



Institute of Technology Sligo

Faculty of Engineering & Design

Faculty Planning

Report

Wednesday 13th February 2019

Contents of Report

Part 1	Executive Summary
Part 2	Introduction
Part 3	Meeting of the Panel of Assessors
Part 4	Meeting with President, Registrar and Head of Faculty
Part 5	Meeting of Panel with Head of Faculty and Heads of Department
Part 6	Meeting of Panel with Programme Chairs
Part 7	Meeting with External Stakeholders & Graduates
Part 8	Findings of the Panel
Part 9	Conclusion
Appendix I	Agenda
Appendix II	Membership of Review Panel
Appendix III	List of documents circulated to the Panel in advance of the meeting
Appendix IV	Private meeting of the Panel.
Appendix V	Presentation made by the Head of Faculty
Appendix VI	Staff members who met with the Panel
Appendix VII	External Stakeholders who met with the Panel

Part 1

Executive Summary

In accordance with Chapter 5 of the Quality Assurance Procedures of the Institute, a (School) Faculty is required to present a Faculty Plan at least once every five years. The objectives of this plan are to:

- a) optimise the resources of the Faculty for the purposes of delivering the highest standard and quality of education and to meet the Faculty strategic objectives;
- b) specify how the Faculty will respond to the Institute's Strategic Plan;
- c) make proposals for changes in direction and focus of the Faculty;
- d) identify key performance indicators for the Faculty and specify how these will be measured;
- e) map the proposed actions to the strategic objectives;
- f) update the procedures for monitoring quality, management and operations within the School.

A visit of the external Panel of assessors took place on Wednesday February 13th 2019. The panel met privately in the evening of February 12th and on the morning of February 13th to exchange views on the submission. The Panel met with the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Head of Faculty, Head of Departments, Programme Chairs and senior Academic Staff. They also met with external stakeholders and graduates of the Faculty.

A draft report was circulated to the Panel Chairperson and corrections and feedback was sought. The Faculty will be issued with the draft report to confirm factual accuracy. To complete...

Findings of the Panel

Findings of the Panel

Commendations

1. The Panel commends the Faculty on its online presence, its scale and its expansion over the past five years.
2. The Panel commends Faculty staff for their engagement with online learning.
3. The Panel commends the Faculty for their engagement with, and establishment of positive relationships with industry and the evidential two way process this engagement is built upon.
4. The Panel commends the recent capital developments and acknowledges the ambitious plans of the Faculty for further developments (e.g. YADA).

5. The Panel commends the Faculty for their proposal to enable students on work placements to continue with their academic activities and maintain links with Faculty staff through their online mediums.

Recommendations

1. The Quality Assurance processes in relation to programmatic review should provide evidence that all conditions/recommendations made by review panels have been dealt with. This evidence should be available to subsequent review evaluation panels.
2. Future School Planning documentation should be more detailed and:
 - Clearly delineate the student body (Full time: Online/part time students) so that review panels are able to appreciate which data is related to which cohort of students.
 - Benchmark reported progression and retention rates against similar programmes elsewhere.
 - Ensure action plans presented are a result of analysis conducted to inform the Faculty planning process.
3. Ensure that the human resources, systems, student supports and quality assurance mechanisms are in place to support online delivery.
4. Ensure that the human resources, systems, student supports and quality assurance mechanisms are in place to support work placements.
5. The Faculty should ensure that there is sufficient technical support for research and online learning.
6. The Faculty should conduct as a matter of urgency an internal review to ascertain the commonalities across the Faculty in relation to work placements (ECTS, Duration, Mode of assessment) and decide if a standardised approach is going to be taken or parameters set.
7. The Faculty should review their plan's KPIs and set reachable targets
8. Faculty staff should engage with the development of the Faculty webpage as part of the revised Institute website to ensure that the design, creativity and innovation of the Faculty is showcased.
9. The Faculty should develop recognised pathways for academic staff to gain additional advanced qualifications.
10. The Faculty should develop a strategic plan around research and development that is informed by their interactions with industry to ensure relevancy of future activity.

Part 2 Introduction

A Programmatic Review is a process by which a Faculty assesses its progress comprehensively over recent years and sets down proposals and plans for future developments. Under the Institute's quality assurance (QA) procedures, this must take place at least every 5 years, if not more frequently. It is a very significant part of the quality assurance process as it enshrines the concept of continual improvement and development based on self-evaluation. A Programmatic Review is a self-monitoring quality-assurance activity carried out by the Academic Council of the Institute.

At IT Sligo, the process is divided into two parts: (a) Faculty Planning (hitherto known as School Planning), and (b) Programme Revalidation. The self-evaluation process includes the production of documentation by the Faculty and formal evaluations by an external review Panel. The overall process is controlled by the Academic Council. The Head of Faculty manages the process within the Faculty and the Registrar has overall responsibility for managing the process on behalf of the Academic Council. The Faculty planning and Programmatic revalidation are completed as two separate activities with the intention that the outcome of School Planning will inform Programmatic revalidation.

Typically, the Faculty planning process takes 18-12 months to complete and the output is a document that report on the findings of the self-evaluation and that specify, as in this case, the plans of the Faculty. At the discretion of the Faculty, the documentation may be considered by an internal Panel (a 'dry-run'). The final set of documents is assessed by a Panel of external experts established by the Registrar on behalf of the Academic Council. This latter Panel comprises representatives from other higher education institutions (HEIs), state agencies and from relevant employer sectors. This Panel is expected to read through the documentation and visit the Institute over a full day period. A report of the visit is issued together with a set of conditions and recommendations from the Panel. This report is sent to the Academic Council for consideration and, if approved, adoption.

The Faculty of Engineering and Design completed its last planning exercise in 2013. This current submission presents the proposed plan of the Faculty in its efforts to prepare itself for the next five years and align itself to the Institute's Strategic plan (2017-2022).

A visit of the external Panel of assessors took place on Wednesday February 13th, 2019. The agenda for this meeting is contained in Appendix I. Membership of the Review Panel is listed in Appendix II. The list of documentation received by the Panel is contained in Appendix III.

Part 3: Meetings of the Panel of Assessors

The Panel held a private meeting on the morning of 13^h February at which a number of points were raised for discussions with staff of the Faculty. A summary of the comments is contained in Appendix IV.

Part 4 Meeting of Panel with President, Registrar and Head of Faculty and Heads of Department

The Chair introduced the Panel and welcomed the President, Dr Brendan Mc Cormack, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Mr Colin Mc Lean and Head of Faculty, Ms Una Parsons and outlined the process for the session.

The Panel requested the President to provide an overview of the Strategic Plan 2017-2022 and the strategic priorities therein. The key issues subsequently focused upon were the proposed growth in student numbers, increasing the student and staff research profile to meet the Technical University metrics, the current status of the TU bid and the proposed capital investment to underpin the expansion of the Institute in line with the strategic plan. Issues discussed in relation to student numbers were the drivers for same, strategies for achieving this growth, the real and potential challenges to the Institute of the changing student profile (increasing number of online students and reducing numbers of full time students). Clarification was also sought regarding the Faculty's part-time programme provision on the campus. It was clarified that there was no on site part-time programme provision.

The President provided the panel with the research metrics that had to be attained in relation to research student numbers - 4% before eligible to be considered for TU status, what constitutes a research student, the current numbers of research students (n 81), the growth required (additional 100) and the proposed strategies for achieving the required growth - structured masters programmes, Post doctorate appointments, student bursaries and interventions to support staff achieve their PhDs so they can supervise research students. The research metrics in relation to staff that have to be attained were also explained to the panel. The panel were made aware of the current number of full time academic staff with PhDs (37).

In relation to the Connacht-Ulster Alliance, clarification was sought from the panel regarding the oversight of the strategic plans of the three Institutes of Technology involved, and how the autonomy of each Institute in terms of programme delivery will be maintained under the TU umbrella. The President addressed the later queries and provided the panel with an insight into the HEA funding that is being received to support developments of the Connacht-Ulster Alliance. The President also shared with the panel the Institutes capital funding plans to enhance the infrastructure of the campus further.

The panel queried if the Faculty's tremendous success in the online learning arena has precluded their ability to develop other issues such as research, expansion of post graduate doctoral student numbers and Bachelor degrees (NFQ level 8). The panel were assured that the Faculty were aware of their need to address the expansion of research students, staff research capacity and honours Bachelor degrees.

The panel queried the quality assurance process in relation to ensuring that previous panel's recommendations and conditions were met in a timely manner as they noted from the self-evaluation report presented that a number of conditions appear not to have

been achieved. The VP of Academic Affairs outlined the current quality assurance processes.

Part 5 Meeting of Panel with Head of School, Heads of Department, Mr. David Tormey and Mr. Nick Doran

The Chair introduced the Panel, welcomed the Faculty management team and outlined the process for this session. The Head of School introduced her team. Each Head of Department provided the panel with a brief overview of the focus of the Department they had responsibility for.

Faculty Presentation

The Head of Faculty made a presentation which addressed the organisational structure of the Faculty, key facts in relation to student and staff numbers, industry linkages and R & D activities, programmatic review process (incl. Faculty planning), S.W.O.T. analysis, key changes since previous review in 2013, stakeholder feedback, Faculty plan including vision and mission, strategic objectives and KPIs for 2018-2023. The panel acknowledged the value of the presentation to enhance their understanding and appreciation of the expanse of the Faculty activities.

Quality assurance processes

The Panel sought an explanation for the reported delay and/or non-completion of some of the conditions from the previous Programmatic review and the Faculty's understanding of the Institute's Quality Assurance process in relation to panel visits/validation etc. The Head of Faculty provided the Panel with an explanation of why there was some delays in the process- the size of the Faculty and the corresponding workload, Institute focus on embedding semesterization, the rapid expansion of online programme delivery, the under resourcing of Faculty in terms of academic management and how the restructuring of the Faculty into 5 distinct departments (with three new Heads of Departments) is facilitating the Faculty address outstanding issues. It was recognised that it takes a period of time for a restructuring to be embedded. The Faculty and panel agreed that an annual quality review post 2014 would have ensured and supported that the quality assurance cycle in relation to the last programmatic review was completed. The panel explored with the team their internal mechanisms for dealing with validations, student feedback and external examiner feedback and the need for such detail to be provided within the report. The Panel were satisfied with the responses received that there are quality processes in place within the Faculty that feed into the Institute wide QA processes. The panel was concerned that in future the outcomes of these processes be available to subsequent evaluation panels.

Key Performance indicators

The panel explored what benchmarks the Faculty deploying to base their reported achieved targets on and what they have based their proposed key performance indicators for 2018-2023 upon. Heads of Department explained how they frequently benchmark performance against other Institutes of Technology but that there are challenges in extracting programmatic data from other HEIs. The panel recommended that such detail was required in the report in order for the panel to consider the appropriateness of same and advised to benchmark at programme level where possible and use publically available HEA data to assist this process.

Research targets

The panel shared with Faculty their concerns about the Faculty's capacity to achieve the proposed research KPIs-increased research students' numbers and increased academic staff with doctoral qualifications. The panel informed them they perceived the KPIs ambitious and therefore discussed what strategies the Faculty proposed putting in place to achieve same. The panel were informed about the proposed change to some Master programmes within the Faculty which will result in the designation of the students registered on such programmes being recognised as research students by the Higher Education Authority for the TU metrics, the development of new level online level 9 Master programmes in areas where such programmes were not available such as in YADA. The Faculty anticipate that the on line delivery mode will attract students to the programme as they can continue to engage in employment whilst studying. The panel explored this perception with the Faculty to ascertain the robustness of this perception. The Faculty also shared with the panel their realisation that they needed to enhance the number of level 8 programmes they offer, so that there are sufficient potential graduates to study at level 9 & 10. The Faculty detailed for the panel programmes that they are proposing to develop at level 8 for the coming academic year.

The panel explored with the Head of Faculty and Head of Departments the proposed strategies to enhance the number of doctoral prepared academic staff from Institute recruitment strategies, Institute funding initiatives to local Faculty based strategies such as releasing academic staff from teaching commitments to engage in doctoral studies/research.

Part 6 Meeting of Panel with Programme Chairs and Other Academic Staff

The Chair welcomed staff, thanked them for the work that they had put into the Faculty Plan and outlined the range of topics that would be addressed in this session. The Panel introduced themselves and informed academic staff they particularly wanted to hear their perspectives in this session.

Development of Faculty self-evaluation documentation and strategic plan.

The Panel explored with academic staff on their contribution to the development of the Faculty plan. They asked academic staff to identify what working groups they were involved in, and to delineate their role therein, to detail how the working group gathered their data and shared this data with the wider Faculty community to inform the Faculty self-evaluation and ultimately the strategic plan for 2018-2023. The panel subsequently teased out with staff particular issues of concern which would have being the remit of some working groups, for example participants of the Teaching & Learning working group were asked their activity in relation to student retention. The academic staff shared exemplars of strategies that had been instigated to address student retention such as additional maths support; identifying modules with high failure rates and increasing student contact hours accordingly and the introduction of virtual lab sessions to engage students.

The Work placement group were asked to clarify for the panel how they were going to meet the Institute's Strategic Vision of having a work placement in all new Level 8 programmes by 2022, if they foresee challenges at Faculty level achieving this target,

what mechanisms had they in place to overcome real or potential challenges and if all academic staff supported the concept of work placements in programmes. The discussion revealed that academic staff valued work placements as a component of their programmes but that presently there was inconsistencies across the Faculty in relation to attributed ECTS load, duration and mode of assessment. The panel were made aware of competing agendas in relation to the positioning of the work placements, and that there are particular challenges in achieving a work placement with the one year add on degree structure. Furthermore, different industries had different demands regarding the duration of work placements which meant standardisation of placement duration was problematic. The panel also sought clarification on whether the Faculty or Institute had a designated work placement office which was supported by academic staff in forming and maintaining relationships with potential work placement sites. The panel were informed that currently it is the remit of academic staff members and that no centralised resource was available. The panel acknowledged the value of having academic staff engaged in the work placement process and that such a link should not be lost, but also acknowledged the burden of same for academic staff given the number of programmes and associated work placements. The panel sought clarification from academic staff of the strategies in place to manage students who fail work placements and/or whose work placement became non-viable. The panel recommended that the faculty establish commonalities in the provision, assessment and management of work placement

Key Performance Indicators.

The panel explored with academic staff the manner in which the student numbers as presented were developed/ calculated and sought clarification in relation to some of the presented outputs in terms of progression, retention rates and successful completion rates. The panel were satisfied with the explanations provided. They shared with academic staff their preference for the online students and conventional student cohorts to be presented separately so comparisons could be made more easily and nuances identified. The panel queried with academic staff if they were aware how their retention and progression rates compared to HEIs offering similar engineering programmes.

The panel explored with staff how realistic and attainable their stated KPIs were in relation to increasing the female student population and the female academic staff compliment. The panel suggested to the Faculty they would be better served in being less prescriptive in their plan and opt for broader statements which stated their intention to increase the Faculty's female population but did not actually state percentage increases.

Staffing

The panel sought clarification in relation to the staffing compliment of the Faculty as they perceived it challenging to identify the technical and administration staff compliment as presented in the report. Clarification was sought from the Heads of Departments on the actual technical officer support staff supporting each of the individual departments. The administration compliment of the Faculty was also explored with the Head of Faculty informing the panel that an additional two administrative posts had been secured.

Marketing of Faculty

Clarification was sought from academic staff regarding their role in the marketing of the Faculty to future students/ wider community. The Panel were informed that the staff recognised that the current Institute website as configured was challenging to navigate and that there was plans to launch a new website which had specific Faculty webpages in the coming academic year. The panel explored with academic staff how they may contribute to the Faculty pages to showcase the working of the Faculty through interactive mediums/student/employer testimonials. Academic staff indicated they were committed to inputting into the development of the Faculty specific webpage.

Sources of data deployed to inform the Faculty plan

The extent to which student and graduate survey findings contributed to the Faculty plan was explored. The panel were informed that students' representatives contributed at Faculty Policy level to the formulation of the plan. Student feedback also contributes to Programme boards which have responsibility for Programme development, modification and delivery. The panel explored with academic staff how *process issues* that emerge from student feedback are dealt with at Faculty level. The panel recommended that consideration is given to deploying different surveys for the distinctively different student cohorts the Faculty deal with to try and capture specific issues pertinent to each cohort (Online: Full time traditional students). The panel explored how the *Irish Survey of Student Engagement* (ISSE) is promoted within the Faculty and the data subsequently used.

The panel expressed concern that the plan did not appear to be informed by relevant key National documentation such as the *Digital transformation: assessing the Future Skills of digitalisation on Ireland's workforce* (Dept. Business, Enterprise & Innovation, 2018) and sought clarification on what data fed into the development of the plan. The panel were assured that all relevant International, National and Regional data sets/ documents were deployed to inform the plan but that they are referenced in the Programmatic revalidation documentation which will be presented for panel review in May 2019.

Faculty Plan

The panel explored what the Faculty hoped to achieve by 2023 in terms of full-time / part-time student configurations, online expansion plans - delivery and online assessment and the planned supports for same in relation to academic supports and student supports. The panel were provided with assurances that academic staff are supported by four instructional designers in the development of their material for online delivery and two online student support officers have been employed at Institute level to address non-academic on line student queries.

Industry linkages

The panel advised the Faculty that they should highlight their positive and numerous industry linkages further and deploy them as a marketing tool.

Staff engagement in Faculty planning process.

The panel concluded the session with ascertaining from academic staff if they felt they were sufficiently communicated with, and involved in the Faculty planning and

development process. Academic staff assured the Panel that the process was very inclusive and their voice was heard through a number of forums-working groups, via Programme chairs and Heads of Departments.

The Chair thanked the staff for their openness and willingness to engage in the discussion and for their involvement in the process to date.

Part 7 Meeting of Panel with Industry representatives and Graduates of the Faculty

The Chair introduced the Panel, welcomed the industry representatives and graduates and provided a brief rationale for the meeting.

The Panel ascertained if the Faculty of Engineering and Design at IoT Sligo had an impact on their industry's day to day operations. An overwhelmingly positive response was provided with exemplars of how the Faculty contribute positively in the provision of an educated workforce who have the knowledge and skills to be a positive influence in the workplace, provide a medium for staff to continue to engage in lifelong learning while working and the ability of industry to influence programme content to address their emerging needs was also highlighted as a positive factor. The Faculty's receptiveness to engagement with Industry and the availability of the resources of the Business Innovation Centre to start up business were also highlighted to the panel. An additional positive attribute identified by industry was that some of the programmes strived to incorporate some of industries required certification as part of the programme content (e.g. Amazon Web Certification in computing programmes) and/ or prepared the graduates to acquire certification following conferring. The Faculty are continually considering new certifications they could add to their programmes to enhance the graduates' employability and met industry's needs. The panel and relevant employers considered this a *Unique Selling Point* that the Faculty should capitalise on, in their programme marketing to students and future employers. The Institute's overt contribution to the Atlantic MedTech Cluster in programme development (e.g. Master in Medical Regulatory Technology Regulatory)/ support was perceived as invaluable to local industries who were part of the cluster in the region. The panel questioned the graduates' soft skills competence and were informed that they had improved. Industry perceived the work placements as invaluable for enhancing the technical and social skills of the students.

Some industrial representatives considered that additional Faculty engagement with them could ensure that the Faculty's R & D activities are current and meet the R & D needs of local industries.

The Panel sought from industry their views on doctoral education relevant to their sector. There was general consensus that there is an industrial perception that a PhD qualification is "academic" and at times may not be attractive to employers who have not an appreciation of the multiple and transferable skills that PhD graduates attain as part of their doctoral journey. The panel and industry urged the Faculty to consider other forms of doctorates (in addition to the standard PhD pathway) which capitalise on the expertise of those engineers in the workforce and could focus on advancing engineering practice (e.g. Professional Doctorates).

The Panel explored the doctoral journey in terms of supports and resources with a recent doctoral graduate and were assured that the students' journey was supportive and that the Institute had the capacity to support students/ graduates through their Business Innovation Centre in areas such as product development/ translation of doctoral findings.

Local industry/employers commitment to the Institute was evident in their willingness to be involved in programme marketing and sponsorship (e.g. Engineering Fair March 3rd 2019).

Part 8 Findings of the Panel

Commendations

1. The Panel commends the Faculty on its online presence, the scale of it and its expansion over the past five years.
2. The Panel commends Faculty staff for their engagement with online learning.
3. The Panel commends the Faculty for their engagement with, and establishment of positive relationships with industry and the evidential two way process this engagement is built upon.
4. The Panel commends the recent capital developments and acknowledges the ambitious plans of the Faculty for further developments (e.g. YADA).
5. The Panel commends the Faculty for their proposal to enable students on work placements to continue with their academic activities and maintain links with Faculty staff through their online mediums.

Recommendations

1. The Quality Assurance processes in relation to programmatic review should provide evidence that all conditions/recommendations made by review panels have been dealt with. This evidence should be available to subsequence review evaluation panels.
2. Future School Planning documentation should be more detailed and:
 - Clearly delineate the student body (Full time: Online/part time students) so that review panels are able to appreciate which data is related to which cohort of students.
 - Benchmark reported progression and retention rates against similar programmes elsewhere.
 - Ensure action plans presented are a result of analysis conducted to inform the Faculty planning process.
3. Ensure that the human resources, systems, student supports and quality assurance mechanisms are in place to support online delivery.
4. Ensure that the human resources, systems, student supports and quality assurance mechanisms are in place to support work placements.

5. The Faculty should ensure that there is sufficient technical support for research and online learning.
6. The Faculty should conduct as a matter of urgency an internal review to ascertain the commonalties across the Faculty in relation to work placements (ECTS, Duration, Mode of assessment) and decide if a standardised approach is going to be taken or parameters set.
7. The Faculty should review their plan's KPIs and set reachable targets
8. Faculty staff should engage with the development of the Faculty webpage as part of the revised Institute website to ensure that the design, creativity and innovation of the Faculty is showcased.
9. The Faculty should develop recognised pathways for academic staff to gain additional advanced qualifications.
10. The Faculty should develop a strategic plan around research and development that is informed by their interactions with industry to ensure relevancy of future activity.

Part 9 Conclusion

Following a Programmatic review process in 2013, the Faculty of Engineering & Design carried out a Faculty self-evaluation during the academic year 2017/18. This culminated in a Faculty Plan submission that was assessed by a Panel of external experts in February 2019, in accordance with the Institute's Quality Assurance procedures.

The evaluation process included a review of the documentation submitted by the Faculty and meetings with the Faculty Management, Academic staff, external stakeholders and graduates of the Faculty.

Following the review, the Panel specified 4 Commendations, and 10 Recommendations. The outcome of this review will be submitted to the Academic Council for adoption.



Mr Stephen McManus
Chairperson



Dr Michele Glacken
Assistant Registrar

Date: 28.2.19

Appendix I Agenda (as progressed on day of panel visit Feb 13th 2019)

Date/Time	Item	Room
08:30-10:00	Private meeting of Panel	Institute Board Room, IT Sligo
10:00-10:15	Meeting with President, Registrar & Head of Faculty	Institute Board Room, IT Sligo
10:15-11:30	<p>Meeting with Head of Faculty, Heads of Departments on Faculty Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approach taken to planning - Faculty/Department Structure and management & administrative structures - Faculty Direction and Academic Plan - The potential Impaction of the Connacht-Ulster Alliance on the operation of the Faculty - Proposed national and international target market - Learning, Teaching and Assessment strategies - Plans for Online learning - Plans for Research growth and further community engagement - Initiatives for student throughput, retention; feedback processes - Plans for improvements in student support services - Staff compliment (academic, technical & administrative), deployment and development. - Physical facilities 	Institute Board Room, IT Sligo
11:30-11:45	Coffee	Institute Board Room, IT Sligo
11:15-13:00	<p>Plenary Session: Programme Chairs and senior academic staff</p> <p>To consider the Faculty Plan (as above)</p>	Institute Board Room, IT Sligo
13:00-14:00	Lunch and meeting with employers and graduates	Institute Board Room, IT Sligo
14:00- 15:00	Private meeting of Panel to agree Findings including top line conditions and recommendations/Coffee	Institute Board Room, IT Sligo
15:00-16:00	Feedback to Head of Faculty and Head of Departments	Institute Board Room, IT Sligo
16:00	Tour of facilities (optional)	Faculty of Engineering & Design
16:15	Finish	

Appendix II: Membership of Review Panel

Title	Name	Surname	Role	Institution/Company
Mr	Stephen	Mc Manus	Chairperson	Retired Registrar, DKIT
Mr	Aaron	Burke	Student representative	GMIT SU President
Ms	Elaine	Murphy	Panel Member/ Industry	Live Tiles
Ms	Nollaig	Crombie	Panel Member	(TBC)LYIT
Dr	Gerrard	Henn	Panel Member/industry	Avenue Mould
Dr	Cathal	Nolan	Panel Member/ Academic	Head of Dept of Engineering,CIT
Dr	Brian	Corcoran	Panel Member/ Academic	Head of Dept of Engineering, DCU
Mr	Damien	Owens	Panel Member	Engineers Ireland
Dr	Michele	Glacken	Minute taker	Assistant registrar

Appendix III: List of documentation circulated to the Panel

The following documentation relevant to the Review was circulated to the Panel in advance of the meeting.

- Faculty Planning, Terms of Reference.
- A proposed agenda and list of panel members.
- A hard copy of the concise Faculty planning document together with a USB key containing a softcopy with hyperlinks to supporting documentation.
- Map of Sligo
- Panel Visit Claim form

Appendix IV: Private meeting of the Panel

13th February 2019. Points raised for discussion by the Panel at a private meeting

- Quality assurance processes and evidence of conditions/recommendations being achieved. Query why some 2013 conditions appear to be still outstanding.
- Overview of Faculty/ programmes could have been more in-depth.
- Status of Technological University Bid and how the Faculty will contribute to this.
- Workplace learning: Introduction/plans for future development/designated personnel to deal with placements.
- Online learning: Constitution/ Introduction/ supports/ future developments
- Benchmarking: What HEIs and programmes are being used to benchmark progression, retention rates. What were annual targets?
- Stated KPIs: query how achievable
- Statistics & tables presented: Query how they were developed and their accuracy. Need to present the statistics separately for online and full time students.
- Staffing: Technical and clerical staff numbers not clear Number of CVs presented in Appendix does not match reported figures.
- Student recruitment strategy.
- Research and innovation profile: research student numbers/ staff with PhDs/ plans to develop research profile/potential partnerships Faculty Teaching & Learning strategy.
- More detail on actions arising from surveys. Need to separate and present survey findings according to different student profiles (Mature/ college leaver etc.) so unique needs are identifiable.
- Faculty responsiveness to regional/local industry needs.
- Perceived external pressures in relation to Institutes strategy/ C.U. alliance
- Query faculty strategy for responding to stakeholders input.

Appendix V Presentation made by the Head of Faculty on behalf of the President

Appendix VI Academic Staff in attendance 13th February 2019

Name	Discipline (s)
Mr. Carter Patrick	Quantity Surveying
Mr. Mel Casserly	Civil
Mr. Collery David	Civil Project mgmt
Ms. Donohoe Bernie	Architectural Design
Dr. Donovan John	Quality
Mr. Doran Conall	Precision Engineering
Mr. Feeney Owen	Construction Mgmt
Dr. Flynn Paul	Systems/Cloud
Mr. Gallagher Kieran	Adv. Wood & Sustainable Building Tech.
Mr. Gannon Neil	Games
Mr. Gilroy Shane	Autonomous Vehicles
Mr. Hughes Ronnie	Fine Art
Mr. Lawlor Conor	Data Centre
Dr. Mannion Una	Writing & Literature
Dr. McCann Brian	Civil
Mr. McGinty Gary	Construction Project Mgmt
Mr. McSharry Trevor	Civil & Construction
Ms. Mitchell Fiona/Ms. Una L'Estrange	Computing
Dr. Mulligan David	Mechatronics
Ms. O'Gorman Louise	Electronic Eng.
Ms. O'Brien Diane	Computing & Electronics
Mr. O'Doherty Emmet	Art, Design & Architecture
Mr. Powell Paul	Software

Mr. Reid Stephen	Toolmaking
Mr. Sheridan Declan	Mechanical
Dr. Tormey David	Precision Engineering
Dr. Velay Xavier	Mechanical & Manufacturing
Ms. Watson Rowan	Interior Architecture
Dr Pat Naughton	Civil Engineering
Mr. Nick Doran	Engineering & Design
Ms Una Parsons	Engineering & Design

Appendix VII: External Stakeholders who met with the Panel

Name	Company	Engagement	Area of Specialisation
Brendan O'Connor	Clanwilliam/Socrates	Employer	Computing
Barry Kilmarten	Abbott	Employer	
Przemyslaw Raiwa	Rhatigan Architects	Graduate	ADA
Drew Monaghan	Ward automation	Graduate	Mechatronics
Katie Morris	E3	Graduate	Computing
Konrad Mulrennan	IT Sligo	Graduate	Mechatronics
