Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement Programme for Academic Units

2010

Peer Review Group Report
for the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Professor Pól Ó Dochartaigh, Dean, Faculty of Arts, University of Ulster (Chair)
Professor Nicholas Rees, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Liverpool Hope University
Ms Teresa Casserly, Senior Consultant and Manager, Institute of Public Administration
Dr Noel Murphy, Head of School of Electronic Engineering, DCU
Ms Pauline Mooney, Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science & Health, DCU (Rapporteur)

November 2010

Introduction

This Quality review has been conducted in accordance with a framework model developed and agreed through the Irish Universities Association Quality Committee and complies with the provisions of Section 35 of the Universities Act (1997). The model consists of a number of basic steps.

1. An internal team in the Unit being reviewed completes a detailed self-assessment report (SAR). It should be noted that this document is confidential to the Unit and to the Review Panel and to senior officers of the University.
2. This report is sent to a team of peer assessors, the Peer Review Group (PRG) – composed of members from outside DCU and from other areas of DCU – who then visit the Unit and conduct discussions with a range of staff, students and other stakeholders.
3. The PRG then writes its own report. The Unit is given the chance to correct possible factual errors before the Peer Group Report (PGR) is finalised.
4. The Unit produces a draft Quality Improvement Plan (QuIP) in response to the various issues and findings of the SAR and PGR Reports.
5. The PGR and the Unit draft QuIP are considered by the Quality Promotion Committee.
6. The draft QuIP is discussed in a meeting between the Unit, members of the Peer Group, the Director of Quality Promotion and Senior Management. The University's responses are written into the QuIP, and the result is the finalised QuIP.
7. A summary of the PRG Report, the QuIP and the Executive Response is sent to the Governing Authority of the University, who will approve publication in a manner that they see fit.

    This document is the report referred to in Step 3 above

Peer Review Group Report

1. Faculty

<u>Location of the Unit</u>

The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences is comprised of five Schools: the School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies (SALIS), the School of Communications, the School of Education Studies, Fiontar, and the School of Law and Government. The Faculty also hosts a number of Research Centres and groups, including the Centre for Translation and Textual Studies, the Centre for International Studies, and the Centre for Society Information and Media, as well as the Institute for Ethics. The Faculty also has an administrative team which supports the academic activities of the Faculty.

Each of the above units is located within the Henry Grattan building, one of the first buildings on the DCU campus to be built on the foundation of the National Institute for Higher Education. The Faculty is not the sole occupant of the building and the allocation of space within the building is determined by the University's Space Planning and Management Group. Allocated Faculty space is managed by the Dean, with support from the Faculty Manager and in consultation with Heads of School. Currently, the Faculty occupies approximately 3,500 square metres within the Henry Grattan, which compares with approximately 3,200 square meters in 2005. The growth in the Faculty's space envelope during this period is attributable to the need to accommodate growth in staff and student numbers and to a concerted drive on the part of the Faculty to consolidate the location of its constituent units which were previously dispersed between the Henry Grattan and four other buildings on the DCU campus. Not only the quantity, but also the quality of Faculty space within the Henry Grattan building has improved considerably during the period since 2005, as the Faculty and University have engaged in a sustained programme of refurbishment. Notwithstanding the improvements made to date, several areas within the Henry Grattan that are occupied by the Faculty remain in need of upgrade. It should be noted, that while the Faculty's student body has increased by 36% and its staff complement has increased by 16%, its space envelope has increased by only 9.4%. The challenges which the Faculty's significant growth to date, and potential for growth in the future, present in terms of space management are dealt with in more detail in section 4.3.1 below.

The Faculty is a key point of interface between DCU and its Linked Colleges. Linkage arrangements are in place between DCU and St. Patrick's College, Drumcondra, All Hallows College, and Mater Dei Institute of Education. Each of these Colleges has research and teaching interests that are close to those of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and, in the case of Mater Dei and All Hallows College, their relationships with DCU are managed via the Faculty. Each of these three Linked Colleges is an independent institution located on its own campus within a two mile radius of DCU.

<u>Staff</u>

Faculty staffing numbers have increased from 128 to 149 in the five year period from 2005 to 2010. This growth in full-time staff numbers is reflective of, but has not kept pace with, a concomitant growth in student numbers. The number of teaching hours delivered by part-time staff within the Faculty decreased by about one third during this period.

Table 1 and Table 2 below show the number of staff at each grade in the Faculty in 2005/2006, and in 2009/2010, and the number of part-time teaching hours used by the Faculty in each of those years.

Table 1 Faculty Staff Numbers 2005-2006

Grade	Comms	Ed Studies	Fiontar	Law & Govt	SALIS	Ethics	Faculty	Total
Professor	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Assoc Prof	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	4
Snr Lecturer	3	1	2	4	6	0	0	16
Lecturer	17	9	5	10	32	0	0	73
Technical	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Admin	1	1	1	1	2	0	7	13
Research	2	0	0	8	5	0	0	15
Total staff	30	11	8	24	47	0	8	128
Part-time teaching hours	2466	2619	624	1139	1261	0	0	8109

Note: Research staff numbers for Faculty UDRCs and FIONTAR only. Institute of Ethics first staffed in 2008/2009.

Table 2 Faculty Staff Numbers 2009-2010

Grade	Comms	Ed Studies	Fiontar	Law & Govt	SALIS	Ethics	Faculty	Total
Professor	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	7
Assoc Prof	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
Snr Lecturer	3	2	2	4	7	0	0	18
Lecturer	18	17	3	18	27	0	1	84
Technical	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Admin	1	2	1	1	2	1	8	16
Research	1	0	8	6	2	0	0	17
Total staff	30	23	14	30	40	2	10	149
Part-time teaching hours	2058	1671	347	485	770	0	0	5331

Note: Research staff numbers are those reported from Faculty UDRCs and FIONTAR only.

<u>Product / Processes</u>

The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences is both an administrative and an academic unit. Following the establishment of a devolved executive faculty structure within DCU in 2003/04, the Faculty assumed responsibility for:

- the overall strategic management and co-ordination of teaching and research activities within its constituent Schools and Research Centres and
- the management of its own resources, in terms of budgeting, finance and staffing.

These functions are discharged by the Executive Dean with the support of the Faculty Board, which comprises the Executive Dean, Associate Dean for Learning Innovation, Associate Dean for Research, the Heads of School and the Faculty Manager.   The Associate Deans for Learning Innovation and for Research assist the Executive Dean and the Faculty Board in implementing the Faculty Strategy. Each chairs a Faculty-wide committee in their respective areas, the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee (FTLC) and the Faculty Research Committee (FRC), on which Schools and students, and, in the case of FRC, Research Centres, are represented. The Faculty Manager manages the Faculty administrative resources and has responsibility for assisting the Dean with resourcing issues, including budgetary planning and management, and space allocation.

The Schools within the Faculty are responsible for planning and managing their own activities, within the budgetary, strategic and administrative framework of the Faculty. The Schools within the Faculty contribute to the Faculty through membership of the various Faculty committees. The Schools remain the "academic homes" of programmes and research activities, unless these have been explicitly defined as "inter-school" or "Faculty".

The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences currently delivers 18 Undergraduate Programmes, and 24 Postgraduate Programmes, including 2 Foundation Certificates for international students, as detailed in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Taught Programmes

School	Undergraduate	Postgraduate Taught
Applied Language & Intercultural Studies (SALIS)	BA in International Business & Languages - French/German/Spanish/ Chinese/ Japanese (joint programme with DCU Business School) BA in Applied Language & Intercultural Studies BA Languages for International Communication (English) International Foundation Certificate	Graduate Diploma in Applied Language & Intercultural Studies MA in Comparative Literature MA in Intercultural Studies MA in Translation Studies MA in Sexuality Studies (joint programme with Faculty of Science & Health) Pre-Masters International Foundation Programme
Communications	BA in Communication Studies BA in Journalism BSc in Multimedia BA Media Production Management (with Ballyfermot College of Further Education)	MA in Journalism MA in Political & Public Communication MA in International Communication MA in International Journalism Studies MSc in Multimedia MSc in Science Communication MA in Film & Television Studies
Education Studies	BSc in Education & Training Foundation Programme in Education & Training BSc in Science Education (joint programme with Faculty of Science & Health) BSc in Physical Education with Biology (joint programme with Faculty of Science & Health)	Graduate Diploma in Education MSc in Education & Training Management (Leadership strand/e Learning strand) MSc in Guidance & Counselling Professional Doctorate in Education
Faculty Programmes	BA in Contemporary Culture & Society	MA in Ethics (with Mater Dei Institute of Education)
FIONTAR	BA Gnó agus Gaeilge/BA Business & Irish BA Gaeilge agus Iriseoireacht/BA Irish & Journalism	MA sa Chleachtas Dátheangach/MA in Bilingual Practice MSc i nGnó agus i dTeicneolaíocht an Eolais/MSc in Business & Information Technology
Law and Government	Bachelor of Civil Law (Law & Society); BA in Economics, Politics & Law (joint programme with DCU Business School) BA in International Relations	MA in Development MA in International Relations MA in International Security & Conflict Studies Structured PhD Programme (GREP) in Politics & International Relations
Total number of programmes	18	24

Training and supervision is also provided to 152 postgraduate research students. There has been a sharp increase in the Faculty's overall student numbers, which grew from 2,039 in 2005/2006 to 2,772 in 2009/2010. The Faculty now constitutes about 24% of the entire student body at DCU. There has been an especially notable increase in the number of postgraduate research students within the Faculty, with the overall numbers more than doubling in that period. The growth in the Faculty's student body from 2005 to 2010 is presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4 Faculty Student Numbers 2005-2010

Undergraduate Students *						
Academic Year	**Comms**	**Ed Studies**	**Fiontar**	**Law & Govt**	**SALIS**	**Faculty**	**Total**
2005/2006	608	188	42	206	264	143	1451
2006/2007	623	260	48	285	280	147	1643
2007/2008	621	276	56	314	261	236	1764
2008/2009	590	292	54	337	268	303	1844
2009/2010	566	313	69	392	265	311	1916
Postgraduate Taught Students*						
Academic Year	**Comms**	**Ed Studies**	**Fiontar**	**Law & Govt**	**SALIS**	**Faculty**	**Total**
2005/2006	123	118	32	158	82	0	513
2006/2007	109	188	22	181	100	0	600
2007/2008	122	274	13	213	81	0	703
2008/2009	114	270	11	171	83	0	649
2009/2010	160	257	15	189	83	0	704
Research Students – Masters and Doctoral*						
Academic Year	**Comms**	**Ed Studies**	**Fiontar**	**Law & Govt**	**SALIS**	**Faculty**	**Total**
2005/2006	25	9	0	19	22	0	75
2006/2007	24	24	1	17	25	0	91
2007/2008	29	31	0	25	32	0	117
2008/2009	25	45	1	32	41	0	144
2009/2010	25	50	2	32	42	1	152

* Registered on 1st March each year

2.   The Self-Assessment Process

The Co-ordinating Committee

The Unit Co-ordinating Committee – the Quality Review Committee (QRC) – was established in May 2010 and comprised the following members of staff:

Professor Eithne Guilfoyle, Executive Dean
Dr Patrick Brereton, Associate Dean for Research
Dr Françoise Blin, Associate Dean for Learning Innovation
Ms Hannah Dyas, Faculty Manager
Ms Goretti Daughton, Faculty Senior Administrative Officer

Methodology Adopted

Prior to commencement of the Faculty's self assessment process, there was considerable discussion at University level (at the Quality Promotion Committee) and between the Director of Quality and the Faculty, regarding the manner in which the review might best be conducted, in light of the experience of those Faculties that had already been subject to review. It was agreed that the Self Assessment Report (SAR) should reflect that the Faculty is both an administrative and academic unit, and should focus on the efficacy with which the Faculty facilitates the academic functioning of the Schools and Research Centres within it, fosters opportunities for cross-school collaboration, and provides effective administrative support to the academic activities it encompasses. A template for the review was presented to Faculty Board for approval, and subsequently to the Director of Quality.

The Quality Review Committee (QRC) initially met on a bi-weekly basis, and subsequently on a weekly basis during the period August to October 2010. In the course of the review process, the QRC gathered information from the individual Schools and Research Centres, from Faculty committees (which are made up of representatives from the Schools), and from the administrative staff working in the Faculty Office.

The PRG noted that the following actions were taken as part of the self assessment process:

- The QRC identified and assembled relevant statistical information, including data provided by the University's Research and Analysis Officer, and provided this information to each of the Faculty's constituent units.

- Three meetings each of the Faculty Teaching and Learning and Research Committees were convened to discuss issues relevant to their respective areas and the functioning of the Committees, and to review drafts of relevant sections of the SAR. Similarly, the Faculty Board met to consider its role and function within the Faculty.

- An on-line staff survey was conducted to elicit views of the efficiency and effectiveness of Faculty structures.

- A meeting of the administrative staff in the Faculty Office was convened by the Faculty Manager, which the Associate Dean for Learning Innovation also attended. The Faculty Office Team provided feedback on a draft of Section 4.4 of this Report.

- A Quality Review Day was held on 1 September 2010 to which all staff members of the Faculty were invited. In particular, programme chairs, members of both the Teaching and Learning Committee and the Research Committee, members of the Faculty Board, Directors of Research Centres, and representatives of the Linked Colleges were requested to attend.

- Schools within the Faculty had undergone individual quality reviews as part of the first cycle of quality reviews within DCU. Each School was invited to provide an update on their Quality Improvement Plan (QuIP) and to report on any issues that had arisen since they underwent review. Research Centres and the Institute of Ethics were invited to submit a separate report on their activities.

- A draft of the Faculty SAR was circulated to the Faculty Board initially, and thereafter to all Faculty staff members, to elicit feedback prior to final submission.

3.   The Peer Review Group Process

The Review Group

The Peer Review Group comprised the following members:

Professor Pól Ó Dochartaigh, Dean, Faculty of Arts, University of Ulster (Chair)
Professor Nicholas Rees, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Liverpool Hope University
Ms Teresa Casserly, Senior Consultant and Manager, Institute of Public Administration
Dr Noel Murphy, Head of School of Electronic Engineering, DCU
Ms Pauline Mooney, Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science & Health, DCU (Rapporteur)

Site Visit Programme

Day	Time	Activity
Wednesday, 24 November 2010	14.00-15.00	Peer Review Group [PRG] briefing by Director of Quality Promotion
	15.00-15.45	PRG meeting to discuss main areas of interest and concern arising from the SAR, principal issues outlined to guide PRG for the visit.
	15.45-16.00	Coffee
	16.00-17.30	Meeting with Quality Review Committee (QRC) Short presentation by Dean of Faculty (10 min) followed by discussion of SAR
	19.30	Dinner for PRG, Faculty Board, Director of Quality
Thursday, 25 November 2010	9.00-9.30	Meeting with Faculty Executive Dean and Associate Deans
	9.30-10.15	Meeting with Faculty Administration
	10.15-10.30	Coffee
	10.30-11.15	Meeting with Faculty Research Committee
	11.25-12.10	Meeting with Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee
	12.20-13.05	Meeting with Heads of School
	13.05-14.00	Lunch
	14.00-14.45	Meeting with Directors of Research Centres / Groups
	14.45-15.30	Tour of Faculty Facilities
	15.30-16.30	Meeting with all Faculty Staff except Dean, Heads of School, Directors of Research Centres, etc.
	16.30-16.45	Coffee
	16.45-17.30	Meeting with representatives from Central Administration
	19.30	PRG Private Dinner
Friday, 26 November 2010	09.00-10.00	Meeting with Senior Management
	10.00-11.00	PRG internal discussion
	10.40-11.00	Coffee
	11.00-11.45	Meeting with Students: Undergraduate
	11.45-12.30	Meeting with Students: Postgraduate
	12.30-13.30	Clarification of outstanding issues for PRG
	13.30-14.00	Lunch
	14.00-15.15	Preparation of Exit Presentation
	15.15-15.30	Coffee
	15.30-16.30	Exit Presentation to all HSS staff members

Methodology

Peer Review Group (PRG) members received, and familiarised themselves with the content of, the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) and related appendices in advance of the site visit. The SAR provided a comprehensive overview of the Faculty and its operations. The PRG agreed that the SAR reflected positive engagement with the review process on the part of the staff members who contributed to the Report's development. However, the PRG also noted that the SAR might have benefited from the inclusion of more widely solicited feedback (via survey, focus groups or other means) from relevant stakeholders, including students and central university units with which the Faculty interacts. The challenges presented in determining a suitable Faculty review format and scheduling of the self assessment process over the summer period while students were not on campus were noted by the PRG.

On arrival at DCU, the PRG was provided with a clear context for the review and was briefed as to its remit by the Director of the Quality Promotion Unit. Thereafter, Professor Pól Ó Dochartaigh agreed to act as Group chairperson and the distribution of responsibilities amongst Group members for the purpose of the site visit and preparation of the PRG Report was agreed. The original meeting schedule was amended at this point, at the PRG's request, to include an open meeting with Faculty staff members on the afternoon of day 2.

The Group then met with members of the Faculty's Quality Review Committee (QRC). The Executive Dean, Professor Eithne Guilfoyle, gave a very informative presentation on the self-assessment process and SAR contents. This presentation was followed by discussion between QRC members and the PRG; these discussions were continued informally over a working dinner that evening.

The second day of the site visit comprised a series of meetings with key members of staff, in keeping with the timetable given above. These meetings were very beneficial in supplementing the information provided in the SAR. However, the PRG agreed that one element of the schedule would have benefited from alternative organisation. The meeting with members of staff from central administration referred to in the schedule above brought together a group of senior officers from some of the central units with which the Faculty interacts. The group membership was necessarily disparate and the PRG agreed that it would have been useful to have been able to meet some or all of the officers for a shorter period on a one to one or smaller group basis. The PRG **recommends** that the organisation of this meeting be reviewed in advance of any future Faculty reviews, though it is acknowledged that timing and other constraints would have to be considered.

Additional documentation, including minutes of Faculty Committee, Board and Administration Team meetings and other supplemental data was made available to the PRG from the outset, in the main meeting room where the substantive business of the site visit took place. PRG deliberations continued over a working dinner on the evening of day two.

Meetings with stakeholders on the third and final day took place as detailed in the timetable above. The PRG's final deliberations focused on principal findings and related recommendations and these form the basis for the PRG Report. These findings and recommendations were the subject of a presentation to Faculty that all staff members were invited to attend.

Schedule of Activity

The schedule of meetings was well-managed over the three day period and the PRG adhered, in the main, to the schedule above. The Group was readily facilitated in any requests it made, and was provided with excellent support and assistance by members of staff from the Faculty Office and the Dean's Office. All members of staff and students contributed generously and openly to the various meetings held during the site visit.

View of the Self-Assessment Report

The PRG recognised that production of the SAR represented a significant achievement and had required considerable effort on the part of the Quality Review Committee and the constituent units that make up the Faculty.

The PRG was satisfied that the SAR, volumes one through three, adequately and accurately described activities carried out within the Faculty and sought to honestly explore the strengths and weaknesses of the

Faculty as a unit of organisation and management. The Group noted that SAR findings might have been more explicitly and, therefore, more effectively highlighted within the text of volume one, in particular. Equally, the Group noted that volume one of the SAR somewhat understated the collective achievements and outputs of the Faculty that were clearly evident in the appendices, particularly those relating to research and the role of the research centres. The Group noted that the self-assessment process and ultimately the SAR findings might have benefited from greater use of evidence by way of feedback solicited from relevant stakeholders.

SAR findings were reviewed by the PRG on a section-by-section basis. These findings were, in the main, endorsed and confirmed during the course of the site visit.

4.   Findings of the Review Group

4.1 Overview and Strategy

The PRG noted that, since its establishment on an executive footing, the Faculty had made considerable progress towards the achievement of the goals it had identified in its Development Plan (2003) and Strategic Plan (2006-08). The diversity of Faculty provision, which demonstrates strong evidence of interdisciplinarity, as well as a commitment to social and economic relevance (and, therefore, the employability of its graduates) gives the Faculty a distinctive place in Irish Higher Education and contributes significantly to the distinctive mission of DCU. In the five year period since 2005, the Faculty has considerably expanded its student intake at undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research postgraduate levels and has sought to capitalise on the breadth of discipline it embraces; the launch of the BA in Contemporary Culture and Society which draws on input from every School within the Faculty being a notable development in this regard.

In parallel with, and in support of, the progress and growth referred to above, the Faculty has implemented management and committee structures that have seen a shift in organisational, resource and strategic emphasis to collective action and consistency of operation across the units that comprise it. In making the transition from the school-based management structure that characterised DCU's operation until 2003, to an executive faculty structure, the PRG noted that the Faculty has strived to achieve a balance between the benefits which Faculty structures and collective action can accrue on the one hand, and maintenance of the largely School and/or discipline based diversity that is fundamental to the Faculty's success on the other. The PRG was agreed that the Faculty has been largely successful in this regard and saw practical evidence of this in the shared postgraduate research facilities that have been established as a result of Faculty lobbying, in the mutual support and benefit that Heads of School reported as resulting from their interactions at Faculty Board, and in the largely consensus view (evidenced in the responses to the survey of Faculty members, and reiterated during the site visit) that Faculty committee structures are, in the main, appropriate to the needs of the Faculty and the units that comprise it.

The PRG considers that the timing is opportune – following in excess of five years of operation of Executive Faculty structures, following the recent appointment of a new President and the anticipated development of a new institutional strategic plan, and with possible strategic developments between DCU and the Royal College of Surgeons and NUI Maynooth – for the Faculty to critically consider how it will further advance its role, agenda and mission as an executive and academic entity. Central to that consideration might be the further development of a collective Faculty culture which could enable the Faculty and its constituent units to maximise its position within DCU and within the Irish Higher Education sector generally. How the Faculty moves along this road is a matter for the Faculty. There have been clear practical benefits to be garnered from acting in concert, such as the expansion of research. The efficiencies of scale that should result from greater operational integration and standardisation could prove particularly beneficial at a time when resources are increasingly constrained.

Further advancement of the relationships already in place between the Faculty and All Hallows, Mater Dei and St. Patrick's College would also enhance the diversity that is simultaneously the Faculty's greatest strength and perhaps, one of its greatest challenges. That increased co-operation between the Faculty and DCU's Linked Colleges would accrue significant mutual benefit in terms of complementary depth and breadth of expertise and related synergies, is apparent to the Faculty, to DCU senior management and, it would appear, to the Linked Colleges themselves. The operational and systemic challenges presented by active collaboration between what are effectively separate institutions with very different histories, structures

and practices were noted by the PRG. While remaining cognisant of the human and other resources that will be needed to address these challenges, the PRG strongly recommends that every effort be made to do so.

The location within the Faculty of the Institute of Ethics, which has a university-wide remit, affords the Faculty a further opportunity to contribute directly to the commitment at senior management level within the University to the development of particular attributes for all graduates of DCU. It should be noted, however, that the Institute is in its early stage of development and will need considerable Faculty support if it is to grow and play a significant role in DCU. In particular, there is currently limited evidence of a broader Faculty involvement in the Institute.

Among the key challenges facing the Faculty in the current climate is sustaining the delivery of 42 taught programmes to 2,700 students by 149 staff members, while simultaneously managing the tensions between preserving teaching quality and the promotion and advancement of the Faculty's research culture. The Faculty's intention to review its portfolio of taught programmes and the manner in which they are administered and managed was noted and is supported by the PRG.

4.2 Organisation and Management

The PRG found the Faculty's organisational and management structures to be, in the main, appropriate to the operation of a Faculty of its size and diversity. While the overall structures serve the Faculty well, there is a recognised need to improve communications and the flow of information

(i)   between the Faculty (Faculty Committees and Administration) and the Schools/Research Centres,

and

(ii)   between the Faculty and Central administration and University decision-making bodies.

The need for improved communication was evidenced in the responses to the staff survey that was conducted as part of the self assessment exercise, with almost 60% of respondents indicating that University decisions affecting their role and responsibilities as lecturers are not communicated to them in a clear and timely fashion. This view was reinforced in the course of the site visit.

It was acknowledged that some of the perceived delays in the communication of decisions made at both University and Faculty level arise from the need to have committee and board minutes approved (as the formal record of the decision taken) prior to their dissemination to the University or Faculty at large, and from the time lag resulting from the cascade of information from central committee to Faculty committee to School or Centre. While a central repository or document management system might not address all aspects of this issue, it would go some way towards improving matters by reducing what has been identified as an over-reliance on email, and by providing a single, clear record of decisions that are made that have a university-wide impact. Given the reliance on email, limits on the storage capacity for staff email (currently 40MB for most staff) and the apparent absence of a protocol for the use of email, hinder administrative effectiveness, and the PRG recommends that these issues be addressed.

Clearly, the Faculty must assume responsibility for the improvement of internal Faculty communications, while simultaneously seeking to clarify the routes via which information should flow from University decision-making bodies and central units to individual staff members, and the role the Faculty should play in this information flow.

Some of the internal reporting relationships within the Faculty and University would benefit from clarification and restatement, and the PRG recommends that this would be done. For example, there appears to be a lack of shared understanding regarding the reporting lines of the Directors of the two University Designated Research Centres (UDRCs) within the Faculty, the Centre for International Studies (CIS) based in Law and Government, and the Centre for Translation and Textual Studies (CTTS) based in SALIS.   The PRG noted that the confusion regarding reporting lines stemmed at least in part from the fact that both Centres obtain their funding, following a competitive bid process, from the Office for the Vice-President for Research (OVPR) and perhaps as a result see themselves as reporting to that Office. However, the Director of Research Support Services (OVPR) indicated that the Research Centres Directors report within the Faculty. The PRG recommends that this issue be clarified by the appropriate officer(s) of the University (i.e. Dean, VPR, as appropriate) and communicated to relevant members of staff.

<u>4.3 Staffing, accommodation & resources</u>

4.3.1 Space

As is indicated above, all Schools, staff and specialist laboratory teaching facilities associated with the Faculty are now accommodated in the Henry Grattan building. This represents significant progress since 2004/2005 when the Faculty's space envelope was spread over several buildings on the campus. Recent refurbishments (funded by a combination of Faculty funding and a HEA facilities grant) resulted in the provision for the first time of dedicated research areas, which house postgraduate research students from all Schools within the Faculty, the Institute of Ethics and the Fiontar research projects. This is seen as a very tangible and highly beneficial manifestation of what can be achieved by working collaboratively to secure funding and space. Notwithstanding this and other refurbishments to the Henry Grattan, additional challenges remain. Available research space is still inadequate for the Faculty's needs, requiring a number of research students to avail of hot-desk facilities. Further parts of the Henry Grattan building are in need of refurbishment and several areas are in need of immediate upgrade, specifically, the offices in the Henry Grattan extension which continue to present a problem in terms of sound-proofing and ventilation. The lift within the building, which does not afford access to the extension where a substantial number of staff offices are located, was also identified as requiring immediate action. In this regard specifically, the PRG noted that there are plans to install a second larger lift in 2011, with works due to commence early in the New Year. The PRG recommends that these works progress as planned and that the remaining issues associated with the extension are pursued as quickly as possible.

4.3.2 Marketing

Historical school-based structures, together with the diverse nature of the student market and the unique nature of each School's programme offerings have influenced the marketing structures and processes which are currently in place within the Faculty. Schools effectively manage their own marketing, producing School and/or programme-specific marketing material and placing advertisements, liaising directly with the University's Marketing Manager in this regard. This work is carried out by School Marketing Convenors, who are members of academic staff, and/or programme chairpersons, who may not necessarily have any specialist expertise in the marketing area. While the knowledge that key members of academic staff possess of their respective niche markets was identified as central to the success of many such activities, as was applicant access to academic staff at recruitment events, the time currently spent engaging with the administrative burden associated with these tasks is arguably not the most effective use of Faculty resources.

Other marketing-related activity such as participation in DCU Open Days, Higher Options and similar events are co-ordinated via the Faculty and specifically by an administrative member of staff – the Faculty Marketing Officer – 25% of whose post is devoted to the provision of marketing support. The Faculty Marketing Officer is a member of the Faculty Marketing Committee (FMC) which is chaired by the Faculty Manager and also comprises School Marketing Convenors and the University Marketing Manager. The Senior Faculty Secretary acts as secretary to the FMC, in addition to other Faculty administrative duties. The PRG noted that while the FMC facilitates a coherent approach to marketing and promotion of Faculty programmes through its quarterly meetings, its role is limited. It does not appear to have a longer-term marketing strategy, nor does it operate annually to a business/marketing plan. School plans are not discussed (but they could be if this was agreed with the Schools) and FMC appears not to have or control a marketing budget. The PRG recommends that the Faculty explore means whereby the role of the FMC could be enhanced and the development of a Faculty Marketing Strategy or Plan might prove a useful first step in this regard. Any such strategy should encompass both the domestic and international markets, though it is understood that principal responsibility for driving international recruitment will lie at University level. Setting a Faculty Marketing Strategy in place would support current marketing efforts which, if delivered against agreed objectives, would potentially identify new markets to grow the business and enhance the profile of the Faculty both domestically and internationally.

While the corporate DCU brand is well established and is managed on an on-going basis by the University Marketing Manager, the Faculty has not yet established its own brand identity. The PRG did note that the Faculty plans to develop a Faculty brand and related brand guidelines and templates, which will facilitate the management and co-ordination of promotional material at Faculty level. The Faculty also plans to put in place mechanisms for the collation of relevant data to facilitate effective use of academic staff members' time attending student recruitment events. Both of these developments were noted as positive and may go some

way towards addressing the concerns expressed regarding the best use of academic staff time vis-à-vis the marketing function.

While the Faculty Office is responsible for maintaining web content, it does not have direct, live access to update this content. Content is updated off-line and is sent to ISS and Registry for live publication (the PRG was not clear that any value was added to the publication process by either ISS or Registry, for example by checking content against specific criteria). This can lead to delays in web updating and the publication of outdated information, in addition to frustrations within the Faculty Office. While the need to ensure that published information relating to the University's programmes is subject to appropriate controls is understood, a means of enhancing approved web access to update Faculty information is needed. The Faculty could gain greater recognition by having a much stronger profile on the website. In order to do so the University will need to reflect on ways in which it can support and encourage Faculty to update material on the web, as the current processes serve as an impediment to action.

4.3.3 Faculty Administration

Faculty Administration is responsible for administrative tasks and processes relating to the delivery of programmes (including academic programme development and management, exam administration, programme board administration, timetabling), postgraduate research administration, financial management, space management, student and staff recruitment, co-ordination of marketing activities and maintenance of Faculty web pages. Faculty administration provides a key point of interface between the Faculty and Central administration and decision-making bodies, and has responsibility for the implementation of many aspects of University and Faculty policies and procedures, While much of the faculty administrative activity is cyclical in nature and is driven by the academic calendar, the role of the administration team is also very frequently a reactive one, driven by changes to university policy and procedures and/or by difficulties and blurring of responsibilities that arise as implementation of new policies and procedures occurs. The very substantial changes that have occurred as a result of implementation of a revised Marks and Standards and the on-going devolution of responsibility for academic administrative processes to Faculties are recent cases in point. There was a clear feeling that administrative staff members have 'absorbed' many of the problems that have emerged as a result of such developments as they undertake to do whatever is required to successfully complete processes, including manual inputs to address systems-related difficulties where necessary.

Faculty administrative staff members meet regularly to review processes and maintain SOPs which are updated annually to reflect changes in practice and/or policy, and it is understood that a significant review of administrative processes has been initiated. With respect to many of the processes carried out by Faculty Administration, these by their very nature feed directly into wider university systems and processes, and while internal improvements are necessary and beneficial, they can only ever have a limited impact. The adoption of a coherent, university-wide approach to the design and development of processes and a clear mapping of key processes would address some of the issues identified. The PRG recommends that steps be taken at university level to ensure the adoption of such an approach to on-going and future developments.

In discharging their functions in relation to examinations, timetabling and so on, members of Faculty administrative staff currently work with a variety of systems that are neither integrated with each other, nor accessible to academic staff in the Schools. This frequently means duplication of effort - inputting of data on more than one system - and academic staff routing queries and requests for information through the Faculty Office. The most beneficial change initiative that could occur for Faculty Administration would be the implementation of an integrated system underpinning their workflow and that of the offices with which they interact. The PRG recognises that implementation of such a system would involve considerable resource deployment and that the decision to do so would have to be taken at university level. Nevertheless, this is a recommendation of the PRG. The Group also noted the efforts that are currently being made to reduce the number of standalone systems in use and/or to enable these systems to speak to each other.

Two key areas of Faculty activity were identified which would benefit from additional administrative resources in both the SAR and during the site visit, namely the provision of increased levels of administrative support for the Faculty's research activities and marketing co-ordination. The PRG acknowledge that both areas would undoubtedly benefit from the provision of additional administrative support, but is mindful that securing additional administrative resources will prove challenging in the current climate. The PRG endorses the efforts of the Faculty Manager in seeking to address the need for research administrative support from within

the current administrative complement, and also the plans to address aspects of marketing-related administration outlined in section 4.3.2 above. While the role of School Offices was not examined in any way as part of the Faculty review process, the PRG recommends that the totality of administrative resources available within the Faculty be considered in seeking to identify efficiencies and address key administrative needs.

4.4 External and Internal Relations

The PRG noted that, as indicated in the SAR, by far the closest external relations the Faculty maintains are those that have been developed with the University's three Linked Colleges: All Hallows College, Mater Dei Institute of Education and St. Patrick's College, Drumcondra. The PRG noted that the linkage agreement with St. Patrick's College is at university level and that, consequently, representatives of the College sit on the University Executive and on other university level committees. On the other hand, much of the interface with All Hallows College and Mater Dei Institute of Education is implemented through the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. For example, all programmes being put forward by these two Colleges for accreditation by DCU are sponsored by the Faculty and are considered in the first instance within DCU by the Faculty Board.

The PRG noted that the Faculty and the three Linked Colleges have committed to working more closely together in all areas of teaching and research and that this commitment is complemented by very good personal relationships and personal engagement by staff on all sides. The recently accredited MA in Ethics, a joint Mater Dei/Institute of Ethics initiative, was noted as a clear manifestation of this. It was also noted that further joint programmes are in the early planning stages.

Nevertheless, there was consensus that opportunities to maximise relationships have not been exploited fully to date, due largely it would seem, to very fundamental operational difficulties which render collaborative activities highly resource intensive. The practical impediments identified included, *inter alia*, the fact that Mater Dei and All Hallows staff do not have access to the DCU Intranet, that regulations such as Marks and Standards are not common to all institutions, that the academic calendars of the institutions are not synchronised, that budgetary and workload models vary and are handled differently in each institution, and that systems are not in place to facilitate joint or dual student registrations.

The workload attaching to existing collaborative or integrative measures such as those relating to the validation and accreditation of Mater Dei and All Hallows' programmes by DCU is not inconsiderable. This is due in part to the fact that colleagues within the Linked Colleges are relatively unfamiliar with DCU processes and procedures and in part to a lack of clarity regarding who is responsible for providing assistance and administrative support to colleagues in the Colleges in this regard. This responsibility has been assumed to date by the Associate Dean for Learning Innovation and the University's Assistant Registrar, but is not otherwise resourced.

Clearly, as noted in the SAR, some of the barriers to collaboration are systemic within all three institutions, and in the reporting mechanisms that the HEA requires in terms of student returns and budgetary reporting. The need to identify solutions to these problems is increasingly urgent as efforts are made to strengthen ties through further joint activities. It was clear from the PRG's meeting with Senior Management that there is not only awareness, but also a desire to address these issues at institutional level and to establish an operational framework that will facilitate and foster increased collaboration. Increased co-operation between the Faculty and DCU's Linked Colleges would accrue significant mutual benefit in terms of complementary depth and breadth of expertise and related synergies. The Faculty might seek to advance and build upon these linkages and the opportunity they present when formulating its new Faculty Strategic Plan and developing its Quality Improvement Plan (QuIP).

In addition to its relationships with DCU's Linked Colleges, the Faculty has established relationships with a number of colleges of further education in the local area, such as those in place between SALIS and Coláiste Dhulaigh, and between the School of Education Studies and Whitehall College of Further Education, both of which facilitate FE student access to certain Faculty programmes.   A similar link between the School of Communications and Ballyfermot College of Further Education has facilitated the development of a one year add-on degree in Media Production Management which is delivered entirely on the campus of Ballyfermot College. The PRG noted that there are plans for further collaborative initiatives with Ballyfermot College.

The PRG also noted the Faculty's commitment to civic engagement and specifically to a number of *DCU in the Community*[1] initiatives, whereby the Faculty delivered modules in the area of Languages, and International Relations at the Centre in Ballymun. The PRG noted that the Faculty is not currently providing any modules because of a number of difficulties, including availability of resources, but remains committed to supporting the initiative, and hopes to find a way to remain involved with it.

The PRG also noted the strong links that the School of Law and Government has established with the Ballymun Community Law Centre which provides free legal advice, information and representation to people within the community. The plan to further develop links with the Centre through the provision of placements in the Centre to students on the new law degree (BCL) was also noted as positive.

Not surprisingly, given that many of the Faculty's programmes deal with international/intercultural subject matter, the Faculty's international linkages, which are predominantly School and/or programme based, are considerable, and include, among others, student exchange agreements between SALIS and institutions in France, Spain, Germany, Japan and China. These international linkages are also evident in the research activity of individual members of staff and the research programmes carried out within the Faculty's Research Centres.

The Faculty's very active participation in the University's India Strategy Committee was noted by the PRG and was highlighted in the meeting with University Senior Management. In this context, the Faculty's intention to develop a Faculty International Policy as well as a Faculty-wide strategy with respect to India was noted as a very positive development which will no doubt be reflected in the Faculty's Strategic Plan when developed.

4.5 Academic Programmes, Teaching & Learning

Much of the Teaching and Learning-related discussion that took place during the course of the site visit related to the process of curriculum review in which the Faculty and wider University has engaged in recent years. This review followed on the adoption by the University in 2007 of the Academic Framework for Innovation (AFI), a framework which is intended to enable the sustainable development and on-going maintenance of the University's portfolio of diverse, flexible and innovative programmes, while facilitating compliance with the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) and the Bologna Accord. Implementation of AFI necessitated the review of all taught programmes to ensure their alignment with NFQ and, consequently, the articulation and alignment of programme and module learning outcomes, as well as the root and branch revision of University Marks and Standards and related policies and procedures. The PRG noted that overall the Faculty has contributed substantially to progress to date in this regard, which has been considerable. It was noted that this process is on-going.

The PRG noted that the transition from an input-based curriculum to a learning outcomes-based one has presented the Faculty with certain challenges, as one of the principal conduits for implementation of that transition. It was noted that the views of individual staff members in relation to the matter ranged from full engagement with, and support for, a learning outcomes-based curriculum, to a fundamental questioning of the need to comply with NFQ and Bologna, and concern regarding the competencies focus this implies. While supporting the learning outcomes approach, the PRG would encourage continuing debate on the matter as implementation continues. The Faculty continues to be a driving force for learning innovation and, by virtue of the expertise it encompasses, is in a unique position within DCU to help to influence appropriate responses to changing educational needs within DCU and the higher education sector generally.

The operational impact that changes to policies and procedures and the on-going devolution of certain responsibilities from central university committees to the Faculty, has had to date within Faculty, are clearly a source of concern for both academic and administrative members of staff. The view was articulated in the SAR, and reiterated during the site visit, that a combination of factors (the devolution of activities to Faculties, the revision of several University policies and related procedures, the restructuring of University and Faculty committee interfaces amongst others) have resulted in a considerable increase in the administrative workload of programme chairpersons, members of FTLC and programme administrators. The challenge that this presents for the Faculty, and specifically for Heads of School, in a context where there is

---

[1] *DCU in the Community* is a community outreach centre established by DCU in partnership with Ballymun Regeneration Ltd (BRL) in 2008.

not only pressure to increase student numbers, but also, in the context of the Faculty's programme provision, the opportunity to do so, but without increasing staff numbers, was noted by the PRG. It was further noted that programme chairpersons have to respond to an increasing volume of requests from University committees, and are often expected to take on additional duties and responsibilities, as determined from time to time by units external to the Faculty.

It is understood that confusion might arise during the transition from one complex structure or process to another. There is, however, a perceived lack of clarity regarding the boundaries between, and the respective responsibilities of Programme Boards, FTLC, University Standards Committee and Registry, on the part of staff who are not directly involved in programme management. When combined with a systemic bias in favour of models of operation which support traditional undergraduate programme delivery and the use of stand-alone IT systems to support aspects of academic-related administration, this contributes to the duplication of work, inefficiencies and delayed decision-making. The PRG noted that very considerable efforts are being expended to address some of these issues and that some of the developments over the last 2-3 years have achieved strategic improvements. However, there are still significant inefficiencies and sources of frustration remaining. In the context of further staffing reductions and increased demand to accommodate a more diverse student body, there is perhaps a need to prioritise critical developments and to consolidate achievements to date.

During the course of the site visit concerns were also expressed regarding the potential loss of corporate memory that could result from the loss of key members of staff from central units as a result of the externally-imposed staffing constraints. The PRG recommends that steps be taken to ameliorate this, to build collective loyalty with a richer administrative staff profile, and to overcome any tendencies that reinforce siloing.

The PRG noted the Faculty's commitment to making its programmes more accessible to non-traditional students. While student feedback in relation to the quality of their academic experience during the site visit was resoundingly positive, postgraduate part-time students and research students who require access to facilities outside of standard working hours reported that their experience in this regard was less than positive. Lack of evening catering facilities, issues with regard to out-of-hours access to the Henry Grattan building arising largely, it would seem, from the absence of a system of swipe card access, as well as limited, if any, access at relevant times (Friday evenings, weekends) to central services such as Registry, were identified as significant issues. In this regard, the PRG was pleased to note the steps that are being taken at Senior Management level to address some of these issues and, in particular, the provision of catering facilities for students who attend DCU at evenings and weekends.

4.6 Research, Scholarship & Training

The PRG noted evidence of a strong research ethos across the Faculty's Schools and University Designated Research Centres, together with clear evidence of collegiality and a willingness to share good practice in relation to research and research funding applications. The PRG also noted a demonstrable awareness of and sensitivity to the considerable diversity of research traditions across the Faculty. The Faculty clearly possesses research strength and critical mass in a number of areas such as the Centre for International Studies (CIS) based in the School of Law and Government, and the Centre for Translation and Textual Studies (CTTS) based in SALIS. The significant growth in the postgraduate research community and the alignment of resources with this growth, including a strong investment in physical facilities, ranks among the most significant achievements of the Faculty.

The PRG recommends that the Faculty consider the implications of its research strategy in terms of identifying and promoting its key areas of research strengths and seeking to build on achievements in these areas to date. In particular, the SAR documentation might have more clearly highlighted the growth of research and explicitly referred to evidence of this available from the OVPR.

In the course of the site visit it was stated that the role of Research Centre Director and other research-related activities were not necessarily recognised within School workload models. The PRG noted as positive the fact that Heads of School were sharing their respective workload models with each other with a view to the possible development of a Faculty workload model. Heads of School clearly saw the benefits which could accrue from a Faculty-based model that would afford consistency of approach while continuing to allow for some discretion and/or adaptation at School level. The PRG supports these developments and recommends that the Faculty progress a common work load model that factors in an appropriate balance

between teaching and research activities to include, *inter alia,* recognition of the role of Research Centre Directors and research student supervision.

It was noted that Research Centre Directors do not have access to administrative support in their own right. The possibility, if any, that some level of secretarial support might be provided via relevant School Offices should be explored. The absence of designated faculty administrative support for research, the efforts that have been made and continue to be made to obtain university approval for a designated research support post, as well as the benefits that it would bring, were convincingly detailed in the SAR. Among the benefits mentioned was the maintenance of a *Faculty memory for research carried out within [the Faculty's] various centres and clusters.* While the PRG commends and supports the Faculty in continuing to lobby for creation of this post, it would suggest that the Faculty simultaneously explore with OVPR how the University Research Support System might better capture the Faculty's research output as well as exploring possible means whereby Faculty research data might be collected in a more systematic manner and the upload of that data to RSS could be ensured and/or incentivised.

In the course of the PRG meeting with Research Centre Directors and Research Groups on day two of the site visit, it was noted that the meeting was the first occasion upon which the staff concerned had been brought together. This in no way detracts from the statement above regarding the evidence of strong collegiality. However, the impact of that collegiality might be significantly enhanced were research directors and the Associate Dean for Research encouraged to meet on a regular basis. Such a forum might assist in the identification of means whereby faculty engaged in making research funding bids could be encouraged and supported.

As indicated above, the PRG was of the view that the Faculty's research related achievements were somewhat understated in the SAR. The Group recommends that the Faculty explore ways in which the profile of Humanities and Social Science research achievements could be highlighted across the University and to an external audience.

With respect to the operation of the Faculty Research Committee (FRC), the PRG recommends that the Faculty review the existing model for allocation of research and travel funds and consider whether there might be a greater role for the Faculty Research Committee in this regard; it is understood that the distribution of internal research funding is currently the remit of the Faculty Board. In making this suggestion, the PRG noted that the views and recommendations of FRC are considered by the Faculty Board in determining the distribution of internal research funding.

The Faculty may wish to consider ways of encouraging greater cross-faculty research collaboration, including identifying research clusters that might be included as part of existing centres. Equally, it is clear that exploration of the ways in which research collaboration with DCU's Linked Colleges might be developed could be beneficial to all concerned.

Overall Analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats

Strengths	Weaknesses
- Diversity and range of disciplines encompassed within the Faculty - Increase in postgraduate research student numbers - Key areas of research strength in Translation & Textual Studies and International Studies - Strength of demand for Faculty programmes - Student satisfaction with the quality of their academic experience - Internal Faculty committee structures	- Quality of communication between Faculty and the constituent units that comprise it, and between University committees, central units and the Faculty - Operational impediments and structural barriers to enhanced collaboration with DCU Linked Colleges - Absence of resources to drive further development of research culture within the Faculty
Opportunities	**Threats**
- Critical mass and complementary academic strengths afforded by enhanced collaboration with DCU Linked Colleges - Critical mass on a national scale in the area of Education afforded by possible collaboration between DCU and other HEIs in the greater Dublin region. - Active participation in the University's India initiative - Potential role for the Institute of Ethics in the development of key graduate attributes	- Creating an overarching sense of Faculty identity given the diversity and range of disciplines encompassed within the Faculty - Sustainability of the Faculty's portfolio of programmes in the current climate - Balancing the heightened tensions between sustaining quality teaching delivery while supporting the development of the Faculty's research culture - Securing additional space and/or refurbishing space within existing envelope to accommodate growth

5. Recommendations for Improvement

PRG recommendations are listed below the same divisions as in Section 4 above. To facilitate planning of quality improvement measures, each recommendation is qualified by an indication of priority as follows:

- o P1: A recommendation that is important *and* requires urgent action.
- o P2: A recommendation that is important, but can (or perhaps must) be addressed on a more extended time scale.
- o P 3: A recommendation which merits serious consideration but which is not considered to be critical to the quality of the ongoing activities in the Unit.

Additionally, the PRG has indicated the level(s) of the University where action is required:

- o A: Academic/Administrative Unit/Faculty
- o U: University Executive/Senior Management

Overview and Strategy

1. The Faculty should critically consider how it will further advance its role, agenda and mission as an executive and academic entity. **(P2, A)**

2. The Faculty should explore and seek to exploit the significant practical benefit to be garnered from continuing to act in concert as well as the efficiencies of scale that should result from greater operational integration and standardisation which could prove particularly beneficial at a time when resources are increasingly constrained. **(P1, A)**

<u>Organisation and Management</u>

3. It is recommended that the internal reporting relationships within Faculty and between the Faculty and University are clarified and restated. **(P1, A & U)**

4. It is recommended that communication and information flow within Faculty and between Faculty and the central units and decision making bodies with which it interacts is clarified and improved. **(P1, A & U)**

5. It is recommended that a protocol for the use of email be developed. **(P2, U)**

6. It is recommended that consideration be given to the establishment of a central document management system that would act as both a repository of and a supplementary means of communicating decisions that are made at institutional level that also have a university-wide impact. **(P2, U)**

<u>Staffing, accommodation and resources</u>

7. It is recommended that the University continues to work with the Faculty in prioritising the refurbishment of the Henry Grattan building and providing, over time, sufficient space to support and facilitate the Faculty's continuing growth. **(P2, U & A)**

8. Specifically, the PRG recommends that the plans to install a larger lift in the Henry Grattan Building in early 2011 are progressed **(P1, U)** and that the remaining issues associated with the Henry Grattan extension (ventilation and sound proofing) are pursued as quickly as possible. **(P2, U & A)**

9. It is recommended that enhancement of the role of the Faculty Marketing Committee be explored and that the development of a Faculty Marketing Strategy and integrated marketing plan might prove a useful first step in this regard. **(P3, A)**

10. It is recommended that the University seek to implement an integrated information management system underpinning administrative workflow across the University. **(P2, U)**

11. While the need to ensure that published information relating to the University's programmes is subject to appropriate controls is acknowledged, it is recommended that a means of enhancing approved web access to update Faculty information is identified and implemented. **(P2, U & A)**

12. It is recommended that the totality of administrative resources available within the Faculty be considered in seeking to identify efficiencies and thereby address key administrative needs **(P2, A)**

<u>External and internal relations</u>

13. With respect to the significant benefits that could accrue from increased collaboration between the Faculty and DCU's Linked Colleges, it is recommended that every effort be made to progress the establishment of an operational framework that will facilitate this. **(P2, U)**

<u>Academic Programmes: Teaching and Learning</u>

14. It is recommended that the Faculty progress the planned review of its portfolio of taught programmes in terms of on-going sustainability and the manner in which they are administered and managed within Faculty. **(P2, A)**

15. It is recommended that the plans outlined by Senior Management regarding the provision of access to catering facilities for part-time students who attend DCU in the evenings and at weekends are progressed and, in addition, that comparable access to relevant administrative and other support services is thereafter explored and progressed. **(P2, U)**

<u>Research, Scholarship and Training</u>

16. It is recommended that the Faculty consider the implications of its research strategy in terms of identifying and promoting its key areas of research strength and seeking to build on achievements in these areas to date. **(P2, A)**

17. It is recommended that the Faculty progress a common work load model that factors in an appropriate balance between teaching and research activities to include, *inter alia,* recognition of the role of Research Centre Directors and research student supervision. **(P2, A)**

18. It is recommended that the Faculty explore ways in which the profile of Humanities and Social Science research achievements could be highlighted across the University and externally. **(P2, A)**

19. With respect to the operation of the Faculty Research Committee (FRC), it is recommended that the Faculty review the existing model for allocation of research and travel funds and consider whether there might be a greater role for the Faculty Research Committee in this regard **(P3, A)**

End.