



Institutional Review of Irish Universities

University College Dublin

(Review: Feb/March 2011)

IRIU Follow-up Report: February 2012

1. Introduction

The Institutional Review of Irish Universities (IRIU), provides robust external assurances of the effectiveness of the internal quality assurance procedures established by each Irish university, to sustain and enhance further the quality of their teaching, learning, research and support services, to meet the demands of a diverse student population.

The IRIU external review process is just one component of the comprehensive *Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* (second edition, 2007)¹, prepared and published jointly by the Irish Universities Quality Board (IUQB) and the Irish Universities Association (IUA, the representative body for Irish universities), and ensures that all internal and external quality processes are coherent, consistent and robust.

The IRIU has also been designed to reinforce the long-standing commitment of Irish universities to connectivity and efficiency between internal and external quality processes. Consequently, while each Irish university will undergo an IRIU process approximately once every six years through a rolling cycle, universities also engage with and formally report to the IUQB annually. The outcomes of annual institutional reports from the universities to the IUQB, alongside the published IRIU review reports are discussed annually by the IUQB with the Higher Education Authority (HEA). The maintenance and continuous improvement of quality in higher education is a key priority for the HEA, which exercises statutory functions in this regard, under the Universities Act, 1997.

In 2004, the IUQB and the HEA jointly commissioned the European Universities Association (EUA) to undertake a customised version of its Institutional Evaluation Programme, as the first cycle of institutional quality reviews of the seven Irish universities. In 2009, following consultation with a range of key stakeholders, the IUQB finalised the process for the second cycle of institutional quality reviews.

Reports arising from Institutional quality assurance reviews of and by Irish universities, in accordance with the Universities Act, 1997, are published at: <http://reviews.iuqb.net/>.

¹ http://www.iuqb.ie/info/iuqb_publications.aspx?article=174bd944-3893-4a53-84a1-a438a2fdedd8

2. 2011 Institutional Quality Review of University College Dublin

As part of the second cycle of IRIU, a team of six independent national and international reviewers visited University College Dublin between 28 February and 3 March 2011. The Review Team Report was published by IUQB on 2 June 2011, and is available at <http://reviews.iuqb.net/>.

In accordance with the spirit of the Universities' Act (1997), the focus of University College Dublin's Quality Assurance activities is on continuous internal reflection and improvement, while adhering to externally generated regulation and accreditation requirements across all aspects of provision. University College Dublin therefore, welcomed the report of the independent external Review Team.

The Review Report affirmed that UCD has in place a range of embedded quality assurance processes at institutional level and within the core University activities of teaching and research. Quality assurance processes are also established within student support services and central University support services. These quality assurance mechanisms are designed to assure the quality of provision and ensure that developments are aligned within the strategic priorities of UCD.

UCD has used the institutional review process as a further opportunity for critical self-reflection. The University has made substantial efforts, both to consider internally and present a range of evidence throughout the Quality Review process, about the effectiveness of its quality assurance mechanisms and efforts to enhance the quality of provision.

The Review Team confirmed that UCD was fully compliant with the statutory requirements of the Universities Act 1997. The Review Team also verified that the UCD internal quality review processes were aligned with Part 1 of the European Standards and Guidelines, and that UCD actively engages with national, European and international good practice.

UCD welcomed the Review Team's conclusion that there is a strong ethos of quality at UCD and a widely shared commitment to ensure that activities are aligned with UCD's strategic objectives and international standards. This commitment, it was acknowledged by the Review Team, was not only exemplified by the formal process designed to ensure and enhance quality, but *"most important of all in our view, it is embedded within the day-to-day working of the University"* (Review Team Report: 11).

The University recognises that improvements can always be achieved and striving for constant quality enhancement is an ongoing process. However, it is gratifying that many of the external Review Team Report recommendations reaffirmed the work already in progress by the University to enhance provision, such as:

- the need to simplify and rationalise academic structures;
- ensuring the integration of various student services;
- reviewing the external composition of Review Groups;
- implementing the cross-University student feedback system
- ensuring greater links between QA/QI and the strategic planning process

The University has developed an action plan to address each of the Report's recommendations for further improvement across its activities (see section 4 below). The University is therefore, appreciative of the Review Team's suggestions for improvement which has helped us to further focus our efforts.

3. Dissemination and Discussion of the Review Findings

The Institutional Review Team Report, with the resulting commendations and recommendations was disseminated and discussed widely throughout the University. The electronic version of the IRIU Report was provided on UCD's website (notice being given by an all staff email), and hard copies were also provided to a number of institutional committees. For example, the report was made available to the UCD Governing Authority (GA), University Management Team (UMT), Academic Council and Academic Council Committee on Quality (ACCQ). The GA, UMT and ACCQ were also briefed on the findings and follow-up action, by the UCD Director of Quality. The key findings from the Institutional Review Team Report were also placed on the University's Home Web Page and included in the quarterly *Registrar's Bulletin* which is sent to all staff.

An Institutional Oversight Group was established in August 2011, to prepare an outline action plan to progress the IRIU recommendations, for consideration by the University Management Team (UMT). The UMT approved the action plan in October 2011, and subsequently, appropriate University staff were tasked with actioning the IRIU Report recommendations.

Section 4 below outlines the actions taken, work-in-progress or proposed, in response to the Review Report recommendations. In the case of work-in-progress and proposed actions, it is planned that these will be subject to periodic on-going monitoring and formal review before the end of 2012, by the UCD Academic Council Committee on Quality and University Management Team.

4. IRIU Recommendations and UCD Response (including Action Plans)

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
<u>Governance</u>			
1.8	Sharpen the University's top-level governance processes: the Governing Authority should be a smaller body with an appropriate mix of internal and external members. The external members, ideally leaders in Irish society, should be in a position to give strategic advice to the University to help it steer through difficult times. This recommendation is broadly in line with the Hunt Report's recommendation on the role, size and composition of governing authorities. It is recommended that UCD work within the IUA to more expeditiously promote such changes in its governance.	The matter of the size and composition of Governing Authorities is currently being considered by the Minister and the Department of Education & Skills as part of the Hunt Report implementation process (National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030). In conjunction with the IUA, UCD will play an active role in responding to developments from the Department of Education & Skills. For example, the University will contribute to a request (December 2011) from the Department to identify models of best practice internationally, regarding governance structures in higher education institutions, and to relate these to broader strategy priorities and Irish system requirements.	UCD Governing Authority & University Management Team <i>Timeline: 2012–13 (provisional)</i>
1.9	Reduce the size of Academic Council and consolidate its committees.		

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
4.7	Ensure a link between QA/QI and the strategic process by improving the quality governance structure whilst maintaining the current level of vitality and distributed ownership.	<p>The University keeps under ongoing review, the mechanisms used to link QA/QI outputs to the strategic planning processes, thereby enhancing the quality governance structure. For example, current links include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Reports on quality related activity are prepared for the UCD Governing Authority, Academic Council and Academic Council Committee on Quality. • Each unit Quality Review Report (Academic and Support) is considered by the University Management Team and is introduced by the relevant College Principal or Vice President. • UCD Governing Authority in 2011 agreed that 'Quality Assurance' should in future be a standing item on the GA agenda to ensure a more rapid response to issues raised by senior management and/or Quality Reviews. • The UCD Quality Office periodically (at least annually) prepares a formal report for University senior management, highlighting key emerging issues from Quality Review Group Reports, highlighting specifically, recommendations targeted at College and University level that collectively, may have implications for institutional strategic planning and/or organisational processes. • The University monitors unit responses to Quality Review Report recommendations, for example, holding a formal progress review meeting to assess progress and identify any Unit and/or University level planning issues that need to be addressed. 	<p>Academic Council Committee on Quality</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Complete – but monitoring will be ongoing to facilitate further enhancements</p>

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
<u>Institutional Review</u>			
2.3	To limit future self-assessment committees to about ten to fifteen members and to plan a self-assessment process over a period of six months.	Due cognisance will be taken of these recommendations which relate to future Institutional Reviews – the next projected review of UCD is 2016-17.	Academic Council Committee on Quality: <i>Timeline:</i> 2016-17 – see comments column
2.4	To achieve a better balance between description and analysis, and reduce the number of additional documentation to key aspects.		
2.5	To ensure that University processes and structures are described clearly and comprehensibly for the benefit of a review body that will have international members.		
<u>Student Support Services</u>			
3.6	Address the discrepancies in student support across colleges and study cycles. Norms for students must be set by the University rather than left to the discretion of the Colleges.	Student experience underpins the philosophy of UCD and the University has an ongoing commitment to this issue. Key initiatives in addressing this core issue have been completed or are underway, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first of these has been a University-wide thematic review of the supports offered to students across the University. This review undertook both qualitative and large-scale quantitative research with students and staff, using online questionnaires and focus groups to ascertain the quality, timing and effectiveness of a range of student supports across the University. The extensive report produced by this review created a ‘road-map’ for the enhancement and integration of a range of supports designed to help students to flourish both socially and academically during their time at university. <li>• A further ‘Focus on First Year’ project 	Office of the Registrar & Vice-President for Academic Affairs
3.8	Review the volume and timing of information to students in order to ensure that they fully exploit the services available		
3.9	Ensure the integration of the various student services		<i>Timeline:</i> A number of developments have been completed; others will be completed in 2012. A number of developments will be ongoing e.g. annual review of Student Orientation Ongoing

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
		<p>brought together all Programme Deans to look at a) the academic structures within which students work in the first year b) the academic supports offered to these students and c) the social and pastoral supports offered to students, particularly in the first year of their time at university. The objective was to coordinate responses in order to ensure a coherent and even development and delivery of these enhanced and reorganised services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of direct outcomes already achieved from these projects include: • The introduction of peer mentoring for all UCD 1st year undergraduate students from September 2011. To enable this significant increase in the peer-mentoring system a full-time Students Engagement Officer (SEO) has been employed to work specifically with students on the large BA degree programme, which is the largest degree programme in the State, at over 5000 students. This officer now coordinates the work of approximately 200 peer mentors who offer support for over 1500 1st year BA students. The SEO also runs key supports and social events for BA students throughout their first semester of first year. • A full review and revision of Student Orientation (see point below) has been undertaken, which has included a significant increase in small-group events for incoming 1st year students to help them establish strong links with peers and staff. • The establishment of a drop-in academic Writing Support Centre for 	

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
3.10	Review the effectiveness of the UCD policy on supporting students with disabilities, particularly the physically impaired students	<p>students to support them in coping with their studies. Funded by UCD Teaching & Learning through SIF 2 the Writing Support Centre has been in operation for over a year. Unfortunately the discontinuation of SIF or similar teaching-focused state funding puts the further development of this and UCD's well-developed and highly-regarded Maths Support Centre at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review and re-design of first year assessment is in progress, with a pilot group of Programmes and Schools using a analysis of current programme assessment strategy and assessment approaches. • An increased use of peer assisted learning schemes - where students at more advanced stages of their programme lead study and revision sessions with first year students, which compliment lectures and tutorials. These student learning leaders offer effective advice and support to students in a number of academic programmes and areas, including the Access Office, who support students from non-traditional backgrounds, those beginning their study as adults and also those wishing to study flexibly. <p>A study has been undertaken: <i>'Exploring the views of students with disabilities of general and specialist supports in UCD'</i>. An on-line survey was distributed in semester two of the academic year 2010/2011 and a number of focus groups are taking place in 2012. The final report and recommendations will inform the Access Centre's plans to improve supports for students with a disability in UCD.</p>	<p>Director of Access & Lifelong Learning and UCD Access Centre</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Ongoing</p>

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
		<p>Under the remit of the Director of Access and Lifelong Learning, a Disability Access Officer (DAO) has been appointed and the UCD Disability Access Oversight group has been established.</p> <p>In addition, the UCD Access Centre has introduced a number of initiatives to support students with physical disabilities, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UCD Access Centre is proactive in inviting students with physical disabilities to visit UCD prior to making a DARE application. The Centre liaises with Student Recruitment when schools or individual students attend. Prospective students meet with the Access Centre Disability Adviser (ACDA), to discuss their particular needs. • The Centre has linked with a number of second level schools whereby, students with physical & sensory disabilities are invited to participate in Shadowing Day and 5th Year summer schools. The Centre has linked with Wheelchair Association of Ireland and the Visiting Teachers for the Visually and Hearing impaired to make them aware of UCD's outreach activities. • From September 2012 all DARE students entering UCD will be automatically registered for supports. Students with physical disabilities are prioritised and contacted as early as possible so their supports needs can be identified and put in place. • As a result of feedback from graduate students, the Access Centre is establishing a working group to address the need for pre-entry and post entry supports for graduate students with a 	

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
	related to the priorities that are set by each college on how to spend the budget it receives from the University rather than analysis of varying need. The Team suggests that there should be University norms for programme support.	and needs of different Programme and College Offices and central student supports will be analysed, with the intention of identifying and spreading best practice across the institution recognising the current fiscal challenges within the Institution.	
<u>Quality Assurance</u>			
3.11	Consider the composition of Review Groups and increase further the number of external members in relation to internal members. Ensure the Chair is external to the University.	<p>UCD believes that its quality assurance processes are robust and stand up to external scrutiny as evidenced by the 2011 Institutional Review Report findings. Further, the University Quality Review procedures are explicit that Review Group composition is independent of the unit under review and has sufficient externality to assure a credible process. UCD is not complacent, however, and is undertaking a pilot exercise (Review of UCD School of Business) to use an external member of the Review Group as Chair, to assess whether there is an enhanced benefit that can be brought to the perceived independence of the review process.</p> <p>The University is also surveying review group members regarding the benefits/drawbacks of using an internal or external chair.</p> <p>Recognising the current fiscal challenges within the Institution the number of external Review Group members relative to internal members will be reviewed in 2012-13.</p>	<p>UCD Director of Quality & Chair of Academic Council Committee on Quality</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Completion 2012</p> <p>UCD Quality Office & ACCQ</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> 2012-13</p>
<u>Graduate Studies and Careers</u>			
P.27	There appears to be a need to develop career support for doctoral students that would be offered at the end of the PhD in addition to (or instead of) the current offer at the beginning of doctoral studies.	Research and Professional Development Planning and transferable skills training form an integral part of the Structured PhD at UCD. It is generally accepted that career development and career decision-making are processes, not isolated incidents.	<p>Dean of Graduate Studies & Deputy Registrar and Director of Career Development Centre</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Development</p>

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
		<p>Therefore, UCD believes that it is important to retain early-stage focus.</p> <p>However, since 2010, the UCD Career Development Centre has been working in partnership with UCD Graduate Studies to deliver career-related workshops for late-stage PhD students within the existing staff envelope. In 2010 two workshops were offered to advanced stage PhD students. In 2012, this provision has grown to five workshops: Self Awareness and Training Needs Analysis, Identifying career options, Making Effective Applications, Interview Techniques and Strategic Career Planning.</p> <p>There is a recognised need to develop bespoke, wider ranging career support to PhD students further. For example, to offer one-to-one career development and career guidance support, to source internships (this is a growing need and internships increasingly are a condition of funding) and importantly, to prepare students for internships, develop mechanisms to capture work-based learning and to facilitate articulation of such learning in PhD students' future job search/applications.</p> <p>As resources become available, it would be advantageous to recruit dedicated PhD Career Development Advisers similar to those in place for Postdoctoral Research Fellows and for taught Masters students at the Michael Smurfit Graduate Business School.</p>	<p>work will be ongoing as resources become available.</p>
<u>Strategic Links</u>			
3.12	Develop the impressive potential of the UCD-TCD Innovation Alliance with urgency and energy.	The UCD-TCD Innovation Alliance governance structure has been established, with the Steering Committee comprised of the UCD President and TCD Provost in addition to the VP's for Research and Innovation from UCD. The Committee	Vice-President for Research <i>Timeline:</i> Ongoing

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
		<p>oversees 3 elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The joint educational programmes under the Innovation Academy 2. The joint development of business supports 3. A joint programme of research and postgraduate education. <p>The programme has been scaled back given the 70% reduction in funding for the programme under the PRTL Cycle 5. The primary objective is the development of innovation as the 3rd pillar of the University's activities and central to that objective is the expansion of the activities of the Innovation Academy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand the Academy to be an all island programme, through engagement with QUB initially. • Develop courses with industry • Engage internationally – this will likely start with Singapore. 	
<u>Academic Structures and Regulations</u>			
3.7	Minimise the diversity of rules and regulations across the schools, and place all academic and administrative regulations on the web.	<p>UCD continues to publish all academic and administrative regulations which have been approved by the Academic Council on the web – see:</p> <p>http://cp.ucd.ie/tag.967cadb9f6d45ae3.ren.der.userLayoutRootNode.uP?uP_root=root&uP_sparam=activeTab&activeTab=u14 1s1194&uP_tparam=frm&frm=frame.</p> <p>School and/or programme specific rules and regulations may be developed to suit subject/discipline needs but are aligned to overarching University regulations.</p> <p>UCD is committed to the principle that regulations are intended to be applied fairly and consistently and to ensure that an annual review of the University regulations is undertaken, inviting submissions from</p>	<p>Director of Academic Secretariat</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Complete</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Ongoing</p>

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
		Schools and Programmes to amend and simplify University regulations where a School or Programme identifies an issue that may require codifying.	
1.10	Involve the Students' Union with policy and practice at all levels and provide training for sabbatical officers following election.	<p>Students Union Sabbatical Officers are <i>ex officio</i> members of all University level academic governance boards engaged in oversight of programme development, teaching and learning, policy development and other educational initiatives, and are invited to join working groups as policy and/or practice issues are discussed.</p> <p>The Director of Academic Secretariat will meet formally with Sabbatical Officers following their appointment each July to provide induction training on academic governance/policy and related developments (this currently happens informally).</p>	<p>Director of Academic Secretariat (or nominee)</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> July 2012 (and each July thereafter)</p>
Page 25	It would be opportune for UCD to monitor gender balance in promotion. This monitoring should be within the context of an Irish Universities Association discussion of the position of women in Irish universities and determination of what actions might be taken by the sector to improve career progress for women.	UCD HR monitors gender balance for all competitions for promotion. The recommendation arising from the UCD institutional review will be circulated to the other members of the IUA including the furnishing of any relevant data that might be helpful.	<p>Vice-President for Staff, Director of ER, Equality and Diversity Equality and Diversity Manager</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Completion: May 2012</p>
Page 21	External examiners are used across the University and their roles are defined by the University's external examiner policy. The Team, however, found some examples of inconsistencies in practice. These processes effectively exclude the traditional role of the external examiner in Ireland as a means of testing the extent to which degree standards are consistent with standards elsewhere. Further, if the module is the fundamental unit of study and the place where grade coherence is ensured, the question arises whether a classified	<p>UCD has implemented a mechanism for systematic university-level review of subject external examiner reports (including the format of the report forms) which allows identification of best-practice and inconsistencies and which triggers and informs follow-up actions where Schools and Programmes are requested to address such issues and ensure compliance with university policy.</p> <p>In designing the examination procedures associated with a modular system in which the module is the basic building block, UCD</p>	<p>Chair of the Academic Council Committee on Examinations (ACCE) working with UCD Communications and Student Recruitment</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> The short-term communication plan will be implemented before end of 2011-12 academic session to include update of prospectus print materials for 2013-14</p>

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
	degree rather than a transcript has meaning.	<p>considered international best-practice and the use of Grade Point Average (GPA) as the standard comparator for the programme-level assessment. This has presented some challenges in the context of the traditional non-modular system found elsewhere in Ireland and the UK and it was for this reason that a mapping between the GPA and the traditional categories was retained. It is the role of the external examiner to assess UCD's examinations in an international context, whereas the internal examiner is tasked with ensuring consistency with national standards.</p> <p>A working group has recently been established to review examination guidelines and procedures now that the modular system has become fully embedded within UCD. The Academic Council Committee on Examinations considers that it is timely to reinforce the meaning and communicate the value of the currency of the GPA and the transcript through a targeted campaign in the short term (with UCD Communications) and ensuring that this feature is applied consistently in all of the literature which is relevant for the 2013-14 intake of students (with Student Recruitment).</p>	student intake
<u>Student Feedback</u>			
4.6	Implement rigorously the cross-University student module feedback system and ensure that students and staff are informed about how these data are used, which suggestions have been adopted and which have not and, crucially, why.	<p>The Student Feedback on Modules (SFM) system is centrally coordinated by UCD Teaching & Learning and UCD Institutional Research. 2011-12 is the second year of the university-wide rollout, following a pilot in 2009-10. The survey system is fully functioning in a secure online environment.</p> <p>To further embed student feedback as a norm across the University and ensure its effective use, a range of developments have been initiated, for example:</p>	UCD Teaching & Learning <i>Timeline: Completed</i>

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SFM is now embedded in the annual Module Enhancement Process, whereby Schools review all of their modules paying particular attention to atypical patterns in registration data, grade distribution and student feedback. The Module Enhancement Report (available to all academic staff) draws together key indicative data on each module, including SFM quantitative scores, which enables module and school level review. <li>• Embedding SFM in online Teaching Portfolios. <li>• A communications campaign aimed at UCD staff was launched in January 2012. A special guide was issued to all staff, promoting a holistic approach to module enhancement including the use of student feedback as an input and closing the feedback loop as an output was developed. See: http://www.ucd.ie/teaching/resources/moduledesignenhancement/moduleenhancementtheacademiccycle/. <li>• Case-studies on 'Closing the Feedback Loop' are currently being developed by a number of individual academics and Schools. The objective is to design simple but effective methods of communicating to students the results of SFM and actions taken. Once trialed and evaluated, the case-studies will be disseminated to all academic staff as a one-page user-friendly resource. <li>• In Semester 1 2011-12 a group of UCD graduate marketing students were co-opted to devise a communications campaign to inform students of the importance of their feedback and conduct market research on current views/issues. A multi-pronged 	<p>Deputy Registrar Teaching & Learning /UCD T&L</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Completed</p> <p>UCD Teaching & Learning</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Completed</p> <p>UCD Teaching & Learning</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Completed</p> <p>UCD Teaching & Learning</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Jan–March 12</p>

IRIU Ref.	Recommendation	Comment and Action Plan	Responsibility and Timeline
		<p>approach to the “Your Feedback Your Future” campaign, included a short video, ads in student media, posters & banners throughout campus, lecture presentations.</p> <p>http://www.ucd.ie/students/modulefeedback/.</p> <p>Areas for continued improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving response rates continues to be a priority and a real challenge (average response rate is 30%). • Implementation and monitoring of annual module and programme enhancement processes, ensuring accountability at school and college levels for the quality of the learning experience on all programmes. This would include a systematic process of ‘closing the feedback loop’ and informing students of changes made. 	<p>College Principals, Heads of School, Vice Principals T&L and Associate Deans T&L</p> <p><i>Timeline:</i> Ongoing</p>

5. Conclusion

UCD is an autonomous public University, which operates within a legislative and regulatory framework established by the Universities Act, 1997. While the University enjoys absolute autonomy in academic matters, and in general operates independently within its budget, as with other Irish Universities, it operates under important constraints with regard to financial and human resource issues. The ongoing national economic crisis, for example, has required (and will continue to require) very significant reductions in public expenditure. Since 2008, the University has experienced a 16% reduction in core funded academic staff (from 1,122.6 in December 2008 to 943.7 in December 2011), has increased its student population by 10.6% (from 22,264 in 2007-08 to 24,625 in 2010-11) and has managed to maintain or enhance its provision to support students.

The planned actions, as set out above, to address the Institutional Review Report recommendations, attest to and emphasises the University’s commitment to continuous improvement across all its activities.

UCD has used the institutional review process as a further opportunity for critical self reflection. The University hopes that, notwithstanding economic challenges, its efforts at continuous improvement through the current and planned developments, will address priority areas for improvement and ensure the achievement of University goals.

The Academic Council Committee on Quality and the University Management Team, will maintain a continuing monitoring and oversight role, to ensure that recommendations will be addressed appropriately.