**Ollscoil Mhá Nuad**

**Maynooth University**

# QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND ASSURANCE

# PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT

# *MUSIC DEPARTMENT*

# ACADEMIC YEAR 2020/21

Date: 18th June 2021

# Contents

# 1.    Introduction

The Peer Review Group met 26-30 April to review the Department of Music. Meetings were scheduled with Prof Aiden Mulkeen, VP Academic & Registrar; Prof Colin Graham, Faculty Dean; Dr Antonio Cascelli, Head of Department; faculty and staff of the Music Department, including occasional faculty; and a selection of undergraduate and postgraduate students. The PRG also met with UE members and external stakeholders. Throughout the week, the PRG had short meetings to identify areas for questions as well as time to summarise findings for inclusion into this report.

The SAR covered the Department mission, its profile, its contributions to teaching and learning and the research outputs of the Department. An appendix provided more detail on these areas, and online materials stood in place of a physical visit of the facilities. The Department offers music subjects in performance, musicology and music technology at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. This includes denominated entries as well as subjects in more general Bachelors courses. The facilities controlled by the Department include practice spaces, lecture spaces, music technology studios and offices. Other facilities managed by the University are used for performance spaces, rehearsals and lecture rooms.

# 2.    Peer Review Group Members

| Name | Affiliation | Role |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dr Kerry Hagan** | University of Limerick | External Reviewer (Chair) |
| **Dr John O'Flynn** | Dublin City University | External Reviewer |
| **Professor Carmel Breslin** | Maynooth University | Internal Reviewer |
| **Dr Frank Mulligan** | Maynooth University | Internal Reviewer |

# 3.    Timetable of the site visit

See Appendix for the timetable.

Given the restrictions resulting from covid-19 measures, the review occurred entirely online. Meetings were scheduled for half-day segments Monday through Friday. The PRG has a split opinion on whether this was better than 2.5 full days as a result of fatigue, teaching obligations of the PRG, and other research and administrative obligations throughout the week.

The meetings durations were adequate for the questions arising from the SAR. Breaking the academic staff into focused sessions allowed for more faculty to have individualised input, though these sessions only reinforced what came up in the meeting with the entire Department. The meeting with the technical and administrative staff was especially valuable, as their concerns were not addressed in the meeting with the Department. Meeting with the occasional faculty also raised issues not addressed in the Department meeting.

Though the meetings with external stakeholders were adequate, there could have been more time allotted for these meetings (15 minutes provided). It was unclear how Dr Brian Carthy of the Sound Training College was an external stakeholder, as his opinion came from his experience with his Department as an alumnus and not through any current interaction in his position at the Sound Training College.

# 4.      Peer Review Methodology

## 4.1    Site Visit
Due to covid-19, a physical site visit was impossible. However, a representative range of images was included in the SAR as well as an online virtual tour of the facilities.

## 4.2    Preparation of the Peer Review Group Report
The PRG used meeting times throughout the week to compile notes and prepare for meetings. In the last day of the week, the PRG drafted the commendations and recommendations provided at the end of this report.

An outline draft was compiled by the Chair of the PRG, then the members of the PRG reviewed and revised the report via a shared document. The Chair then checked for formatting and typographical errors before submitting.

# 5. Overall Assessment

## 5.1    Summary Assessment of the Department
Overall, the PRG agreed with the Department's SWOT analysis. The strengths of the Department include a breadth of valuable offerings to music students, valuable front-facing community interactions through performances and work with external stakeholders, a diverse faculty cohort with generous contributions to teaching and learning, high levels of research activity among some individual members, and a competitive edge compared to other music departments. The weaknesses of the Department arise from the lack of adequate facilities, time burdens on the faculty, and insufficient budgets to mitigate issues around facilities. The PRG believes that the faculty may spend too much time in Department and University committees, which may lead to the lack of time to pursue research interests. There is also a lack of clarity and communication between the University and the Department on budgets and monies available for addressing Department needs.

There are more opportunities to work with external stakeholders. For example, there are possible interactions with Kildare County Council beyond Music Generation, which itself is a new initiative that was immediately hampered by covid-19 restrictions. There may be further performance and presentation opportunities for students and staff via partnerships with specialist providers, for example, in sound training or in musical theatre. The PRG feels that more market/competitor analysis is necessary for the music technology offerings by the Department.

An ongoing threat to the Department is the inadequacy of the facilities. Lack of fit-for-purpose performance spaces, obsolete technology and studios, and poor practice and rehearsal facilities threaten student recruitment and competitiveness with other music departments. The one-year leases of music department spaces mean that there is little room for improvement. Other improvements must happen at the University level. Though these threats can be mitigated through certain measures, e.g., leveraging University software, pursuing open-source technology, investment in equipment, the real solution to space and facility problems can only come from University investment. An additional threat stems from one the Department's strengths—its diverse offerings in musicology, music technology, composition and performance. The further incorporation of new genres, including popular music and musical theatre are also positive additions, but this breadth presents challenges for maintaining a coherent Departmental mission, and for matching faculty expertise and research interests with an increasingly diverse music student cohort.

## 5.2    Self-Assessment Report

The SAR was very extensive and provided, through Appendices, sufficient details of course offerings, faculty teaching and learning outputs, and Department research outputs. Some of the outputs fell under multiple categories so were repeated. In some cases, a single administrative role had multiple components, and these were listed as separate outputs.

Throughout the week, the PRG returned to Helen Berry, Administrative Officer of Strategy and Quality, with clarifications, comments and suggestions for corrections.

Corrections include:

- The PRG recommended some minor modifications to details regarding comparable music departments in Ireland and Northern Ireland, and these were communicated to the HoD.
- P. 48 of the Appendix includes the Teaching Council's Subject Requirements. They might want to update this information as the TC changed their guidelines in November 2020.
- There is an analysis of competitors in music departments, but there is less analysis of music technology programmes, such as those at LIT and IT Tralee.

Clarification was sought for:

- How the department circulates board meeting minutes and/or advises faculty/staff of decisions and changes made by the board
- A list of modules available to research postgraduate students for their taught components, especially from the Department as opposed to external modules.
- Clarification on music registration fees, how they are delivered to the department, and whether music technology students garner the same registration fees.
- Who pays the music registration fees: students, state or university/faculty.

The SAR was completed with working groups focussing on each section and completed quite well despite covid-19 disruptions. Sections were led by existing roles in the Department, e.g., Research, Teaching and Learning. There was no QR committee. However, this was

unnecessary due to the number of meetings. This did not impact the quality or thoroughness of the SAR. The working groups also had opportunities to consult with Dr Teresa Lee, Director of Quality, and others. The PRG found no faults in the SAR that would arise from this methodology.

# 6.   Findings of the Peer Review Group: Commendations and Recommendations

## 6.1   Overview

- *Department governance and organisation*

The Department is well organised with a clear committee structure which operates under the guidance of the head of department.  Responsibilities are delegated to specific committees which meet on a regular schedule through the year.  Minutes of these meetings are recorded.  Decisions are reached on the basis of discussion leading to a consensus.  The strong sense of team spirit, unity of purpose and loyalty to each other that was evident among academic, administrative and technical staff are testament to the success of this approach.

Leadership roles within the Department are allocated to members of academic staff for the overall direction of research, postgraduate studies, undergraduate studies, performance, and examination matters.  The management of the Department is also supported by seven programme directors – one for each of the degree programmes offered at either undergraduate or postgraduate level.  Programme directors deal with the day-to-day running of each of the degree programmes and report directly to the head of department.

Representation of the Department on University committees is undertaken by the head or the deputy head of department where the position is *ex officio*, and is distributed among staff members in other instances.  Although no formal method for allocating such duties was evident, the outcome has resulted in a strong sense of engagement and participation in decision making by all staff members.

Administration within the Department could be streamlined by making sure that decisions made at committee level are communicated promptly to administrative and technical staff (by circulating minutes for example) who may have to implement changes arising from these decisions.

- *Teaching, learning, assessment and student feedback*

All meetings with staff in the Department highlighted their obvious pride in the range and the quality of the courses offered to students.  The ability of the Department to cater for students whose interests are primarily in musicology and performance as well as those who would traditionally have attended a Conservatory is cited in the SAR as a distinguishing feature compared with other higher education institutions in Ireland.

The benchmark used to gauge the range of courses is the work of the European Polifonia Accreditation Working Group (2010) entitled *Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Higher Music Education*.  Three undergraduate programmes (BMus (MH101), BA(Hons) and BA

(Theology & Church Music)), six Masters taught programmes (MA (Musicology),MA (Performance & Musicology), MA (Composition), MA (Creative Music Technologies) MA (Irish Traditional Music), MSc (Sound & Music Computing), and a structured PhD programme run concurrently. The teaching load associated with the undergraduate and taught Masters programmes is enormous particularly when one considers the particular demands associated with music.

While some modules are common across programmes at undergraduate level and also at taught masters level (leading to efficiencies in teaching), one has to ask whether this level of teaching is sustainable in the long term with the number of staff available? Competition for students, particularly at undergraduate level is prompting the Department to expand offerings even further. The PRG commends the Department for its responsiveness to student demand and for its excellent pastoral care of existing students. However, it is recommended that a review of the Departmental teaching and learning strategy be undertaken with a view to rationalising the existing catalogue of modules, and aligning resources with programmes prioritised for development.

Teaching and learning methodologies employed include small group teaching, one-to one instrumental tuition, and practical assessments. The Department is hampered in its work by the poor level of the facilities (teaching and equipment) in which it must operate. Staff have not allowed the quality to the facilities to dictate the quality of education offered to students. The focus of all attention is on the experience of the student from the time they enter the Department until the day they graduate. Students were effusive in their description of the efforts of staff to support their learning and development.

- *Research activities and outputs*

The research activities and outputs are impressive, especially in light of the high teaching and administrative commitments made by the staff and the lack of appropriate infrastructure within the department. The department has hosted postdoctoral researchers and publications have extended from books, book chapters, peer-reviewed journals to various conferences, comparing very well with other departments in the faculty. The department is making efforts to create dedicated time for research through sabbatical leave and research days, but academic members expressed mixed opinions on the effectiveness of these measures. The front-loading of teaching to accommodate sabbatical leave may be an additional provision, enabling researchers to take more frequent and longer sabbatical leave to focus on their research careers.

The PRG was of the view that the research profile could be further enhanced. Greater parity across research is required to create a more sustainable research environment in the department. This may require a diversification of research funding sources, aided by collaboration with other disciplines in arts, social science and science, and coupled with international collaborations and industry partners. In addition, more staff should be encouraged to seek funding and appropriate mentoring and support for early career staff in securing funding opportunities could be put in place. While there is evidence of informal mentoring a more systematic approach could be developed.

The PRG was impressed with the enthusiasm of the PhD students, but thought that the PhD students could play a greater role in the department. Any additional activities could be part of the Structured PhD programme in Music.

- *Staffing and staff development*

The PRG was impressed with the remarkable efforts of the staff in delivering a teaching programme that the students clearly value, despite increasing teaching and administrative duties.

The administration staff and technical officer play a vital role in the department and there is a clear need for additional administrative resources. In particular, the vacant Executive Assistant 2 post, should be filled immediately. The department has a number of short-term contracts that do not facilitate long-term planning and greater opportunities for promotion are required to attract and retain staff. There is a need to make the sabbatical leave and research time allocation models more attractive and introduce more formalised staff development and mentoring to encourage and guide staff in developing their research strategies.

Resourcing and Facilities

The PRG noted that the space and teaching facilities within the department have not been expanded greatly since 2010, and this is impacting on both the teaching and research activity within the department. This is now an ideal time to prioritise the planned cultural quarter for the campus, including professional performance spaces and an investment in a Steinway grand piano. The department can play a leading role in this development.

In the meantime, performance facilities are urgently required. The existing prefab buildings are in disrepair and unsuitable. Music technology equipment requires investment. Additional office space is needed for occasional staff, who contribute regularly to teaching in the department. Disability access was also identified as an issue.

- *Internal and external engagement*

It was clear to the PRG that the Department has extensive internal and external engagement through various activities and associations, most notably in the area of performance which has considerable reach through an annual carol service, a major choral event in Spring, and a lunchtime concert series. This engagement was valued by colleagues at university and faculty levels and across various units. External promotion of lunchtime concerts could be bolstered through more streamlined and immediate connections between university and department webpages, and through offering undergraduate and postgraduate students organisational and entrepreneurial roles; similarly, postgraduate students might be more directly involved in administration and marketing for the Department's established seminar series, which has potential to increase its international reach through blended delivery modes. The PRG notes the strong leadership demonstrated by the Department in the field of musicology, through involvement in the Society for Musicology in Ireland and the organisation of numerous peer-reviewed conferences and seminars. Department staff across composition, music technology and musicology are regularly engaged at a national level

through media involvement, participation in policy-informing and advocacy groups and networks, and events curation and participation, with some significant international engagement also. This complements the very high levels of commitment to university-wide service.

At university level, there is capacity to enhance the Music Department's external engagement and visibility through providing resources and facilities appropriate for open days, research seminars and public concerts. The PRG further considers that the Department could build on its already fruitful connections with external agencies Kildare County Council (e.g., joint applications for composition commissions, events funding, artist residencies) and the Contemporary Music Centre (e.g., collaborations on aspects of undergraduate modules, greater interface with music technology). Additionally, given the expansion of music technology and the broadening of music studies across the Department's various programmes to include popular music and musical theatre, mutually beneficial partnerships could be built with existing private providers in these areas

- *Implementation of recommendations for improvement made in Peer Review Group Report arising from last quality review*

The last quality review of the Music Department was carried out in 2010, with recommendations divided into departmental and institutional categories:

**Implementation of recommendations made to the Department**

- Review the balance between teaching, research and administrative duties. This is still ongoing, with Department staff noting increased administrative workload in the interim.
- Review the scope and nature of formative assessments, especially for more technical modules. This has been implemented.
- Coordinate research activities with other agencies in the region. This has been addressed through one long-term project, with another at development stage
- Develop a structured PhD. This was implemented at university level.
- Explore setting up a more formal mentoring scheme. This was not directly addressed due to a lack of university policy, and workload issues; however, it has been implemented to some degree through the Aurora programme and the faculty's pilot mentoring scheme introduced in 2020.
- An additional observation was the Department could consider greater exploration of digital humanities research initiatives. This has been addressed at many levels, particularly through postgraduate modules and digitisation projects with the Contemporary Music Centre and the Irish Traditional Music Archive.

- Upgrade quality of facilities provided for research students. Spaces were made available in the Iontas building from 2010, and research students are further supported by the Arts and Humanities Institute.
- Urgently consider sabbatical leave provision, especially for early career staff. There has been no major change, and those who are granted sabbatical leave incur a loss in income.  This is a particular disincentive to early career staff.
- Review the provision of library resources. This has been implemented, with excellent provision of materials and services.
- Ensure that quality of IT resources is maintained and, where possible, enhanced. Investments in capital resources were made, but due to the changing demands of technology and increasing student numbers, a more substantial capital investment plan is required.
- Secure ongoing provision of technical and administrative support. The Department successfully sought two permanent 0.5 executive assistant posts and one permanent f/t technician post. However, one of the 0.5 executive posts has not been filled for some time.
- As a priority, replace retiring member of staff. This has been implemented.

## 6.2   Commendations

The University is to be commended for:

- Its widespread recognition of music dept contributions to the cultural life of the university across executive, other faculties, other departments and research units.
- Its support of department innovation in teaching and in musicological and creative practice research from T&L and AHI; Innovative approach to integrating creative practice into research and teaching at faculty level.
- The support offices (e.g., Research Development Office, Admissions and Recruitment, Teaching and Learning, EDI) available for faculty and staff.
- Its strong focus on A&H research as evidenced by the strength of the AHI and AHI support for music.
- The desk space at AHI creates culture of collaboration between departments, including music department postgraduates.
- The collegiality among faculty, administrative and technical across faculties, network of support among administrative staff
- The supplemental music subvention for instrumental and vocal tuition gives department significant advantage over competing music departments in the region.
- Recognising the need for a new music tech post and advertising this week, timely appointment and warranted based on music dept needs.
- The indication of development of EDI in progress, with a view to extending beyond Athena Swan.

The Department is to be commended for:

- The unity and collegiality of music department across musical disciplines despite challenges in cross-faculty or -department collaborations
- The unity and collegiality of academic, administrative and technical staff within music department.
- Its student experience, student focus, and student support – esp. Pastoral care or with Covid challenges
- Students were unanimous in crediting department and staff for extraordinary academic and pastoral care
- The student career support through entrepreneurship elective and faculty mentorship
- Its strong national profile
- Its recognised success within university in leading research in A&H and funding successes in music tech
- The very high standard of public-facing annual events, seminars and conference hosting over many years
- Its pursuit of excellence in teaching through innovative teaching and assessment methods, pilot programmes through T&L, and number of staff who have completed Certificate in University Teaching and Learning
- The quality of education and professional training in the face of significant constraints of physical and human resources, equipment, performance spaces
- The breadth of offerings; successful in recruiting students in face of negative national trends
- Being successful in maintaining and increasing postgraduate numbers across postgraduate courses and PhD (including creative practice pathways)
- Its strong research culture evidenced especially in individual projects, conferences organized, and number of scholars funded by external agencies (IRC, MSCA)
- Its high profile in publications, creative-practice outputs, public engagement and national/international scholarly associations among many staff
- The very high levels of commitment to university-wide service
- The Department structure with committees, roles and management clear and invokes member investment through participation and contribution.
- Its strong collaborations with external bodies (CMC, Kildare Co Co) with potential to expand.
- Its EDI awareness; particular strength in addressing gender equality.

## 6.3    Recommendations for Improvement

Provide a list of recommendations for improvement for the department, having reflected on those identified in the Self-Assessment Report and those that the Peer Review Group would like to make in addition to those made by the department.

The tables below categorise recommendations as being institutional/strategic or department level, in line with the guidance notes accompanying this template.

## Institutional/Strategic Recommendations

| Number | Recommendation | Additional PRG Comments |
|--------|----------------|-------------------------|
| S.1 | Oct 2016 Arts Strategy Committee Preliminary Report needs to be enacted, especially capital investment. | |
| S.2 | University demands on music department are not supported at an adequate level in budget or resources. | Extraordinary existing and future potential for dept contributions to the university in public-facing offerings. |
| S.3 | Subvention fees should be extended to music technology enrolments due to similarity to resource-intensive science/engineering laboratories. | |
| S.4 | Research and industry competitiveness is significantly impacted by lack of resources. | |
| S.5 | One-year leases of campus buildings prevent long-term planning. | |
| S.6 | Immediately: address access issues in Logic House and adjacent music department spaces, soundproofing and ventilation in practice rooms, and assessments of pre-fabs as fit for purpose. | |
| S.7 | Prioritise cultural quarter plans for campus, include professional performance spaces, Investment in Steinway grand piano. | |
| S.8 | Need clearer communication channels between management and department stakeholders, esp. Re plans for resources and facilities. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | More clarity on budgeting matters. More music dept contribution to space planning and to faculty-wide creative practice initiatives | |
| **S.9** | Provide office space/secure room for occasional staff who are present in the Department on a regular basis. | |
| **S.10** | Immediately: 0.5 executive administrative staff post to be filled | |
| **S.11** | Limited opportunity for promotion and lack of faculty/music department promotion to Assoc, Prof B, Prof A | |
| **S.12** | Labour-intensive teaching requirements of music discipline should be recognised and rewarded through institutional means (grants, promotion, etc) | |
| **S.13** | Systemic research bias demonstrated in RIS category of 'Other Publications' that encompass arts-based research. | |
| **S.14** | Research development office consider workshops, support sessions to develop awareness of funding opportunities, contact persons in RDO for music dept. | |
| **S.15** | Contract employees (non-permanent) have access to benefits and funds supporting research outputs. | |
| **S.16** | Facilitate regular and up-to-date liaison between university website and social media officers and technicians, with their counterparts in the Department, to enhance the outward image of both, and to strengthen the national and international profile of the Department. | |

| Number | Recommendation | |
|--------|---------------|---|
| S.17 | Timetabling prohibits cross-faculty student offerings. | |
| S.18 | Make Core portal more efficient for occasional staff payroll. | |

## Recommendations to the Department

| Number | Recommendation | Additional PRG Comments |
|--------|---------------|-------------------------|
| U.1 | Review departmental T&L and curriculum mission to reflect all four sub-disciplines of Music as identified in SAR.; ...addressing also the complementary mission of Music Technology as a distinct UG degree subject. | |
| U.2 | Refine the department strategy supporting department mission, esp re subject area development within department, aligning faculty work, resources and initiatives prioritised by the strategy. | |
| U.3 | Newest programmes and components in existing courses esp. in popular music/music theatre/music technology should be prioritised in resource allocation. | |
| U.4 | Devise by consensus an alternative to workload model to facilitate career development of all staff. | |
| U.5 | Recommend rationalisation of existing catalogue of modules offered by the music department. | |
| U.6 | Evaluate public-facing events and budget priorities in face of new programme offerings and increasingly diverse student cohort. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **U.7** | Faculty could be more strategic in time allocation for pastoral care for students by directing them to other available supports. | |
| **U.8** | Implement interim solutions to access issues, e.g., secure drop-box for assignments on ground floor of Logic House. | |
| **U.9** | Take advantage of postgraduates and undergraduates in entrepreneurship to assist in promotion, marketing and organisation of department events - paid or for academic credit. | |
| **U.10** | Leverage university scheduling/booking software (e.g., library, student union, Moodle) to alleviate admin responsibilities in manual scheduling. | |
| **U.11** | Evaluate open-source options for music technology software requirements. | |
| **U.12** | Improve communication between academic and admin staff, and provide opportunities for regular communications and interactions among and with tutors and other occasional staff. | |
| **U.13** | Capacity to develop collaborative research further, with units across arts and social sciences, and with national and international institutional and industry partners. | |
| **U.14** | Greater parity across research practice (individual work, collaborative work and PhD supervision) to create more sustainable research environment in the department. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **U.15** | Take more advantage of supports provided by the research development office. | |
| **U.16** | Formalised mentorship between new faculty and senior academics | |
| **U.17** | Front-load teaching to accommodate sabbatical leave with less stress on replacement resources. | |
| **U.18** | Develop link with private providers for popular/music theatre and music technology. Potential placement modules. Potential for sharing facilities, placements and return to accredit provider. | |
| **U.19** | Develop partnership with CMC to extend beyond composition and musicology (e.g. performance and music tech) and to expand offerings for UG students. | |
| **U.20** | Develop more professional collaborations with Kildare Co Council beyond Music Generation (composer-in-residence, professional performance opportunities) that enhance community interaction. | |

**APPENDIX A: MUSIC DEPARTMENT: PEER REVIEW GROUP ONLINE VISIT TIMETABLE**

| DAY 1 Monday 26th April 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Time** | **Description** | **Attending** |
| 14.00-14.30 | Convening of the Peer Review Group<br><br>• Briefing by Dr Teresa Lee, Director of Quality<br>• PRG agrees a Chair, and discusses the review<br>• Identification of any aspects requiring clarification or additional information | Peer Review Group<br>Dr Teresa Lee, Director of Quality |
| 14.30-15.00 | Peer Review Group meet to prepare for afternoon sessions | Peer Review Group |
| 15.00-15.15 | Break | |
| 15.15-16.15 | **VP Academic/Registrar & Faculty Dean**<br>Professor Aidan Mulkeen, VP Academic & Registrar<br>Professor Colin Graham, Faculty Dean | Peer Review Group<br>Professor Aidan Mulkeen<br>Professor Colin Graham |
| 16.15-16.30 | Break | |
| 16.30-17.30 | **Head of Department**<br>Dr Antonio Cascelli | Peer Review Group<br>Dr Antonio Cascelli |
| 17.30-18.00 | PRG debrief | Peer Review Group |

| DAY 2 Tuesday 27th April 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Time** | **Description** | **Attending** |
| 8:30- 9.00 | Peer Review Group meet to prepare for morning sessions | Peer Review Group |
| 9.00-10.00 | **Group meeting with all Department staff**<br>(Head of Department recused) | Peer Review Group<br>All Departmental Staff |
| 10.00-10.15 | Break | |
| 10.15-11.00 | **Academic Staff Group 1** | Peer Review Group<br>Dr Michael Palmese<br>Professor Victor Lazzarini<br>Dr Francesca Placanica<br>Dr Martin O'Leary<br>Professor Christopher Morris |
| 11.00-11.15 | Break | |

| 11.15-12.00 | **Administrative/Technical Staff** | Peer Review Group<br>Ms Kate Crofton<br>Ms Emily Cook<br>Mr Paul Keegan |
|---|---|---|
| 12.00-12.15 | Break | |
| 12.15 -13:00 | **Meet with other MU Staff**<br>Dr John McGinnity, Admissions Officer<br>Professor Tom O'Connor, Director Arts & Humanities Institute<br>Dr Niamh Ni Shiadhail, Graduate Studies<br>Ms Marie Murphy, Graduate Studies<br>Ms Rose Donovan, Academic Advisory | Peer Review Group<br>Dr John McGinnity<br>Professor Tom O'Connor<br>Dr Niamh Ni Shiadhail<br>Ms Marie Murphy<br>Ms Rose Donovan |
| 13.00-13.30 | PRG debrief | Peer Review Group |

| DAY 3 Wednesday 28th April 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|
| Time | Description | Attending |
| 8.30-9.00 | Peer Review Group meet and prepare for morning sessions | Peer Review Group |
| 9.00-9.45 | **Academic Staff Group 2** | Peer Review Group<br>Dr Adrian Scahill<br>Dr Ryan Molloy<br>Professor Fiona Palmer<br>Dr Laura Watson<br>Dr Iain McCurdy<br>Professor Lorraine Byrne Bodley<br>Dr John O'Keeffe |
| 9.45-10.00 | Break | |
| 10.00-10.45 | **Academic Staff Group 3 Tutors/Occasional** | Peer Review Group<br>Dr Fionnuala Moynihan<br>Mr Ivan McKenna<br>Mr Grant Ford<br>Ms Kaeylea Van Keith<br>Ms Marcella Barz<br>Dr Shane Byrne |
| 10.45-11.00 | Break | |
| 11.00-11.45 | **Undergraduate Students** | Number of students<br>7 Confirmed |
| 11.45-12.00 | Break | |
| 12.00-12.45 | **Postgraduate Students** | Number of students<br>5 Confirmed |
| 12.45-13.30 | PRG Debrief | |

| | DAY 4 Thursday 29ᵗʰ April 2021 | |
|---|---|---|
| Time | Description | Attending |
| 8.30-9.00 | Peer Review Group meet and prepare for morning sessions | Peer Review Group |
| 9.00-9.45 | **Meet with University Executive Members**<br>Alison Hood, Dean of Teaching & Learning<br>Gemma Irvine, VP Equality & Diversity<br>Ronan Farrell, Dean Faculty Science & Engineering | Peer Review Group<br>Dr Alison Hood<br>Dr Gemma Irvine<br>Professor Ronan Farrell |
| 9.45-10.00 | Break | |
| 10.00-10.15 | **External Stakeholder 1**<br>Ms Lucina Russell<br>Kildare County Council<br><br>MU is a partner with the Council in relation to education programmes with Music Generation Kildare | Peer Review Group<br>Ms Lucina Russell |
| 10.15-10.20 | Break | |
| 10.20-10.35 | **External Stakeholder 2**<br>Ms Susan Brodigan<br>Mr Keith Fennell<br>Contemporary Music Centre<br><br>CMC is a partner with the Digital Skills Module (MU623) for our MA programmes and they have connections with the composers in the Department | Peer Review Group<br>Mr Keith Fennell<br>Ms Susan Brodigan |
| 10.35.-10.40 | Break | |
| 10.40-10.55 | **External Stakeholder 3**<br>Dr Brian Carthy<br>Sound Training College<br><br>Former PhD student, he is also a research partner on several projects | Peer Review Group<br>Dr Brian Carty |
| 10.55-11.15 | Break | |
| 11.15-13.00 | PRG begin preliminary drafting of commendations and key recommendations | Peer Review Group |

| DAY 5 Friday 30th April 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Time** | **Description** | **Attending** |
| 8.30-9:00 | Peer Review Group Meet | Peer Review Group |
| 9.00-9.30 | **Head of Department**<br>Final clarifications | Peer Review Group<br>Dr Antonio Cascelli |
| 9.30-12.30 | PRG finalise draft of commendations and recommendations | Peer Review Group |
| 12.30-1.30 | **PRG presentation to all Departmental staff**<br>Close off and thanks to PRG: Director of Quality & Faculty Dean | Peer Review Group<br>All Departmental Staff<br>Dr Teresa Lee<br>Professor Colin Graham |