Ollscoil Mhá Nuad

Maynooth University

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND ASSURANCE

PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT

SCHOOL OF MODERN LANGUAGES LITERATURES AND CULTURES

ACADEMIC YEAR 2021/22

Date: January 2022

Contents

1. Introduction

The review took place in the week of November 15-19, 2021, in virtual format. The PRG had first met in the previous week. All members had had the opportunity to read the School's Self-Assessment Report, as well as the University's Strategic Plan 2018-22 and Framework for Quality Assurance and Enhancement. The School of Modern Languages, Literatures and Cultures was established in 2010, bringing together three existing language departments: French, German and Spanish. A new language section in Chinese Studies was added in 2011. A further section, English for Academic Purposes, was incorporated into the School in 2015. This is the first review of the School since its foundation.

2. Peer Review Group Members

Name	Affiliation	Role
Professor Michael Brophy	University College Dublin	External Reviewer
Professor Nicola McLelland	University of Nottingham	External Reviewer (and Chair of the PRG)
Professor Emeritus Bill Richardson	NUI Galway	External Reviewer
Dr Julian Ward	University of Edinburgh	External Reviewer
Professor Donal O'Neill	Maynooth University	Internal Reviewer
Dr Fiona Walsh	Maynooth University	Internal Reviewer

3. Timetable of the site visit

- The timetable for the visit is provided as an appendix.

Staff of the Quality Office were extremely efficient and helpful in their communication with members of the PRG, before, during and after the visit, including assistance with technical matters. Careful consideration was given to all the details of the process, which was outlined with great clarity to the panel. Late changes requested to the timetable were well-managed, and the timetable was clear. However, the PRG has some points that it considers worthy of review:

- With diaries blocked out for "mornings" or "afternoons", to discover this meant in practice 2pm to 6pm, and then 8.30am to 1.45 was unsatisfactory and difficult to manage.

- Meetings before 9am and after 5pm are unacceptable in EDI terms, and certainly without prior discussion. This would not have been acceptable in at least two of our home institutions.

The panel appreciated the clear effort at inclusivity, but:

- The whole-school meeting was considered to be unnecessary, and the panel doubts the value of attempting to ensure that the PRG gets to meet *all* the staff of the School, which appeared to be one of the objectives of the process.
- Some groupings seemed excessively small, e.g. meeting Chinese subject lead separately from the only other Chinese academic, and separately again from Confucius Institute tutors. Organisation of interviews along these lines seemed to constitute an uneconomical use of time. One option might have been to have representatives from groupings brought together in a single meeting.
- Some group meetings involved colleagues who had little to do with each other (HR, Admissions, Dean of T&L). In future, it might be useful to consider having separate smaller meetings for such individuals.

4. Peer Review Methodology

4.1   Site Visit

As stated above, the review took place in virtual format. Beyond the numerous meetings with academic and administrative staff, undergraduate and postgraduate students, and internal and external stakeholders, requests for additional documents and images were actioned promptly and efficiently, allowing the PRG a detailed overview of all areas pertinent to the review.

4.2   Preparation of the Peer Review Group Report

At the end of the (virtual) site visit, the PRG group met to discuss the report, in particular commendations and recommendations. Each member took responsibility for drafting particular sections. The draft was then discussed and amended; a revised draft was circulated for comment by the Chair.

5. Overall Assessment

5.1   Summary Assessment of the Department

A clear strength is the collegiate atmosphere and considerable commitment of staff, which came across clearly in our meetings with staff and were also reflected in high levels of student satisfaction evidenced in the PRG's meetings with students.

A weakness is research, both as measured in productivity and funding, and in the structured support for all colleagues to develop their research portfolio (notwithstanding the notable achievements of a few individuals). A step change is arguably needed here.

There is an opportunity for the School to expand the numbers of students taking its courses, with certain areas such as Applied Linguistics already identified. There is also an opportunity for the School to take account in its strategic planning of the future importance of other languages such as Polish and Lithuanian to secondary school teaching.

There is an external threat to the School in the form of a downward trend in numbers of students taking languages at national level, which is related to recent changes in the requirements for entry onto Arts programmes in Ireland, including the removal of a foreign language requirement.

5.2   Self-Assessment Report

The Self-Assessment Report is very detailed and comprehensive, and largely very readable.

Research data could have been more clearly presented, for example grant submission and success rates; publication data amalgamated figures from current and former staff, making it hard to judge the overall level of research engagement among current staff.

The section on teaching and learning was primarily descriptive of current staff and student experience; a strategic voice was difficult to discern.

The Report was arguably rather long. In other institutions a 20-page limit is enforced (plus data). This document was 93 pages + 70 pages of appendices.

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

6.1   Overview

- **Department governance and organisation**

The School structure seems broadly to have been a success, resulting in harmonizing of processes and student experiences, opportunities to share good practice (e.g. via the new regular teaching pedagogy workshops), and, in some cases, chances to co-operate in teaching and research. The addition of a School Research Committee was surely long overdue.

- **Teaching, learning, assessment and student feedback**

We support the "areas for consideration moving forward" identified in the Self-Assessment Report, in particular the explicit articulation not only of module but also programme-level outcomes, and how these relate to employability. There is an absence of an explicit teaching and learning strategy – developing this will help embed these "areas for consideration" in future practice in the School.

The lack of a unified process for gathering student feedback was surprising. This appears to be a University-level decision, and it is good to see the School's module questionnaire for student feedback.

- **Research activities and outputs**

The presentation of data about research productivity makes it hard to assess the level of research activity across the School (e.g. because of the inclusion of retired staff in output figures). However, it is clear that, with some exceptions, there are overall relatively low expectations not just about how much research is possible – given other pressures – but also how much it is desirable. The number of outputs is relatively low and patchy; and grant capture is low.

Awareness of funding opportunities and of their strategic importance seems low, even among colleagues who would, on the face of it, be competitive. These relatively low expectations are at odds with expectations about research and impact in the promotions process.

The establishment of a School Research Committee is a positive step toward strengthening a research culture, as is the establishment of the School's Research Incentivisation Fund. However, we have several recommendations to help build a culture of research excellence.

- **Resourcing and facilities**

The current resources and facilities of the School are merely adequate and are in need of improvement and updating, particularly in relation to certain aspects of staffing but also in relation to technical equipment and teaching spaces. The staff must plan for sudden losses of technical capacity in their teaching rooms, which is increasing their workloads and reducing some learning opportunities for the students e.g. oral/aural.

- I**nternal and external engagement**

The PRG was pleased to note the positive, open and productive relationship between the Teaching Council of Ireland and the School and their innovation in teaching learning; the Council praised the School in relation to new flexible programmes to increase language teacher supply.

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

A key recommendation was the formation of a School. This has now taken place.

6.2 Commendations

6.2.1 The PRG commends the school for a very positive and constructive engagement with the review process. The detailed self-assessment report produced by the School, complemented by open and frank staff engagement with the PRG during its virtual visit, bears witness to a solid process of self-reflection embedded in the culture of the School.

6.2.2   The PRG commends both the collegial approach of all staff and the positive working environment that currently exists within the school. The School demonstrates high levels of collegiality and camaraderie within and across all its units, with staff keen to further collaboration and nurture interdisciplinary synergies. Within the individual subject areas, junior staff members, both tutors and lecturers, feel they are supported by senior staff members.

6.2.3   The PRG commends all involved for a successful transition from individual departments to a coherent well-functioning School of Modern Languages, Literatures and Cultures.

6.2.4   The School has been successful in harmonising processes across subjects and eliminating unnecessary duplication that may have occurred under the old structure.

6.2.5   The PRG commends the commitment to teaching and pedagogical development on the part of all staff within the school.

6.2.6   Students at all levels in the school viewed academic staff as being open, friendly and approachable and committed to teaching.

6.2.7   The PRG was impressed by the success of members of the school in securing national teaching hero awards, and this success was also acknowledged by the university executive.

6.2.8   The review group commend the administrative and technical staff within the school for managing the transition to the new school. The administrators are highly efficient and professional. Students and tutors pointed out that members of the administrative staff were often considered the go-to person when academic issues or difficulties arose. The warm and helpful reception provided by the administrative staff in these instances was greatly appreciated.

6.2.9   The administrative staff have also successfully managed the increased workload that has been placed on administrative staff in academic departments in recent years.

6.2.10   We commend the existing breadth of the SMLLC (French, German [with a module in Dutch], Spanish [modules in Portuguese and Catalan], Chinese and EAP), as well as the creative development of new programmes and modules in response to opportunities (e.g Business with a language).

6.3   Recommendations for Improvement

Institutional/Strategic Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
	Staffing and staff development	
I.1	Improve standards (transparency and timeliness) of communication between HR and the Head of School, and between HR and individual colleagues.	There is a strong sense of dissatisfaction with the level of support from HR. This is most keenly felt among junior staff, some of whom spoke of having been treated disrespectfully by HR.
I.2	Review the staffing structure and plan staffing strategically for the School.	Given evidence of imbalance in distribution of senior-grade staff across the various sections of the School, review the staffing structure and plan staffing strategically to ensure sufficient academic leadership in all areas of the School. There is a sense that there is a dearth of academic leadership in certain sections due to a lack of staff at professorial level. There is a need to ensure sufficient levels of senior staff in the various languages

I.3	A piece of work must be undertaken to review colleagues' contracts to ensure that colleagues undertaking similar work are on comparable contracts, especially for tutor staff. Identify relevant anomalies that exist among staff and rectify these systematically (not ad hoc).	Contractual differences between staff undertaking similar work were repeatedly mentioned as a source of dissatisfaction and low morale.
I.4	Ensure a transparent route of promotion is available from tutor to senior tutor.	The PRG probed the assertion that this route already exists and was not able to satisfy itself that one does. This is a missed opportunity – in languages in particular – to allow skilled staff to take on greater leadership (e.g. in module convening) to free up other academic staff members to develop their leadership in research. The lack of opportunity for career progression for language teaching staff is out of step with the sector, at least in England, and creates a serious vulnerability for the School. There is a danger in the current situation that staff could become demoralised over time, leading to an adverse impact on the School's culture.
I.5	Review promotion criteria for academic staff to ensure that they are articulated so as to acknowledge specificities of Arts and Humanities research outputs, funding, and impact.	The lack of explicit acknowledgement of disciplinary differences may constitute a structural disadvantaging of colleagues in Arts and Humanities.
I.6	Appropriate rates of reimbursement should be applied for the correction and assessment of language courses, these to be	

		applied in a fair and equitable manner across the range of staff, including tutorial staff	
I.7		There is a need for the university to provide more opportunities for career development and promotion opportunities for administrative staff in academic units.	Some staff described having been stuck at a particular level for several years, with no chance of applying for promotion
		Resourcing and facilities	
I.8		University and Faculty should work with the School to improve the quality of the teaching-spaces that are made available for the teaching of language courses, where traditional lecture-halls are often not appropriate and where classrooms with flexible seating arrangements are often required.	
I.9		Faculty to consider establishing equipment/infrastructure committee.	
I.10		A plan and specific timetable of quality control checks of the IT and technical equipment used for teaching and learning is required. This should include working with IT services to devise and implement the plan.	Many incidences of faulty or slow equipment have resulted in reduced teaching time or the inability to run certain classes.
		Teaching and learning	
I.11		The University should articulate clear and strong support for blended-learning modules and should facilitate the provision	

	of such modules where appropriate, with special consideration given to postgraduate level.	
I.12	Consider greater career development opportunities for language teaching staff on a teaching-and-curriculum leadership track (in line with other institutions) to provide leadership in teaching, especially in language pedagogy, freeing up those staff with research as part of their role profile to spend more time on research.	Some staff are keen to take on leadership (though not all).
	Research outputs and activities	
I.13	Make membership of the Arts & Humanities Institute automatic for all colleagues whose research is part of their role profile.	
I.14	Ensure funding opportunities available through the Arts & Humanities Institute are transparently and regularly advertised, and are assessed according to clear criteria. Require formal application for these internal funding opportunities, as useful training in the art of writing external applications.	
I.15	Consider an annual structured programme of Research Leadership Training and/or research mentorship schemes (cross-School or even cross-Faculty), perhaps via the Arts & Humanities Institute, which is well placed to offer strategic research leadership	

I.16	Consider instituting structured 1:1 annual research conversations (conducted by a group of senior colleagues) with all colleagues for whom research is part of their role profile.	
I.17	Consider (if not already in place) internal peer review for funding applications (this also raises awareness among the peer reviewers).	
I.18	In particular, consider structured research training support schemes for early career researchers and mid-career researchers.	
I.19	In the (possible) absence of a sufficient number of research leaders, consider establishing guided "peer mentoring" among research peers.	
I.20	Faculty/University to review existing Sabbatical arrangements to facilitate greater uptake, and undertake an Equality Impact Assessment	

Recommendations to the Department / School

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
	Resourcing and facilities	
S.1	School to discuss (with library) changes or increases in resources required in the library for T&L and research, and a plan to achieve this on an ongoing basis	
	School governance and organisation	
S.2	In the absence of an established workload allocation model at University level, the School should consider devising its own model to ensure equitable, open and transparent distribution of teaching and administrative workloads across all units. Beyond the number of teaching hours per week, the model should allow inclusion of such details as coordination, class size, and number and type of assessments (albeit with the assumption that modules with the same credits have same assessment load). PhD supervision could also be integrated. A common allocation for research should be considered, with additional weightings for externally funded research. Models already adopted elsewhere in the University or used in other institutions might be helpful in this respect. The request for such a model was reiterated by staff during the visit days.	

S.3	In the interim, workload (teaching and admin) allocations within sections should be made transparent.	
S.4	The role of Deputy Head of School, introduced in the School in December 2020 as a precautionary measure during the Covid-19 pandemic but now set to be extended beyond the health crisis, needs to be properly defined, either at School or University level as most appropriate, and integrated into School structures.	
S.5	All University and School policies and procedures should be made centrally available to staff in the School. Development of a regularly updated staff folder / resource in a central location (Teams/Onedrive/Sharepoint as apporopriate) accessible to all staff would be beneficial in this regard.	
S.6	The roles and relationship of the School Executive and School Committee should be reviewed to improve the efficacy and transparency of the decision-making process, with robust lines of communication maintained throughout the School to build collective understanding and trust in that process. The relationship between School Subcommittees (Teaching and Learning/Research/Postgraduate Education) and the School Executive should also be reviewed. We recommend the inclusion of the Chairs of these Subcommittees on the Executive to help firm up, and initiate School discussion of, Executive proposals prior to their presentation at the School Committee. Broadening Executive membership and the consultative process should aim	

	to reduce the length and agenda load of individual School Committee meetings. This would allow the Head of School (who can attend Subcommittees ex officio but should not be running them) to delegate strategy and leadership responsibilities in key areas.	
S.7	Consider the method by which chairs of committees are nominated. Key roles (chairs of sub-committees, deputy head of school) should be advertised with an explicit role profile, and written expressions of interest invited. As far as practicable, an effort should be made to ensure representation of all School sections across key roles.	
	Teaching and learning	
S.8	The PRG recommends that the SMLLC develop a Teaching and Learning Strategy for the School as a whole, and articulate it in written form. This would ideally be aligned with the overall teaching and learning strategy of the University, to the extent that such a strategy exists or can be determined.	This would address issues such as: priority areas of teaching-learning for further development, possible additional languages to be added to the suite of languages offered in the long term, the criteria to be applied when assessing proposals for new modules (including aspects such as blended learning, embedding enhancement of graduates' employability, skills profile, etc.).
S.9	The School should continue to harmonise teaching across the languages where this is feasible, to ensure that equivalent student effort is required for equivalent credits in cognate areas of expertise and competence, such as in the oral/aural skills	

	area, in written composition or in the learning of literary and cultural content	
S.10	Where language-teaching specialists are available to take over and coordinate complete modules, identify ways in which this can be allowed to happen, including opening up further opportunities for such work to be undertaken by relevant and well-qualified tutor staff, by this means ensuring that academic staff with research as part of their role profile have more time for research.	
S.11	The School should consolidate steps recently taken to establish regular seminars on teaching practice by making a concerted effort to secure further resources to support and expand the initiative, including University resources (funding; advice; expertise).	
S.12	The School should focus the effort to increase its student numbers on the expansion of its *undergraduate* student population, above all.	Given the tight market at postgraduate level, and the existing workload pressures on staff, resources and energy are better spent on building on existing successes at undergraduate level, rather than seeking to resource postgraduate courses with very low student uptake and a small potential market.
S.13	The School should focus strategic effort at postgraduate level on numerically viable courses (which might include, for example, Applied Linguistics). Consider Master by Research programmes to accommodate small numbers of 1-year Masters programmes.	

S.14	The School and Faculty should examine the feasibility of offering additional timetabled groups for language courses on the Arts programme, to facilitate students from a greater variety of disciplines who would be interested in studying a combination of subjects that is not currently feasible.	The PRG noted that the gradual expansion of combinations is already underway, to continue incrementally.
S.15	Ensure that opportunities are made available for the ongoing training and development of teaching staff at all levels, including both academics of all grades and tutorial staff: the University to ensure that favourable consideration is given, where possible, to requests from staff for access to training courses, degree programmes, etc. where these enhance the profile of the staff member in a way that responds both to the professional expertise of the person in question and to their general educational profile.	
S.16	In order to ensure continuity of excellence in the provision of courses to students, in making the case for staffing priorities to the University, the School should attend to the relative strengths and weaknesses of staffing levels in the various sections within the School, so that there is equitable distribution of senior posts providing leadership in the sections.	
	Research activities and outputs	
S.17	Develop the role of the School Research Committee to foster and enhance an expectation and culture of research among all	

	academics in the school (unless on an explicitly teaching-focussed track).	
S.18	Expand membership of the School Executive to include the Chair of the Research committee ex officio, with Research as a standing item. (See also under School governance and organisation above)	
S.19	Make use of dedicated sessions at Away Days, strategy days, or other similar events to continue to build knowledge and expertise in research strategy, especially awareness of expectations of research funding and how to do it. Continue and reprise "demystifying" whole-school sessions on funding opportunities, research planning, and strategy.	
S.20	Consider open call (no deadline) for the Research Incentivization Fund to reduce barriers to take-up.	
S.21	Consider in-School research-leave rota or other structured interventions in workload to free up research time, without salary sacrifice (this would mean higher workloads for colleagues not on leave). See separate recommendation re. a workload model.	
S.22	Ensure PGR students receive explicit feedback from their annual review and ensure standard review procedures across the School.	

APPENDIX 1: SCHOOL OF MODERN LANGUAGES LITERATURES AND CULTURES: PEER REVIEW GROUP ONLINE VISIT TIMETABLE

DAY 1 Monday 15th November 2021			
Time	**Description**		**Attending**
14.00-14.30	Convening of the Peer Review Group • Briefing by Dr Teresa Lee, Director of Quality • PRG agrees a Chair, and discusses the review • Identification of any aspects requiring clarification or additional information		Peer Review Group 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	**Vice President Academic/Registrar and Faculty Dean** Professor Aidan Mulkeen Professor Colin Graham		Peer Review Group Professor Aidan Mulkeen Professor Colin Graham
16.15-16.30	Break		
16.30-17.30	**Head of School** Professor Valerie Heffernan		Peer Review Group Professor Valerie Heffernan
17.30-18.00	PRG debrief		Peer Review Group

DAY 2 Tuesday 16th November 2021				
Time	**Description**		**Attending**	
8:30- 9.00	Peer Review Group meet to prepare for morning sessions		Peer Review Group	
9.00-9.40	**Meet Deputy Head of School** Dr Catherine Leen		Peer Review Group Dr Catherine Leen	
9.40-9.45	Break			
9.45-10.15	**(A) Subject Leader/French** Dr Julie Rodgers	**(B) Subject Leader/German** Dr Linda Shortt	(A) Michael Bill Fiona	(B) Nicola Julian
10.15-10.20	Break			
10.20-10.50	**(A) Subject Leader/Spanish & Latin American** Dr David Conlon	**(B) Subject Leader/Chinese** Dr Yinya Liu	(A) Michael Bill Fiona	(B) Nicola Julian

External Reviewers: Professor Michael Brophy, UCD, Professor Nicola McLelland, University of Nottingham, Professor Emeritus Bill Richardson, NUIG, Dr Julian Ward, University of Edinburgh

Internal Reviewers: Professor Donal O'Neill, Economics Department, Dr Fiona Walsh, Biology Department

Time	Description			Attending		
10.50-11.00	Break			Peer Review Group		
11.00-12.00	**Meet all School Staff** (Head of School, Deputy Head and Subject Leaders recused)			Peer Review Group All School Staff		
12.00-12.15	Break			Peer Review Group		
12.15-13.00	**(A) Academic Staff Group 1** Spanish & Latin American Dr Mercedes Carbayo-Abengozar Dr Ana DePrada Perez Dr David García León	**(B) Academic Staff Group 2** German Dr Jeff Morrison Dr Cordula Boecking Dr Britta Jung		(A) Michael Bill Fiona	(B) Nicola Julian Donal	
13.00-13.30	PRG debrief			Peer Review Group		

DAY 3 Wednesday 17th November 2021

Time	Description			Attending		
8.30-9.00	Peer Review Group meet and prepare for morning sessions			Peer Review Group		
9.00-9.45	**(A) Academic Staff Group 3** French Dr Francesca Counihan Dr Elyse Ritchey Professor Ruth Whelan	**(B) Academic Staff Group 4** Chinese Dr Zhouxiang Lu		(A) Michael Bill Fiona	(B) Nicola Julian Donal	
9.45-10.00	**Break**					
10.00-10.30	**(A) Postgraduate Students Taught** 5 Confirmed	**(B)Postgraduate Students Research** 5 Confirmed	**(C) Undergraduate Students Chinese** 2 Confirmed	(A) Michael Fiona	(B) Nicola Donal	(C) Julian Bill
10.30-10.45	Break					
10.45-11.15	**(A) Undergraduate Students French** 4 Confirmed	**(B) Undergraduate Students German** 5 Confirmed		(A) Michael Bill Fiona	(B) Nicola Donal	
11.15-11.20	Break					
11.20-11.50	**(A)Undergrad Students Spanish & Latin American** 4 Confirmed	11.20-11.35	**(B) Individual** meeting (anonymized)	(A) Michael Bill Fiona	(B) Nicola Donal	

External Reviewers: Professor Michael Brophy, UCD, Professor Nicola McLelland, University of Nottingham, Professor Emeritus Bill Richardson, NUIG, Dr Julian Ward, University of Edinburgh

Internal Reviewers: Professor Donal O'Neill, Economics Department, Dr Fiona Walsh, Biology Department

11.50-12.00	Break			
12.00-12.40	**(A)Academic Staff Group 5 Tutors Spanish & Latin American** Dr Daniel de Zubía Fernández Ms Anna Laribal Abante Ms Carolina Valles Ms Soila López de Tynan Mr Vitor Neves Fernandes Ms Anna Albiol Esquer Mr Javier Álvares Caballero Ms Laoise Sutton Ms Antonia Flores	**(B)Administrative/Technical Staff** Ms Sue Crofton Ms Fiona Cummins Ms Deirdre Marshall Ms Ann-Marie Thomas Mr Éamann Ó hÉigeartaigh	(A) Nicola Bill Fiona	(B) Michael Julian Donal
12.40-12.45	Break			
12.45-13.15	**(A) Academic Staff Group 6 Tutors French** Ms Brigitte McNeely Ms Sandrine Fargeat-Kells	**(B)Academic Staff Group 7 Tutors German** Ms Roos Kreeft Ms Anna Niekchen Ms Lisa Winter	(A) Michael Bill Fiona	(B) Nicola Julian Donal
13.15-13.45	PRG Debrief		Peer Review Group	

DAY 4 Thursday 18th November 2021

Time	Description	Attending
8.30-9.00	Peer Review Group meet and prepare for morning sessions	Peer Review Group
9.00-9.30	**Academic Staff Group 8 Tutors EAP** Mr Mark Hennessy Ms Ivanka Marinova	Peer Review Group
9.30-9.45	**External Stakeholder 1** Ms Brid Murphy Teaching Council of Ireland	Peer Review Group
9.45-10.15	**Meet with University Executive Members/Other Members** Dr Alison Hood, Dean Teaching & Learning Ms Rosaleen McCarthy, Director of HR Mr John McGinnity, Director of Admissions	Peer Review Group
10.15-10.30	Break	
10.30-11.15	**Meet with other MU Staff** Professor Tom O'Connor, Director Arts & Humanities Institute Dr Anne O'Brien, Head of Media Studies Department Mr Patrick Boyle/Research Development Office	Peer Review Group

External Reviewers: Professor Michael Brophy, UCD, Professor Nicola McLelland, University of Nottingham, Professor Emeritus Bill Richardson, NUIG, Dr Julian Ward, University of Edinburgh

Internal Reviewers: Professor Donal O'Neill, Economics Department, Dr Fiona Walsh, Biology Department

11.15-11.30	Break	
11.30-12.00	**(B)Academic Staff Group 9 Tutors Chinese** Ms Sixi Liu Ms Xinan Sun Ms Fengling Wang Ms Meishan Zhang	Nicola Julian Donal
11.45-12.00	Break	
12.00-13.30	PRG begin preliminary drafting of commendations and key recommendations	Peer Review Group Dr Teresa Lee

DAY 5 Friday 19th November 2021		
Time	**Description**	**Attending**
8.30-9:00	Peer Review Group Meet	Peer Review Group
9.00-9.30	**Head of School for any final clarifications (if required)** Professor Valerie Heffernan	Peer Review Group
9.30-12.30	PRG finalise draft of commendations and recommendations	Peer Review Group
12.30-1.30	**PRG presentation to all School staff** Close off and thanks to PRG: Director of Quality & Faculty Dean	Peer Review Group All School Staff Dr Teresa Lee Professor Colin Graham

External Reviewers: Professor Michael Brophy, UCD, Professor Nicola McLelland, University of Nottingham, Professor Emeritus Bill Richardson, NUIG, Dr Julian Ward, University of Edinburgh

Internal Reviewers: Professor Donal O'Neill, Economics Department, Dr Fiona Walsh, Biology Department