



University College Dublin

REVIEW GROUP REPORT

Periodic Quality Review

UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics

June 2018

**Accepted by the UCD Governing Authority at its meeting of
16 October 2019**

Table of Contents

	Key Findings of the Review Group	3
1.	Introduction and Overview of UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics	5
2.	Organisation and Management	8
3.	Staff and Facilities	10
4.	Teaching and Curriculum	13
5.	Research Activity	16
6.	Management of Quality and Enhancement	17
7.	Support Services	18
8.	External Relations	19
Appendix 1:	Summary of Commendations and Recommendations	
Appendix 2:	UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics Response to the Review Group Report	
Appendix 3:	Schedule for Review Site Visit to UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics	

Key Findings of the Review Group

The Review Group has identified a number of key findings in relation to areas of good practice operating within the School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics (SLCL) and key areas which the Review Group would highlight as requiring future improvement. The main section of this Report sets out all observations, commendations and recommendations of the Review Group in more detail. A composite list of all commendations and recommendations is set out in Appendix 1.

Examples of Good Practice

The Review Group identified a number of commendations, in particular:

- The School is ranked number 1 in Ireland for Modern Languages according to the QS World University Rankings 2017. Current and former students reinforced this, noting that the School is unique among Irish Universities in terms of the flexibility in language selection, options to study three languages alongside cultures and linguistics, part time options, individual attention to students and the accessibility of staff to students.
- The Review Group commends the commitment of the staff to the School and to their students noting a particular commitment to those students who are in need of extra support.
- The Review Group commends the staff's commitment to research-led teaching.
- The leadership and energy of the Head of School is commended by the Review Group.
- The Review Group congratulates the School on its high-quality, innovative and reflective teaching culture. Positive feedback was given by students, who stressed the enthusiasm and accessibility of staff.
- The clear rise in the School's ambition in applying for larger grants, with a large increase in the value of applications since 2016.
- The School enhances the impact of its research through bibliometrics. For example, the School is very active in submission of articles to the UCD open access repository system. Approximately 50% of the College's articles on the repository come from the School.

Prioritised Recommendations for Improvement

The full list of recommendations is set out in Appendix 1, however, the Review Group would suggest that the following be prioritised:

- The School should develop a five-year staffing plan intimately connected to the broader vision for the School. This should involve strategic investment in key areas to ensure sustainability within the financial envelope available to the School.
- SLCL should implement a compulsory and forward-looking workload model for *all* faculty and academic-related staff, based on a 40:40:20 split, with opportunity for variation at the discretion of the Head of School.

- While the maximisation of research-led teaching is to be welcomed, this should not be allowed to inhibit participation in new, perhaps collaborative, curriculum initiatives.
- The Review Group recognises that the School's teaching would be greatly enhanced by the improvement of its facilities and supports, especially through the appointment of an educational technologist.
- Language teachers and coordinators from across the School should work together to bring greater consistency to the language curriculum across all languages. This should not be a one-size-fits-all approach, but a *coordinated* one, with consistency in terms of expected contact-hours, outcomes and coverage of the four key skills.
- Recruitment into existing MA courses is low. The Review Group recommends that consideration be given to (a) the viability of low-enrolment MAs, (b) the introduction of MA courses that may attract significantly higher enrolments, e.g. in *Translation Studies* and in *English, European and World Literatures*.
- In particular, the School should acknowledge that most colleagues, not just the early career researchers, would benefit from support in developing and sustaining their research. The idea that this responsibility should fall entirely to the individual academic is not supported, and suggests an abdication of responsibility towards the scholarly community of the School.

1. Introduction and Overview of UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics

Introduction

- 1.1 This Report presents the findings of a quality review of the School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics, University College Dublin, which was undertaken on 6-9 November 2017. The School response to the Review Group Report is attached as Appendix 2.

The Review Framework

- 1.2 Irish Universities have collectively agreed a framework for their quality review and quality improvement systems, which is consistent with both the legislative requirements of the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012, and international good practice (e.g. Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, 2015). Quality reviews are carried out in academic, administrative and support service units.

- 1.3 The purpose of periodic review is to assist the University to assure itself of the quality of each of its constituent units, and to utilise learning from this developmental process in order to effect improvement, including:

- To monitor the quality of the student experience, and of teaching and learning.
- To monitor research activity, including: management of research activity; assessing the research performance with regard to: research productivity, research income, and recruiting and supporting doctoral students.
- To identify, encourage and disseminate good practice, and to identify challenges and how to address these.
- To provide an opportunity for units to test the effectiveness of their systems and procedures for monitoring and enhancing quality and standards.
- To encourage the development and enhancement of these systems, in the context of current and emerging provision.
- To inform the University's strategic planning process.
- The output report provides robust evidence for external accreditation bodies.
- The process provides an external benchmark on practice and curriculum.
- To provide public information on the University's capacity to assure the quality and standards of its awards. The University's implementation of its quality procedures enables it to demonstrate how it discharges its responsibilities for assuring the quality

and standards of its awards, as required by the Universities Act 1997 and the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012.

The Review Process

1.4 Typically, the review model comprises four major elements:

- Preparation of a self-assessment report (SAR)
- A visit by a review group (RG) that includes UCD faculty and staff and external experts, both national and international. The site visit normally will take place over a two or three day period
- Preparation of a review group report that is made public
- Agreement of an action plan for improvement (quality improvement plan) based on the RG report's recommendations. The University will also monitor progress against the improvement plan

Full details of the review process can be found on the UCD Quality Office website: www.ucd.ie/quality.

The Review Group

1.5 The composition of the Review Group for the UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics was as follows:

- Professor Jason Last, UCD Dean of Students (Chair)
- Assoc. Professor Aoife Gowen, UCD School of Biosystems and Food Engineering (Deputy Chair)
- Emeritus Professor Brian Nelson, School of Languages, Literatures, Cultures and Linguistics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia (Extern)
- Professor Claire Honess, Dean of the Doctoral College and Professor of Italian Studies, University of Leeds (Extern)

1.6 The Review Group visited the School from 6-9 November 2017 and held meetings with School faculty and staff; undergraduate and postgraduate students; other University faculty and staff, including the College Principal. The site visit schedule is included as Appendix 3.

1.7 In addition to the Self-assessment Report, the Review Group considered other documentation provided by the School and the University during the site visit, including: external examiner reports, staff survey results and staff demographic data.

Preparation of the Self-assessment Report (SAR)

- 1.8 Following a briefing from the UCD Quality Office, a Self-assessment Report Coordinating Committee (SARCC) was established with the aim of facilitating proportional staff representation. Members of the committee, in consultation with staff and student representatives, drafted sections of the Self-assessment Report. The committee met on 7 occasions between October 2016 and September 2017.
- 1.9 All staff were given the opportunity, to provide input and feedback to a draft version of the self-assessment report before submission. Progress was reported at School meetings and communicated by email. In addition to these formal and informal opportunities to input into the SAR, the School convened an externally facilitated away-afternoon to develop its SWOT, a dedicated all-staff meeting to discuss an advanced draft of the SAR and an externally facilitated T&L workshop.

The University

- 1.10 University College Dublin (UCD) is a large and diverse university whose origins date back to 1854. The University is situated on a large modern campus about 4 km to the south of the centre of Dublin.
- 1.11 The University Strategic Plan (to 2020) states that the University's mission is: "to contribute to the flourishing of Dublin, Ireland, Europe and the world through the excellence and impact of our research and scholarship, the quality of our graduates and our global engagement; providing a supportive community in which every member of the University is enabled to achieve their full potential".

The University is currently organised into six colleges and 37 schools:

- UCD College of Arts and Humanities
 - UCD College of Business
 - UCD College of Engineering and Architecture
 - UCD College of Health and Agricultural Sciences
 - UCD College of Social Sciences and Law
 - UCD College of Science
- 1.12 As one of the largest universities on the island of Ireland, UCD supports a broad, deep and rich academic community in Science, Business, Engineering, Health Sciences, Agriculture, Veterinary Medicine, Arts, Law, Celtic Studies and Social Sciences. There are currently more than 27,869 students on the UCD campus (approximately 16,684 undergraduates, 8,202 postgraduates and 2,983 Occasional and Adult Education students) registered on over 70

University degree programmes, including over 7,012 international students from more than 131 countries. The University also has over 5,591 students studying UCD degree programmes on campuses overseas.

UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics

- 1.13 The UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics is one of seven schools in the UCD College of Arts and Humanities. The School currently comprises 46 members of staff including 31 faculty members, 2 members of administrative staff and 12 people who hold 'other academic and teaching posts'.
- 1.14 Following University restructuring in 2004-05, the disciplines of French, German, Spanish & Portuguese, Italian, Near Eastern Languages and Film Studies merged to form the School of Languages, Literatures and Film. In 2006, the mix of disciplines was reviewed and the School was reconfigured to form the School of Languages and Literatures. In 2015, UCD academic structures were reviewed and Linguistics joined the School to form the School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics.
- 1.15 The core subject sections within the School are French and Francophone Studies, German Studies, Italian Studies, Linguistics and Spanish & Portuguese Studies. In addition, a three-year post in Chinese studies has been introduced. Subjects within the School contribute to delivery of the following undergraduate degrees: BA in Modern Languages (BAIML), BA, BA International (BAI), BComm International (BCIT) and the Bachelor in Civil Law degrees (BCL; BCL with French Law; BCL Maîtrise). Along with the PhD, at postgraduate level the School offers three programmes at MA level: MA in Applied Linguistics; MA in Linguistics; and the MA in Modern Languages.
- 1.16 The School is actively engaged with the development of the 4-year BA Humanities degree (English, European and World Literatures; Languages, Linguistics and Cultures; and the new Social Sciences degrees (Social Sciences with a Language; Social Sciences with Linguistics), which will be launched in 2018. The School will continue to deliver the BAIML, alongside the traditional 3-year BA and the new BA Humanities.

Commendation

- 1.17 The School is ranked number 1 in Ireland for Modern Languages according to the QS World University Rankings 2017. Current and former students reinforced this, noting that the School is unique among Irish Universities in terms of the flexibility in language selection, options to study three languages alongside cultures and linguistics, part-time options, individual attention to students and the accessibility of staff to students.

2. Organisation and Management

- 2.1 As set out in 1.14 above, the School has seen significant changes to the structure of the unit over the last 15 years, including a recent union between Linguistics and the already formed

School of Languages. It appears that the disciplines in the School are still learning to adapt to these structures. This is reflected in the fact that the School's mission is formulated mainly in terms of a collection of individual Subject requirements and views rather than a unified ambition for all.

- 2.2 The School's structure is flat, with every member of staff reporting to the Head of School, with one exception. The role of the School Executive is not universally understood within the School. It is, however, clear that the executive committee does not have a role in determining how the School spends its budget and the final decision on human resource matters lie with the Head of School.
- 2.3 The Review Group recognises that some of its recommendations may have budget and staffing implications and that the prioritisation of investment choices remains a matter for the Head of School, determined through strategic planning considerations. The Review Group is aware that the School will need to consider carefully the areas in which it would like to make targeted new appointments (please also see section 3 below).

Commendation

- 2.4 The Head of School has a consultative and consensus driven approach which is to be commended.
- 2.5 Administrative staff in the School are commended for consulting with faculty to identify ways to reduce the faculty administrative burden, taking on those tasks where possible and streamlining many School processes.

Recommendations

- 2.6 The Review Group recommends the formation of an advisory group within the School, in partnership with the College, co-opting external academic and professional administrative expertise. This would require a clearly formulated Terms of Reference and timeframe for completion of its express purpose which would be:
- identification of a unified vision for the School;
 - evaluation of opportunities for future development;
 - identification of opportunities for harmonisation across Subjects in the delivery of education and research;
 - development of an organisational chart, clearly mapping out the current School governance structures, and the reporting lines of School office holders and School committees. This should then be updated following the work of the advisory group.
- 2.7 The Review Group recommends the formation of a management team or similar, comprising individuals who can assist the Head of School with activities such as strategic resource

allocation, performance management and to help implement the outcomes from the advisory group.

- 2.8 The Review Group recommends continued engagement between School administrative staff and faculty to optimise administrative processes within the School, for example, to ensure a reasonable spread of deadlines for staff and students throughout the academic year.

3. Staff and Facilities

Staff

- 3.1 As set out in section 1, the School comprises 46 members of staff including 31 members of faculty, 3 members of administrative staff (one of whom is on secondment) and 12 people who hold 'other academic and teaching posts'. Within the new University resource allocation mechanism, the School has more control of its staff planning and now has the opportunity to develop a medium-term staffing plan that is aligned to a clearly articulated School vision and strategy. The School is considering appointing an Educational Technologist in support of its digital learning ambitions.
- 3.2 The School is currently implementing a limited, opt-in, staff workload model (WLM) which is retrospective and descriptive. As such, the current WLM does not support forward planning and the School is not achieving the benefits that an effective, transparent, compulsory workload model can deliver. The University has developed, and is in the process of rolling out, a performance development programme for all staff - Performance for Growth (P4G).
- 3.3 The School includes a cohort of language-only teaching staff and the morale of this group is low. The current system for language teaching staff within the School does not facilitate development and progression opportunities for these staff. The Review Group acknowledges there is a complex history here but believes that this must not be allowed to prevent development for the good of the School and its students.
- 3.4 The School is one of the most diverse Schools in UCD, in terms of staff representation on the grounds of gender and nationality. The School is one of eight schools in the University applying for an Athena SWAN award in 2018.

Facilities

- 3.5 The School, along with other Schools in the College of Arts and Humanities and the College of Social Sciences and Law, is based in the Newman Building. Built in the 1960s, the space in the Newman Building is not ideal for a modern teaching and working environment. The building is currently being refurbished on a phased basis and the School is actively collaborating with the College and UCD Estate Services on the design and refurbishment of the School's space and facilities.

Commendations

- 3.6 The Review Group commends the commitment of the staff to the School and to their students noting a particular commitment to those students who are in need of extra support.
- 3.7 The Review Group commends the staff's commitment to research-led teaching.
- 3.8 The leadership and energy of the Head of School is commended by the Review Group.
- 3.9 The Review Group commends the School for its decision to be one of the UCD early applicants for an Athena SWAN award.
- 3.10 The forthcoming refurbishment will vastly improve the quality of space within the School.

Recommendations

- 3.11 The School could benefit from engaging proactively with both a redesigned WLM and the staff development programme (P4G), to review and reallocate its academic workload and administration.
- 3.12 The School should develop a five-year staffing plan intimately connected to the broader vision for the School. This should involve strategic investment in key areas to ensure sustainability within the financial envelope available to the School.
- 3.13 The Review Group cautions against both excessive diversification (e.g. (re)introduction of additional languages) and an expectation that all posts falling vacant because of retirements, be automatically filled in the same or similar areas of the relevant Subject. Consideration should be given to investment in areas judged to have considerable potential for growth e.g. *Translation Studies* and *English, European and World Literatures*.
- 3.14 The School should move as soon as possible to appoint an educational technologist (ET) to support the work of the School Head of Teaching & Learning. The Review Group recommends that the first task of the ET might be to conduct a thorough analysis of the School's needs in this area: for example, the decision between the provision of a language laboratory or investment in software that students can access in various locations.
- 3.15 The different needs of Foreign Language teaching and, for example, the teaching of Phonetics and Corpus Linguistics should be taken into consideration when thinking about space requirements.
- 3.16 SLCL should implement a compulsory and forward-looking workload model for *all* faculty and academic-related staff, based on a 40:40:20 split, with opportunity for variation at the discretion of the Head of School.

- The WLM should be explained clearly to all so that it is understood that it represents a broad-brush overview of an individual's contribution rather than an exact reflection of time spent.
- Key administrative roles should be weighted according to an agreed points system or similar.
- The WLM for all staff should be initially prepared by School administrative staff, before being passed to the individual staff member for review and agreement.
- The WLM findings should be transparent; the outcomes should be shared with all staff, perhaps initially anonymously.
- Individual workloads, as measured by the WLM, should feed naturally into discussions taking place as part of the annual performance development process.
- The WLM should be used as a key piece of management information to inform future staffing decisions.

3.17 Staff should engage constructively with the University's new staff development system, including:

- within the School, potential reviewers need to be identified and trained;
- School staff concerns and expectations regarding the new development system need to be articulated and clarification provided by UCD Human Resources;
- the School needs to ensure that information from the research management system and WLM feeds into this process to facilitate a rounded discussion and to avoid duplication of effort.

3.18 Consideration should be given to streamlining academic administration undertaken by faculty and moving some tasks to the School level, thereby providing development opportunities for School administrative staff as well as freeing up faculty time for teaching and research. Administrative staff numbers may need to be increased to facilitate this restructuring. Examples for School consideration include:

- ERASMUS support, some exams and assessment support, and coordination of hourly-paid staff could all be done by School administrative staff with *advice* from faculty.
- The very time-consuming coordination of language teaching could be taken away from research-active staff if a clearer career structure were put in place for language teachers.

3.19 The School should consider ways to improve the low morale of the language-only teaching staff. This could include identification of opportunities for career progression, greater

clarification of the role that these staff play in the School, and recognition of the importance of their contribution to the School.

- 3.20 An alternative system for language teaching provision could be considered which, for example, would include a number of full-time Language Coordinators who could lead language provision and work with some hourly-paid staff, postgraduate teaching assistants and others, such as German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), Italian government-funded and Camões, to deliver key language-teaching hours.
- 3.21 The School should explore ways of working more closely with the UCD Applied Language Centre (ALC). It could benefit both the School and the University to develop a community of language-teaching specialists which also includes colleagues working in/teaching Applied Linguistics, transforming the School into a centre for scholarship in the field of language pedagogy, as well as for research into foreign cultures.

4. Teaching and Curriculum

- 4.1 The School contributes to the delivery of a number of undergraduate degrees, including the BA in Modern Languages, the BA, the BA International, the BComm International and the Bachelor in Civil Law degrees (BCL; BCL with French Law; BCL Maîtrise). The School offers a suite of modules across all Subject areas (French and Francophone Studies; German; Italian; Linguistics; Portuguese; Spanish). Elective modules in Chinese Studies and modules on study skills are also offered by the School. Interdisciplinary School modules are primarily targeted at BAIML students.
- 4.2 The School delivers collaborative modules to three programmes at MA level (MA in Applied Linguistics; MA in Linguistics; MA in Modern Languages) and also provides a PhD programme at postgraduate level. The School is currently working to develop a stronger postgraduate cohort.
- 4.3 The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) is an international standard for describing language ability. The CEFR is used by all the language areas in the School to describe learning outcomes, but the process by which each language area arrives at these outcomes appears to be varied, leading to very different experiences for students studying two (or three) languages.
- 4.4 The ALC also uses the CEFR to describe its outcomes and some progression from ALC to SLCL modules already happens. Mapping of SLCL and ALC modules against one another should be relatively straightforward and may help to facilitate further, more significant, developments.

Commendations

- 4.5 The School offers a broad and diverse portfolio of courses involving a multiplicity of partnerships across the University including with Business and Law. The development of new BA programmes and pathways is to be applauded.

- 4.6 The Review Group congratulates the School on its high-quality, innovative and reflective teaching culture. Positive feedback was given by students, who stressed the enthusiasm and accessibility of staff.
- 4.7 The School's regular review of its curriculum and teaching practices was positively noted by the Review Group.
- 4.8 The maximisation of research-led teaching is to be welcomed (one student commented: "It inspired me").

Recommendations

General

- 4.9 While the maximisation of research-led teaching is to be welcomed, this should not be allowed to inhibit participation in new, perhaps collaborative, curriculum initiatives.
- 4.10 The Review Group encourages the School to consider how it might build on areas of common interest, across subject areas.
- 4.11 The Review Group recommends that further consideration be given to the alleviation of workloads (and class sizes) through 'smart' teaching (e.g. via electronic means, etc.), as well as through an increased number of graduate teaching assistantships.
- 4.12 The Review Group recognises that the School's teaching would be greatly enhanced by the improvement of its facilities and supports, especially through the appointment of an educational technologist (see above).

Undergraduate

- 4.13 The creation of the BA in *English, European and World Literatures* is an exciting development, and it is to be hoped that this will begin to pay dividends in terms of postgraduate enrolments. The Review Group recommends that the possibility of postgraduate studies should be flagged to students undertaking this course.
- 4.14 The Review Group recommends that, to maximise enrolments in the BA in *English, European and World Literatures*, the stricture concerning translation (i.e. texts should only be studied in their original language) should be removed. The Review Group does not believe that this would have deleterious consequences, given appropriate language co- and pre-requisites.
- 4.15 Consideration should be given to the diversification of the curriculum towards the social sciences, film studies or similar areas to respond to the varied interests of students.
- 4.16 The Review Group recommends that the School address the concern that was expressed by some students regarding the need for more appropriate language-level streaming.

- 4.17 Language teachers and coordinators from across the School should work together to bring greater consistency to the language curriculum across all languages. This should not be a one-size-fits-all approach, but a *coordinated* one, with consistency in terms of expected contact-hours, outcomes and coverage of the four key skills.
- 4.18 Progression pathways from ALC modules to SLCL modules should be formalised where they exist and be advertised to students.

Graduate Studies

- 4.19 Recruitment into existing MA courses is low. The Review Group recommends that consideration be given to (a) the viability of low-enrolment MAs, (b) the introduction of MA courses that may attract significantly higher enrolments, e.g. in *Translation Studies* and in *English, European and World Literatures*.
- 4.20 The Review Group fully endorses the School's aim to develop a stronger graduate studies cohort, and recommends that the following be considered:
- increased provision of PhD scholarships and perhaps an increase in their financial value;
 - an enlarged system of graduate teaching assistantships;
 - the development of an enhanced PhD mentoring system;
 - proactive and vigorous advertising of postgraduate opportunities e.g. on relevant electronic noticeboards such as 'Francofil';
 - a shared study space to provide a greater sense of community.
- 4.21 The UCD *University Code of Practice for Supervisors and Research Degree Students* clearly sets out the responsibilities of Research Masters/Doctoral Studies Panels, typically comprising a Principal Supervisor, any additional supervisor(s) and a number of advisors. The Review Group recommends (though it realises that this is not primarily a matter for the School) that consideration be given to the introduction of a co-supervisor PhD supervision model. Co-supervision is now considered international best practice as it provides flexibility, additional supports and systematic safeguards for both postgraduate students and their supervisors.
- 4.22 An annual graduate colloquium should be considered, perhaps in partnership with other higher-level institutions.

5. Research Activity

5.1 The School presented evidence of publication across publication type with particular strength in book chapters, conference contribution and peer-reviewed journal publication. The majority of staff are research active and research specialisms are embedded in teaching. The School has developed a research strategy that aims to increase research productivity through the further development of, and engagement with, existing School activities. These activities include operation of a School-wide sabbatical leave rota, collaborative partnerships and the increased incorporation of specialisms into the School curriculum. The School is successful in securing competitive internal and external funding. The School has introduced a new system of graduate teaching assistantships (first candidates in place in 2017-18) which it believes will support their aims to increase numbers on their graduate research programmes.

Commendations

- 5.2 The School's decision to put funding into PhD scholarships with a teaching component.
- 5.3 The clear rise in the School's ambition in applying for larger grants, with a large increase in the value of applications since 2016.
- 5.4 A number of emerging interdisciplinary cross-School projects around which funding bids could be made e.g. Dictators and Degenerates.

Recommendations

- 5.5 The Review Group recommends that the School should continue with the graduate teaching assistantship scholarships, with a view to expanding where possible.
- 5.6 The School should consider introducing dual supervision where appropriate as a way of giving colleagues experience of supervision.
- 5.7 Consider increasing the number of interdisciplinary cross-School projects around which larger funding bids could be made.
- 5.8 The School should establish a peer-review forum (consisting of, at least, all professorial-level staff) with the aim of supporting the research development of all (and not just early career) staff in the School. Responsibilities for consideration include:
- Every research-active member of staff should have at least one pre-publication piece of work read by a member of the peer-review forum every year.
 - Review should happen at the pre-publication stage to allow for advice on improvements to be taken on board.
 - The peer-review forum should also review all external research grant applications.

- If need be, for large grants, experienced successful applicants from outside the School should be brought in as advisors, since experience within the School is limited.
- 5.9 The School should implement the College's new rules around sabbatical leave. Staff taking leave must submit clear plans before the leave period and feedback on outcomes afterwards.
- 5.10 The School should consider allowing staff to spread a one-semester leave over a full academic year to facilitate the continued delivery of specialist modules, e.g. staff could take a number of sabbatical weeks in each semester or 1-2 days sabbatical leave per week over 2 semesters.
- 5.11 In particular, the School should acknowledge that most colleagues, not just the early career researchers, would benefit from support in developing and sustaining their research. The idea that this responsibility should fall entirely to the individual academic is not supported, and suggests an abdication of responsibility towards the scholarly community of the School.
- 5.12 The School, in conjunction with the College, should consider the inclusion of support for 'early- and mid-career colleagues at Lecturer/Assistant Professor level' within job descriptions for more senior academic roles and highlighting the need to do this as part of promotions processes.

6. Management of Quality and Enhancement

- 6.1 The School utilises a number of management and quality enhancement mechanisms to evaluate the quality of their output and the experience for their students including, *inter alia*, strategic planning; programme and module design and approval; curriculum review; engagement with external accreditation processes, student feedback; effective recruitment practices and, external examining.
- 6.2 The School engaged very positively with this quality review, including developing an honest and reflective Self-assessment Report, as well as taking opportunities to engage with stakeholders and developmental exercises during their preparations.
- 6.3 Commendations and recommendations related to many of the quality mechanisms listed above are included in other sections of this Report.

Commendations

- 6.4 The School is engaging with quality enhancement routinely, notably through regular review of teaching methods.
- 6.5 Despite the challenging external funding environment, the School has continued to prioritise a high-quality learning experience for students and has engaged with technology-enhanced learning.
- 6.6 The Review Group commends the School for their:

- engagement with Athena SWAN via their upcoming School application.
- creation of a School fund to invite speakers/organise conferences.
- engagement with the initiative to link undergraduate students with previous graduates via email.
- recent introduction of a School induction system for new staff.

6.7 The School used the process of developing their Self-assessment Report to review many of their activities and to consult with School staff on possible opportunities for improvement.

Recommendations

6.8 The Review Group recommends that the School continue to engage in self-reflection and development activities. The School would benefit from the introduction of facilitated workshops, with clear agendas, to discuss the School's vision and strategy, School issues and for the consideration opportunities for development.

6.9 The School should engage with University mechanisms, in conjunction with the College Principal, to ensure implementation of the Quality Improvement Plan that they will develop to address Review Group recommendations.

7. Support Services

7.1 The School regularly engages with a wide range of University support services including the Programme Office, the Library, Research Office, IT Services, Teaching and Learning, Registry, Assessment and Logistics, UCD Estate Services and the International Office. These engagements are often positive and constructive, for example, the library liaison sits on the School teaching and learning committee and the School regularly consults with UCD Research for advice on preparation of research grant proposals and grant registration.

Commendations

7.2 The School enhances the impact of its research through bibliometrics. For example, the School is very active in submission of articles to the UCD open access repository system. Approximately 50% of the College's articles on the repository come from the School.

7.3 Faculty at all levels regularly enhance their teaching by engagement in continuous professional development through UCD Teaching & Learning.

Recommendations

- 7.4 The Review Group recommends that the School provide input to UCD Research (e.g. via the Chair of the School Research Committee) to capture journals relevant to the School's disciplines (e.g. foreign language journals) for recognition in the University Output-based Research Support Scheme (OBRSS).
- 7.5 The role of the Programme Office should be clearly communicated to School staff and students.
- 7.6 Delivery of technology-enhanced learning should be supported by reliable infrastructure. The technology (*i.e.* projectors or similar) in small-group teaching room facilities of the Newman Building are unreliable and should be updated as a matter of urgency.

8. External Relations

- 8.1 The School has an extensive network of relationships with prospective and current students, alumni, staff across the institution, other universities and many other stakeholder groups outside of UCD. It is, however, very aware of the opportunity to increase its profile.
- 8.2 UCD strategically promotes its identity as Ireland's Global University. The University's global relationships and reputation can be enhanced through communication with others in terms of both language and intercultural understanding. The Review Group identified the opportunity for the institution to further consolidate itself in this position by having a strong language unit rooted in real research into other cultures as well as linguistic competence.

Commendations

- 8.3 The School has reviewed its visibility and developed a School media portal to enhance its online presence.

Recommendations

- 8.4 The Review Group encourages the School to explore the creation of new external relationships (and the consolidation of existing ones) with universities across and outside Europe, with a view to increasing funding opportunities and facilitating staff and PhD level exchanges and collaboration.
- 8.5 To improve visibility, highlight the School's national and international standing in School promotion activities, including the website, media portal, print media, social media in consultation with the new College marketing resource.
- 8.6 The School should consider using its engagement with Athena SWAN in its promotional activities in UCD and externally.

UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics – Full List of Commendations and Recommendations

This Appendix contains a full list of all commendations and recommendations made by the Review Group for the UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics and should be read in conjunction with the specific chapter above. *(Please note that the paragraph references below refer to the relevant paragraphs in the report text)*

A. Introduction and Overview of UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics

Commendation

- 1.17 The School is ranked number 1 in Ireland for Modern Languages according to the QS World University Rankings 2017. Current and former students reinforced this, noting that the School is unique among Irish Universities in terms of the flexibility in language selection, options to study three languages alongside cultures and linguistics, part-time options, individual attention to students and the accessibility of staff to students.

B. Organisation and Management

Commendation

- 2.4 The Head of School has a consultative and consensus driven approach which is to be commended.
- 2.5 Administrative staff in the School are commended for consulting with faculty to identify ways to reduce the faculty administrative burden, taking on those tasks where possible and streamlining many School processes.

Recommendations

- 2.6 The Review Group recommends the formation of an advisory group within the School, in partnership with the College, co-opting external academic and professional administrative expertise. This would require a clearly formulated Terms of Reference and timeframe for completion of its express purpose which would be:
- identification of a unified vision for the School;
 - evaluation of opportunities for future development;

- identification of opportunities for harmonisation across Subjects in the delivery of education and research;
- development of an organisational chart, clearly mapping out the current School governance structures, and the reporting lines of School office holders and School committees. This should then be updated following the work of the advisory group.

2.7 The Review Group recommends the formation of a management team or similar, comprising individuals who can assist the Head of School with activities such as strategic resource allocation, performance management and to help implement the outcomes from the advisory group.

2.8 The Review Group recommends continued engagement between School administrative staff and faculty to optimise administrative processes within the School, for example, to ensure a reasonable spread of deadlines for staff and students throughout the academic year.

C. Staff and Facilities

Commendations

3.6 The Review Group commends the commitment of the staff to the School and to their students noting a particular commitment to those students who are in need of extra support.

3.7 The Review Group commends the staff's commitment to research-led teaching.

3.8 The leadership and energy of the Head of School is commended by the Review Group.

3.9 The Review Group commends the School for its decision to be one of the UCD early applicants for an Athena SWAN award.

3.10 The forthcoming refurbishment will vastly improve the quality of space within the School.

Recommendations

3.11 The School could benefit from engaging proactively with both a redesigned WLM and the staff development programme (P4G), to review and reallocate its academic workload and administration.

3.12 The School should develop a five-year staffing plan intimately connected to the broader vision for the School. This should involve strategic investment in key areas to ensure sustainability within the financial envelope available to the School.

3.13 The Review Group cautions against both excessive diversification (e.g. (re)introduction of additional languages) and an expectation that all posts falling vacant because of retirements, be automatically filled in the same or similar areas of the relevant Subject. Consideration

should be given to investment in areas judged to have considerable potential for growth e.g. *Translation Studies* and *English, European and World Literatures*.

- 3.14 The School should move as soon as possible to appoint an educational technologist (ET) to support the work of the School Head of Teaching & Learning. The Review Group recommends that the first task of the ET might be to conduct a thorough analysis of the School's needs in this area: for example, the decision between the provision of a language laboratory or investment in software that students can access in various locations.
- 3.15 The different needs of Foreign Language teaching and, for example, the teaching of Phonetics and Corpus Linguistics should be taken into consideration when thinking about space requirements.
- 3.16 SLCL should implement a compulsory and forward-looking workload model for *all* faculty and academic-related staff, based on a 40:40:20 split, with opportunity for variation at the discretion of the Head of School.
- The WLM should be explained clearly to all so that it is understood that it represents a broad-brush overview of an individual's contribution rather than an exact reflection of time spent.
 - Key administrative roles should be weighted according to an agreed points system or similar.
 - The WLM for all staff should be initially prepared by School administrative staff, before being passed to the individual staff member for review and agreement.
 - The WLM findings should be transparent; the outcomes should be shared with all staff, perhaps initially anonymously.
 - Individual workloads, as measured by the WLM, should feed naturally into discussions taking place as part of the annual performance development process.
 - The WLM should be used as a key piece of management information to inform future staffing decisions.
- 3.17 Staff should engage constructively with the University's new staff development system, including:
- within the School, potential reviewers need to be identified and trained;
 - School staff concerns and expectations regarding the new development system need to be articulated and clarification provided by UCD Human Resources;

- the School needs to ensure that information from the research management system and WLM feeds into this process to facilitate a rounded discussion and to avoid duplication of effort;
- 3.18 Consideration should be given to streamlining academic administration undertaken by faculty and moving some tasks to the School level, thereby providing development opportunities for School administrative staff as well as freeing up faculty time for teaching and research. Administrative staff numbers may need to be increased to facilitate this restructuring. Examples for School consideration include:
- ERASMUS support, some exams and assessment support, and coordination of hourly-paid staff could all be done by School administrative staff with *advice* from faculty.
 - The very time-consuming coordination of language teaching could be taken away from research-active staff if a clearer career structure were put in place for language teachers.
- 3.19 The School should consider ways to improve the low morale of the language-only teaching staff. This could include identification of opportunities for career progression, greater clarification of the role that these staff play in the School, and recognition of the importance of their contribution to the School.
- 3.20 An alternative system for language teaching provision could be considered which, for example, would include a number of full-time Language Coordinators who could lead language provision and work with some hourly-paid staff, postgraduate teaching assistants and others, such as German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), Italian government-funded and Camões, to deliver key language-teaching hours.
- 3.21 The School should explore ways of working more closely with the UCD Applied Language Centre (ALC). It could benefit both the School and the University to develop a community of language-teaching specialists which also includes colleagues working in/teaching Applied Linguistics, transforming the School into a centre for scholarship in the field of language pedagogy, as well as for research into foreign cultures.

D. Teaching and Curriculum

Commendations

- 4.5 The School offers a broad and diverse portfolio of courses involving a multiplicity of partnerships across the University including with Business and Law. The development of new BA programmes and pathways is to be applauded.
- 4.6 The Review Group congratulates the School on its high-quality, innovative and reflective teaching culture. Positive feedback was given by students, who stressed the enthusiasm and accessibility of staff.

- 4.7 The School's regular review of its curriculum and teaching practices was positively noted by the Review Group.
- 4.8 The maximisation of research-led teaching is to be welcomed (one student commented: "It inspired me").

Recommendations

General

- 4.9 While the maximisation of research-led teaching is to be welcomed, this should not be allowed to inhibit participation in new, perhaps collaborative, curriculum initiatives.
- 4.10 The Review Group encourages the School to consider how it might build on areas of common interest, across subject areas.
- 4.11 The Review Group recommends that further consideration be given to the alleviation of workloads (and class sizes) through 'smart' teaching (e.g. via electronic means, etc.), as well as through an increased number of graduate teaching assistantships.
- 4.12 The Review Group recognises that the School's teaching would be greatly enhanced by the improvement of its facilities and supports, especially through the appointment of an educational technologist (see above).

Undergraduate

- 4.13 The creation of the BA in *English, European and World Literatures* is an exciting development, and it is to be hoped that this will begin to pay dividends in terms of postgraduate enrolments. The Review Group recommends that the possibility of postgraduate studies should be flagged to students undertaking this course.
- 4.14 The Review Group recommends that, to maximise enrolments in the BA in *English, European and World Literatures*, the stricture concerning translation (i.e. texts should only be studied in their original language) should be removed. The Review Group does not believe that this would have deleterious consequences, given appropriate language co- and pre-requisites.
- 4.15 Consideration should be given to the diversification of the curriculum towards the social sciences, film studies or similar areas to respond to the varied interests of students.
- 4.16 The Review Group recommends that the School address the concern that was expressed by some students regarding the need for more appropriate language-level streaming.
- 4.17 Language teachers and coordinators from across the School should work together to bring greater consistency to the language curriculum across all languages. This should not be a one-size-fits-all approach, but a *coordinated* one, with consistency in terms of expected contact-hours, outcomes and coverage of the four key skills.

- 4.18 Progression pathways from ALC modules to SLCL modules should be formalised where they exist and be advertised to students.

Graduate Studies

- 4.19 Recruitment into existing MA courses is low. The Review Group recommends that consideration be given to (a) the viability of low-enrolment MAs, (b) the introduction of MA courses that may attract significantly higher enrolments, e.g. in *Translation Studies* and in *English, European and World Literatures*.

- 4.20 The Review Group fully endorses the School's aim to develop a stronger graduate studies cohort, and recommends that the following be considered:

- increased provision of PhD scholarships and perhaps an increase in their financial value;
- an enlarged system of graduate teaching assistantships;
- the development of an enhanced PhD mentoring system;
- proactive and vigorous advertising of postgraduate opportunities e.g. on relevant electronic noticeboards such as 'Francofil';
- a shared study space to provide a greater sense of community.

- 4.21 The UCD *University Code of Practice for Supervisors and Research Degree Students* clearly sets out the responsibilities of Research Masters/Doctoral Studies Panels, typically comprising a Principal Supervisor, any additional supervisor(s) and a number of advisors. The Review Group recommends (though it realises that this is not primarily a matter for the School) that consideration be given to the introduction of a co-supervisor PhD supervision model. Co-supervision is now considered international best practice as it provides flexibility, additional supports and systematic safeguards for both postgraduate students and their supervisors.

- 4.22 An annual graduate colloquium should be considered, perhaps in partnership with other higher-level institutions.

E. Research Activity

Commendations

- 5.2 The School's decision to put funding into PhD scholarships with a teaching component.
- 5.3 The clear rise in the School's ambition in applying for larger grants, with a large increase in the value of applications since 2016.

- 5.4 A number of emerging interdisciplinary cross-School projects around which funding bids could be made e.g. Dictators and Degenerates.

Recommendations

- 5.5 The Review Group recommends that the School should continue with the graduate teaching assistantship scholarships, with a view to expanding where possible.
- 5.6 The School should consider introducing dual supervision where appropriate as a way of giving colleagues experience of supervision.
- 5.7 Consider increasing the number of interdisciplinary cross-School projects around which larger funding bids could be made.
- 5.8 The School should establish a peer-review forum (consisting of, at least, all professorial-level staff) with the aim of supporting the research development of all (and not just early career) staff in the School. Responsibilities for consideration include:
- Every research-active member of staff should have at least one pre-publication piece of work read by a member of the peer-review forum every year.
 - Review should happen at the pre-publication stage to allow for advice on improvements to be taken on board.
 - The peer-review forum should also review all external research grant applications.
 - If need be, for large grants, experienced successful applicants from outside the School should be brought in as advisors, since experience within the School is limited.
- 5.9 The School should implement the College's new rules around sabbatical leave. Staff taking leave must submit clear plans before the leave period and feedback on outcomes afterwards.
- 5.10 The School should consider allowing staff to spread a one-semester leave over a full academic year to facilitate the continued delivery of specialist modules, e.g. staff could take a number of sabbatical weeks in each semester or 1-2 days sabbatical leave per week over 2 semesters.
- 5.11 In particular, the School should acknowledge that most colleagues, not just the early career researchers, would benefit from support in developing and sustaining their research. The idea that this responsibility should fall entirely to the individual academic is not supported, and suggests an abdication of responsibility towards the scholarly community of the School.
- 5.12 The School, in conjunction with the College, should consider the inclusion of support for 'early- and mid-career colleagues at Lecturer/Assistant Professor level' within job descriptions for more senior academic roles and highlighting the need to do this as part of promotions processes.

F. Management of Quality and Enhancement

Commendations

- 6.4 The School is engaging with quality enhancement routinely, notably through regular review of teaching methods.
- 6.5 Despite the challenging external funding environment, the School has continued to prioritise a high-quality learning experience for students and has engaged with technology-enhanced learning.
- 6.6 The Review Group commends the School for their:
- engagement with Athena SWAN via their upcoming School application.
 - creation of a School fund to invite speakers/organise conferences.
 - engagement with the initiative to link undergraduate students with previous graduates via email.
 - recent introduction of a School induction system for new staff.
- 6.7 The School used the process of developing their Self-assessment Report to review many of their activities and to consult with School staff on possible opportunities for improvement.

Recommendations

- 6.8 The Review Group recommends that the School continue to engage in self-reflection and development activities. The School would benefit from the introduction of facilitated workshops, with clear agendas, to discuss the School's vision and strategy, School issues and for the consideration opportunities for development.
- 6.9 The School should engage with University mechanisms, in conjunction with the College Principal, to ensure implementation of the Quality Improvement Plan that they will develop to address Review Group recommendations.

G. Support Services

Commendations

- 7.2 The School enhances the impact of its research through bibliometrics. For example, the School is very active in submission of articles to the UCD open access repository system. Approximately 50% of the College's articles on the repository come from the School.
- 7.3 Faculty at all levels regularly enhance their teaching by engagement in continuous professional development through UCD Teaching & Learning.

Recommendations

- 7.4 The Review Group recommends that the School provide input to UCD Research (e.g. via the Chair of the School Research Committee) to capture journals relevant to the School's disciplines (e.g. foreign language journals) for recognition in the University Output-based Research Support Scheme (OBRSS).
- 7.5 The role of the Programme Office should be clearly communicated to School staff and students.
- 7.6 Delivery of technology-enhanced learning should be supported by reliable infrastructure. The technology (*i.e.* projectors or similar) in small-group teaching room facilities of the Newman Building are unreliable and should be updated as a matter of urgency.

H. External Relations

Commendations

- 8.3 The School has reviewed its visibility and developed a School media portal to enhance its online presence.

Recommendations

- 8.4 The Review Group encourages the School to explore the creation of new external relationships (and the consolidation of existing ones) with universities across and outside Europe, with a view to increasing funding opportunities and facilitating staff and PhD level exchanges and collaboration.
- 8.5 To improve visibility, highlight the School's national and international standing in School promotion activities, including the website, media portal, print media, social media in consultation with the new College marketing resource.
- 8.6 The School should consider using its engagement with Athena SWAN in its promotional activities in UCD and externally.

UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics – Response to the Review Group Report

The School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics wishes to thank the external Review Group for generously agreeing to help the School with its quality review process. SLCL conducted its internal quality review throughout the academic year 2016-17 and School colleagues benefited collectively from the opportunity to hold exceptional quality review workshops centred around SWOT analysis, educational technology tools and email/time management. This review has afforded the School a valuable moment of collective reflection and reassessment which will continue during the QIP process. The external Review Group's keen engagement with all aspects of the School and with its constituent members during a busy site visit in November 2017 is deeply appreciated. The School was recently restructured in 2015, when Linguistics was moved to join Modern Languages. Hence, the Review Group's external perspective as formulated within the pages of this Report is particularly timely. Their observations, commendations and recommendations will assist the School in enhancing its governance, in honing its strategic planning, and in developing a clear vision for the future.

The School welcomes the Review Group's highlighting of its unique position in Ireland, including its ranking as number 1 nationally for Modern Languages according to the QS World University Rankings 2017. The School is particularly pleased with the Review Group's commendations in the areas of 'high quality, innovative and reflective' teaching culture, student support, substantial submissions to UCD's research repository, and research-led teaching. It notes that the external recognition comprised within the QS high international ranking is primarily achieved through sustained collective dedication to a high-quality research culture.

With specific reference to the list of prioritised recommendations for improvement provided by the Review Group, the School's initial responses are provided below:

1. *Recommendation: The School should develop a five-year staffing plan intimately connected to the broader vision for the School. This should involve strategic investment in key areas to ensure sustainability within the financial envelope available to the School.*

Response: The School looks forward to developing a five-year staffing plan connected to the broader vision for the School. The formulation of this five-year plan will be informed by discussion at School Executive and at School Council levels, and also by financial, marketing and strategic advice to be provided by a new (short-term) Advisory Group (2.6).

2. *Recommendation: SLCL should implement a compulsory and forward-looking workload model for all faculty and academic-related staff, based on a 40:40:20 split, with opportunity for variation at the discretion of the Head of School.*

Response: The School concurs with this stated ambition of 40:40:20 split within the academic workload. To achieve equitable distribution of tasks and to ensure engagement across teaching, learning and administration/outreach, each colleague will henceforth complete and submit a

workload model at regular intervals, or upon request. The School also welcomes the Review Group's recognition of the low morale of current language-only teaching staff, many of whom have CID contracts (3.3), about which they are currently in discussions with HR. The School is attempting to address the low morale amongst this valued cohort of staff members.

3. *Recommendation: While the maximisation of research-led teaching is to be welcomed, this should not be allowed to inhibit participation in new, perhaps collaborative, curriculum initiatives.*

Response: The School wishes to note that research-led teaching and innovative non-specialist collaborative initiatives are not mutually incompatible, and underscores the fact that both already exist within the School. While UCD actively promotes research-led teaching, which currently comprises most level 2 and level 3 and all MA modules, colleagues are encouraged to develop new modules that build on common interests within and across subject areas. For example, most School SLL-coded modules, much language teaching and many level 1 modules (these three combined comprise approximately 43% of annual total 175 modules) involve non-specialist and collaborative teaching. The School nonetheless acknowledges that there is much room for diversification of the curriculum to respond to varied student interests. School colleagues welcome the fact that the new BA in Humanities degrees will facilitate the emergence of innovative new modules, including broad inter- and cross-disciplinary collaborative initiatives, including at MA level.

4. *Recommendation: The Review Group recognises that the School's teaching would be greatly enhanced by the improvement of its facilities and supports, especially through the appointment of an educational technologist.*

Response: The School welcomes the recently-launched refurbishment work within Block A (3rd floor) Newman. The School also welcomes imminent work on Newman Block D, until which time the School will be without significant assets such as a seminar room and meeting rooms, which impacts not only on everyday business, but also on collegiality, and most particularly on the School's postgraduate community. The School will henceforth signal all in-classroom technical failures directly to UCD Estates. The School is pleased to set in train the hiring of an Educational Technologist on a 3-year contract, in support of significantly expanding its online platforms (including new UCD VLE and newly-launched School Media Portal: <https://slclmediaportal.com>) and honing its use of digital learning skills.

5. *Recommendation: Language teachers and coordinators from across the School should work together to bring greater consistency to the language curriculum across all languages. This should not be a one-size-fits-all approach, but a coordinated one, with consistency in terms of expected contact-hours, outcomes and coverage of the four key skills.*

Response: Building on recent internal reviews of Language teaching, the School's Teaching and Learning committee will endeavour to ensure that the language curriculum across all languages is cohesive, consistent, and logical, with particular awareness of students who may engage with three or more different language sections within the School over the course of their degree. The School, in consultation with the new Advisory Group, will consider the Review Group's suggestion

for a School Language Coordinator, and may release some member(s) of staff from part of their teaching duties in order to carry out this onerous task.

6. *Recommendation: Recruitment into existing MA courses is low. The Review Group recommends that consideration be given to (a) the viability of low-enrolment MAs, (b) the introduction of MA courses that may attract significantly higher enrolments e.g. in Translation Studies and in English, European and World Literatures.*

Response: The School cherishes its three current MA courses (MA in Linguistics, MA in Applied Linguistics; MA in Modern Languages) but acknowledges the problem of low-enrolment MA offerings, especially for some programmes. The Postgraduate Committee, in consultation with Heads of Subject and the new Advisory Group (which might profitably include a market researcher to measure external demand in selected new MA areas), must analyse the potential of trial new MA degree courses such as those suggested by the Review Group and/or expand specific areas of internal expertise, for example Cultural Theory, or Interculturality. Creative teaching methods such as dual-coding of extant final year modules, and/or further diversification of MA programmes are currently being considered and implemented. The School will also seek better guidance on the optimal number of students per MA programme, taking account of staffing arrangements in any given year. The new BA Humanities pathways provide an obvious new template at MA level for future MA offerings such as an MA in English, European and World Literatures, or an MA in Languages, Linguistics and Cultures.

7. *Recommendation: In particular, the School should acknowledge that most colleagues, not just the early career researchers, would benefit from support in developing and sustaining their research. The idea that this responsibility should fall entirely to the individual academic is not supported and suggests an abdication of responsibility towards the scholarly community of the School.*

Response: The School is most grateful to the Review Group for its articulation of the importance of developing, sustaining and supporting research. This last includes the importance of moral, academic and career support for colleagues along their lifelong trajectory of producing high-quality publications. The School wishes to emphasise, expand and sustain its collective dedication to a high quality research culture. In order to achieve this, the School recognises that each individual colleague must be supported in constructive ways by senior colleagues and by the institution in a fair, transparent and respectful manner. Arising from the Review Group's suggestions, the School will endeavour to concretise some new channels of research support, including an expansion, or reinforcement of, informal and formal professor-led research support systems. The School suggests that all colleagues engaged in research might profitably be mentored by professors and other senior academics across both College and School. In this regard, the School particularly welcomes the recent launch of a Research Advisory Network by the College of Arts and Humanities. The School also welcomes the idea of establishing an internal advisory forum to review external research grant applications pre-submission. Given peer-review by journals and editors, the School does not, however, agree that peer-review of pre-submission articles need be provided by that forum, unless specifically requested by colleagues. This is both due to time restraints and to avoid duplication of effort, where articles will already be peer-reviewed pre-publication. The idea of flexibility in future sabbatical leave arrangements (e.g. a few days each week across a teaching year) will also be explored within the School.

As well as the prioritised recommendations addressed above, the Review Group makes one recommendation in relation to the ALC, on which the School will comment briefly below:

8. *Recommendation: 3.20. The School should explore ways of working more closely with the UCD Applied Language Centre (ALC). It could benefit both the School and the University to develop a community of language-teaching specialists which also includes colleagues working in/teaching Applied Linguistics, transforming the School into a centre for scholarship in the field of language pedagogy, as well as for research into foreign cultures.*

Response: The School already cooperates with the ALC on numerous levels and a number of colleagues already work closely with the ALC. However, given the clear overlap in research interests between the two entities, it would make sense to further develop collaborative working partnerships between SLCL and the ALC in cognate fields including language pedagogy and Interculturality in future. In the short term, a working group will be set up to put discuss new collaborative research possibilities.



UCD School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics

6-9 November 2017

FINAL Review Visit Timetable RG

Monday, 6 November 2017: Pre-Visit Briefing Prior to Site Visit – DOES NOT INCLUDE THE SCHOOL

- 17.15-19.00 RG meet in hotel to review preliminary issues and to confirm work schedule and assignment of tasks for the site visit – **RG and UCD Quality Office only**
- 19.30 Dinner for the RG hosted by UCD Registrar and Deputy President – **RG, UCD Deputy President and UCD Quality Office only**

Day 1: Tuesday, 7 November 2017 Venue: Room A318, Newman Building

- 08.45-09.15 Private meeting of Review Group (RG)
- 09.15-10.15 RG meet with **Head of School** and **Chair of SAR SLCL Co-ordinating Committee**
- 10.15-10.30 Break
- 10.30-11.45 RG meet with **representative group of academic staff** – primary focus on Teaching and Learning, and Curriculum issues
- 11.45-12.00 Tea/coffee break
- 12.00-12.30 RG review key observations and prepare for lunch time meeting
- 12.30-13.30 **Working lunch (buffet)** – meeting with employers (and/or other external stakeholders)
- 13.30-13.45 RG review key observations

13.45-14.15	RG meet with UCD Programme Dean(s)
14.15-14.30	RG review key observations
14.30-15.30	RG meet with College Principal, UCD College of Arts & Humanities
15.30-15.45	RG tea/coffee break
15.45-16.30	RG meeting to discuss the School's financial situation and resources
16.30-16.45	Break
16.45-17.30	RG meet with Language Assistant and Language Instructor Staff
17.30-17.45	Break
17.45-18.15	Tour of School facilities and brief visit to UCD Applied Language Centre
18.15	RG depart

Day 2: Wednesday, 8 November 2017

Venue: Room A318, Newman Building

08.30-08.45	Private meeting of the RG
08.45-09.10	RG meet with Acting Director of the UCD Applied Language Centre
09.10-09.20	Break
09.20-10.00	RG meet relevant support service representatives
10.00-10.15	Break
10.15-11.15	RG meet with a representative group of postgraduate students (taught and research) and recent graduates (PG and UG)
11.15-11.30	RG tea/coffee break
11.30-12.45	RG meet with a representative group of academic staff – primary focus on Research
12.45-13.00	RG review key observations
13.00-13.45	Lunch – Review Group only
13.45-14.45	RG meet with representative group of undergraduate students

14.45-15.00	RG private meeting - review key observations
15.00-15.15	Break
15.15-16.00	RG meet with recently appointed members of staff
16.00-16.15	Break
16.15-16.45	RG meet with members of administrative staff
16.45-17.00	Break
17.00-17.45	RG available for private individual meetings with staff
17.45-18.00	RG private meeting – review key observations/findings
18.00	RG depart
18.45	RG working dinner in hotel

Day 3: Thursday, 9 November 2017
Venue: Room A318, Newman Building

09.00-09.30	Private meeting of RG - begin preparing draft RG Report
09.30-10.00	RG meet with College Principal to feedback initial outline commendations and recommendations
10.00-11.00	RG continue preparing draft RG Report
11.00-11.15	Break
11.15-12.15	RG continue preparing draft RG Report
12.15-12.30	RG meet with UCD Programme Dean for Law with French (BCL/Maîtrise)
12.30-13.15	Lunch
13.15-14.30	RG finalise first draft of RG Report and feedback commendations/recommendations
14.30-14.45	Break
14.45-15.15	RG meet with Head of School to feedback initial outline commendations and recommendations

15.30 **Exit presentation** to all available staff of the unit – summarising the principal commendations/recommendations of the Review Group

16.00 Review Group depart