them to her office.

---

<sup>4</sup> Extract from document “Quality at UCC” approved by the Governing Body of UCC for use in Quality Reviews.

The PRG read all the staff questionnaires. Many, it is to be noted, were prepared with great care and attention to detail.

In the light of the perceived grievance among many staff members on the issue of consultation prior to the submission of the SAR, the PRG undertook to increase the time available for oral presentations during its two days of meetings. The PRG met the staff for an extended plenary session and later individually or in small groups. The four members of the PRG committee also had an opportunity to talk with Language Centre staff informally over the two days of interviews.

On the basis of the questionnaires, the additional written material and interviews, the PRG has identified four areas of common concern to the staff of the Language Centre:

- The dichotomy between management/administrative and academic status.
- Problems associated with dual allegiance – simultaneous assignment to a designated Language Department and to the Language Centre.
- Perceived discrepancies in workload allocation for Language Teachers.
- Failure to provide adequate IT facilities and access to the internet.

The PRG will provide a more detailed commentary on these four issues later in the report.

The task of the PRG would have been greatly assisted by the provision of a more comprehensive Self-Assessment Report that included the following:

- Organisation chart of the Language Centre
- Job descriptions of the different staff categories in the Language Centre
- Budget statements and detailed financial records for the Language Centre
- Student questionnaires
- Administrative and management procedures relating to the recruitment of students
- Procedures governing the timetabling and allocation of staff to language departments
- Details on marketing policy, the dissemination of information on courses, examples of promotional literature, brochures published by the Centre and critique of website location.

## **Governance**

The PRG has already made a number of general comments about the inadequacy of the reporting structures and governance of the Language Centre. Despite the many efforts by successive Chairpersons of the Language Centre Board to address certain problems the substantive issues remain unresolved.

The PRG notes that there was also a structural reason for that failure. The PRG is convinced that the narrow composition of the Language Board militated against the development of the Centre.

The perceived interests of the Language Departments were protected to the detriment of the forging of a wider role inside and outside the university for the Language Centre.

1. A programme of Languages for All was not developed to its full potential.
2. A strategy to provide a full portfolio of courses in Languages for Specific Purposes has yet to be developed.

The PRG has learned that in certain cases the full quota of hours to be taught by a language teacher in the Departments of French, German, Italian and Spanish has not been assigned by the head of the respective departments. The department in question simply did not have sufficient teaching hours to give to the assigned number of language teachers.

The PRG is convinced that the system of secondment of staff, as it currently stands, is a wasteful and inefficient use of scarce college resources.

The PRG wishes to emphasise that the biggest unused resource of the Centre is the hours of the French, German, Italian and Spanish CLTs. The PRG wishes to make it absolutely clear that this is the case and that it requires urgent attention.

The Language Centre must be seen to provide a return on University investment either in terms of giving the full complement of contracted teaching hours ( $15 \times 28 \times 35 = 14,700$  hours annually) or earning corresponding income from commercial sources. In the light of the current continuous decline in student numbers taking certain languages, it will be necessary for the Language Centre to further develop commercial language services in order to meet this requirement.

These services could include language courses for the general public at several levels; language courses for business and industry; summer programmes for second-level pupils and those returning to learning; design of language learning materials for use in the university and/or outside. In short, the Language Centre must begin to realise the objectives quoted in its own mission statement.

The PRG recommends that the Director of the Language Centre should report to the Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs and to the Dean of Arts.

The Language Centre Board should be reconstituted to reflect the wider interests and language needs of the university. It should be structured as a users group with a

representative from each Faculty under the Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs as Chair.

The assignment of all Language Centre teachers must be on the basis of need. A Head of Department should apply at the beginning of the academic year to the Director of the Language Centre for teaching cover for the number of language teaching hours required by his/her department. That assignment must be made exclusively on the basis of need. The hours taught by each teacher could then be monitored weekly by the Director of the Language Centre or by the proposed Language Co-ordinator (See Appendix J).

## **Management of the Language Centre**

### **Findings and Recommendations**

The PRG, having reviewed the literature supplied and the issues raised in the interviews, has come to the conclusion that radical changes are required in the management of the Centre. The Director of the Language Centre, with 2 administrative staff, 27 College Language Teachers, 6 Special Language Demonstrators (2 part-time), 2 Language Scholars and 9 part-timers, gives 30% of his time to work in the Department of Hispanic Studies.

While the role of Director is one of management the PRG recommends that, if his professional duties at the Centre permit, the teaching hours of the Director should not exceed two hours in any week in total in the Department of Hispanic Studies and/or graduate programmes. The Director should be released from any contractual commitments to the Department of Hispanic Studies, while retaining the grade of Statutory Lecturer (part-time).

The PRG has also reached the conclusion that there are serious weaknesses in the management structure of the Centre.

The PRG recommends the appointment of a Co-ordinator of External Services for Publicity and Promotion, External Recruiting, national and international, and working closely with international networks of language teachers and other centres. This post could be best filled by the secondment of a Language Teacher, already employed by the Centre, with the relevant experience.

In view of the magnitude of the challenge facing such a Co-ordinator, the PRG is further of the view that it would be prudent to second a second language teacher to work fulltime for two years with the Co-ordinator of External Services. This would involve drawing up brochures, building a website and providing additional documentation on an expanded range of language courses offered by the Centre. It will be necessary to provide an initial start-up budget for such basic and such essential work.

The PRG noted the increased administrative workload and rapidly growing potential for income generating programmes in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The PRG recommended the creation of an additional post at Executive Assistant level.

The PRG noted that the current procedures were inadequate in the Language Centre for the administration of Language Teaching in the Departments.

The PRG recommends the appointment of co-ordinators for each of the following areas: French, German, Italian, Spanish and EFL (x2). These posts should carry with them a clearly defined set of duties, including teaching, curriculum development, course design testing and assessment, liaison with relevant departments and sponsors and co-ordination of part-time and full-time language teachers and demonstrators. The appointees should be recruited internally and initially for a probationary period of one or two years.

## **STAFF MATTERS**

### **Findings and Recommendations**

The administrative arrangement of partial or full-time language teaching staff to academic departments has led to a series of unnecessary personnel difficulties / low morale / confused reporting procedures demoralisation of staff, lack of transparency in work allocations.

The PRG wishes to re-emphasise that the administrative arrangement of ‘secondment,’ as currently in operation, is a wasteful and inefficient deployment of teaching resources and scarce university funds.

The PRG recommends that in future CLTs must only be seconded to the Language Department of Italian, Spanish, French and German for the number of teaching hours required.

The PRG recommends the permanent transfer to the Departments of Ancient Classics and Irish respectively of the College Language Teacher of Ancient Classics and of the College Language Teacher of Irish.

The PRG recommends that College Language Teachers seconded to a continental language academic department should be treated as members of the staff of that department.

The Heads of the Language Departments should take responsibility for decisions in relation to the College Language Teachers in their department.

On the issue of academic/administrative status, the University should give early consideration to the creation of a category of academically-related staff, a category which exists in other EU countries. In the case of the Language Centre, such a category would recognise that the primary function of the CLTs was a teaching one but would acknowledge research conducted by those who wished to do so.

The PRG has been made aware that there are serious disparities in the workloads of the Language Centre teachers. The “ownership” issues referred to above have led to a

situation whereby it is difficult for either the Director of the Language Centre or the Head of the relevant Department of Modern Languages to know whether a particular tutor has reached the target teaching load of 525 hours (equivalent to 15 hours per week for 35 weeks annually).

The PRG recommends that for reasons of fairness and to ensure effective use of resources that teaching loads be closely monitored. This monitoring could be built into the job descriptions of the proposed Language Co-ordinators (see Appendix J). In order to harmonise with the EFL section, we suggest that the teaching loads (15 hours per week for 35 weeks) could be calculated over a twelve-month period. This would enable any shortfalls to be met through the summer period.

## **CORE ACTIVITIES**

### **Findings and Recommendations**

The Language Centre should concentrate on the following core activities:

- English as a Foreign Language
- English for Academic Purposes
- English for Specific Purposes
- English language testing and assessment
- Languages for All
- Accredited foreign language modules in degree programmes in all faculties
- A full range of language services to companies and institutions in the private and public sectors.

In particular the Peer Review Group endorses the following extract from the statement of objectives of the Language Centre<sup>5</sup>:

The Language Centre will have the following objectives:

(2) in particular, to support programmes in the business, management, engineering and technological fields where competence in a foreign language is desirable by providing appropriate language training within the course structure in subjects crucial to the promotion of employment and economic growth.

(3) to ensure that a good range of major world and other strategic languages will be available as subjects for study at UCC.

(4) to provide a range of language training services at appropriate fees in response to demand from within or outside UCC, including evening and intensive courses, or in-service courses in languages for business and industry.

(6) to provide specialised programmes for training of teachers of foreign languages, including English as a foreign language.

(8) to make available on a sound commercial basis translating, interpreting and related linguistic services for College purposes and for business, industry and other clients,

---

<sup>5</sup> as detailed on page 1 of the Self-Assessment Report of the Language Centre

whether in Ireland or elsewhere, including linguistic support for the provision of services within UCC's conference facilities.

(11) to act as an examination centre and otherwise collaborate with other institutions of similar purpose in supporting high standards of language provision in the Munster region.

Liaison with the Access Officer in UCC should be initiated in order to make available appropriate language teaching in this area.

Substantial expansion of multimedia facilities for autonomous learning should be undertaken. These should include a fully networked computer suite offering a wide range of computer-assisted language learning materials, an expanded listening/viewing room with individual audio and video stations, satellite TV facilities and a reference library with private study facilities.

Specialised and intensive and/or tailor made language courses for staff at the appropriate levels should be offered.

A three-year development plan should be prepared. The restructured Language Centre Board should monitor the implementation of this three-year development plan.

### **Accommodation**

The Language Centre should apply in good time to the centralised booking system for the allocation of adequate space.

The financial situation of the Language Centre would be enhanced by the deployment of all College Language Teachers for the full complement of their contractual hours in revenue generating activities and by a more transparent resource allocation mechanism from the finance office.

The PRG noted complaints about the cleaning of rooms in the Language Centre.

### **Resource allocation and financial reporting mechanisms**

The PRG recommends the submission of an annual financial report to Dean of Arts and to the Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

## **Summary of Recommendations**

1. The PRG recommends that the Director should report to the Dean of Arts and to the Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs.
2. The Language Board should be reconstituted to reflect the wider interests and language needs of the university. It should be structured as a users group with a representative from each Faculty under the Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs as Chair.
3. The assignment of all Language Centre teachers to Language Departments must be on the basis of demonstrated need.
4. A new Organisation Chart with clear reporting structures is drawn up based on Appendix K.
5. The position of Director, given the size and complexity of the LC, should be one of full-time management. Where time permits, allowance may be made for no more than two hours teaching in any one week outside the Language Centre.
6. The appointment of a Co-ordinator of External Services for Publicity and Promotion, External Recruiting, national and international, and working closely with international networks of language teachers and other centres. A second language teacher should be seconded to help with this work for a specific period.
7. The creation of an additional post at Executive Assistant level.
8. The appointment of co-ordinators for each of the following areas: French, German, Italian, Spanish and EFL (x2).
9. The permanent transfer to the Departments of Ancient Classics and Irish respectively of the College Language Teacher of Ancient Classics and of the College Language Teacher of Irish.
10. That College Language Teachers seconded to a language department should be treated as members of the staff of that department.
11. Heads of the Language Departments should take responsibility for all decisions in relation to the College Language Teachers in their department.
12. The Language Centre must use to the optimum the contracted time of all College Language Teachers.
13. Early consideration should be given to the creation of a category of academically related staff as in other EU countries.

14. Teaching loads of CLTs ought to be closely monitored for reasons of fairness and to ensure effective use of resources.
15. The Language Centre should concentrate on core activities of:
  - Teaching English as a Foreign Language,
  - English for Academic Purposes,
  - English for Specific Purposes,
  - English language testing and assessment,
  - Languages for All,
  - Accredited foreign language modules in degree programmes in all faculties,
  - A range of language services to companies and institutions in the private and public sectors.
16. The Language Centre should focus in particular on the Objectives 2, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 11 as detailed in the objectives for the Language Centre approved by the Language Centre Board.
17. Liaison with the Access Officer should be initiated in order to make available appropriate language teaching in this area.
18. Substantial expansion of multimedia facilities for autonomous learning should be undertaken.
19. Specialised and intensive and/or tailor made language courses for staff at the appropriate levels.
20. A three-year development plan should be prepared before October 2002 by a committee chaired by the Registrar and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
21. The Registrar and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Dean of Arts should monitor the implementation of this 3-year development plan, carrying out detailed six-monthly reviews.
22. The Language Centre should apply in good time to the centralised booking system for adequate space.
23. Deployment of all College Language Teachers for the full complement of their contractual hours in revenue generating activities.
24. A more transparent resource allocation mechanism from the Finance Office.
25. The submission of an annual financial report to Dean of Arts and to the Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

**Timetable for conduct of Peer Review Group Site Visit**

**Language Centre, UCC**

**Monday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2002**

- 18.00 – 19.30 Meeting of members of the Peer Review Group  
Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion Unit, Dr. N. Ryan.  
Group agrees final work schedule and assignment of tasks for the following 2 days.
- 20.30 Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group and Head of Department and Departmental representatives (Steven Dodd, Sally-Ann Attale, Christine Montané, Donald O’Driscoll, Louise Sheehan).

**Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> March 2002**

*All meetings take place in Room G33, Language Centre, O’Rahilly Building unless otherwise indicated*

- 08.30 – 09.00 Convening of Peer Review Group in Room G33, Language Centre, O’Rahilly Building, UCC
- 09.00 – 13.00** Consideration of Self-Assessment Report and other inputs along with all unit staff.
- 09.00 – 09.30 Mr. Steven Dodd, Director, Language Centre
- 09.30 – 10.30 All staff of Language Centre  
Venue: Room G27, Language Centre, O’Rahilly Building, UCC
- 10.40 - 13.00 Meetings with individual members of staff (Room G33)
- 10.40 Bernie Cronin/Trina Scott
  - 10.50 Vivienne Lordan
  - 11.00 Sally-Ann Attale
  - 11.20 Kevin Power
  - 11.30 Cathy Gannon
  - 11.40 Margot Spencer / Didier Bellettre
  - 11.50 Sylvie Campion
  - 12.00 Claire Sibut
  - 12.10 Nicola Bradwell
  - 12.20 Christine MacDonald, Louise Sheehan, Sally-Ann Attale, Siobhan Malley
  - 12.30 Gene O’Sullivan
  - 12.40 Siobhan Malley, Eugenia Bolado-Coina, Mari-Carmen O’Mahony
  - 12.50 Joseph French
- 13.00 – 14.00 Working lunch for members of the Peer Review Group

- 14.00 – 14.30 Meetings with individual members of staff (Room G33)
- 14.00 Toshiko Yoshikawa  
14.30 Joan O’Sullivan
- 15.00 - 16.00 Telephone conference with Professor Aidan Moran, Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs
- 16.00 – 17.00 Meetings with representative selections of students  
Coffee/tea will be provided during session
- 18.30 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 for members for the Peer Review Group

**Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> March 2002**

- 08.30 – 09.00 Convening of Peer Review Group in Room G33, Language Centre, O’Rahilly Building, UCC
- 09.00 – 09.30 Professor Peter Woodman, Dean of Arts
- 09.30 – 10.00 Professor Patrick O’Donovan, Chair, Language Centre Board
- 10.00 – 10.45 Meeting with Chair and members of the Board of the Language Centre  
  
Professor Patrick O’Donovan, Chair of LCB and Head, Department of French  
Dr. Beatte Dreike, Head, Department of German  
Professor David Mackenzie, Head, Department of Hispanic Studies
- 11.00 – 11.30 Professor Keith Sidwell, Head, Department of Ancient Classics
- 11.30 – 12.00 Mr. Michael O’Sullivan, Vice-President for Planning, Communications & Development
- 13.00 – 14.00 Working Lunch for members of the PRG
- 14.00 – 14.30 Mr. Noel Keeley, Vice-President for Human Resources
- 14.30 – 15.00 Mr. Michael Kelleher, Secretary & Bursar, and member of Executive Management Group of the University
- 15.00 – 15.30 Mr. Steven Dodd, Director, Language Centre (to clarify any outstanding issues)
- 15.30 – 15.45 Pól Ruiséal, Head, Ionad na Gaeilge Labhartha
- 16.00 – 18.00 Preparation of first draft of final report
- 18.00 – 18.30 Exit presentation, to be made to all staff of the Unit by the Chair of the Peer Review Group or other member of Peer Review Group as agreed, summarising the principal findings of the Peer Review Group

Venue: Room G27, Language Centre, O'Rahilly Building, UCC

19.30 Working private dinner for members of the Peer Review Group to complete drafting of report and finalisation of arrangements for speedy completion and submission of final report.

**Thursday 28 March 2002**

Externs depart

## **Appendices B – J**

These documents, as referred to in the Report, are not available electronically. Copies may be obtained on request in writing from the Director of the Quality Promotion Unit, West Wing, UCC