

Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement  
Programme for Academic Units  
2004-2005



Peer Review Group Report  
for the  
School of Applied Languages and Intercultural  
Studies (SALIS)

**Dr Arnd Witte**

National University of Ireland, Maynooth, Ireland (Chair)

**Ms Geraldine Marry**

Capella and McGrath GmbH, Munich, Germany

**Professor Roberto Mayoral Asensio**

University of Granada, Spain

**Professor Martin Henry**

School of Physical Sciences, Dublin City University, Ireland

**Dr Sarah Ingle**

Dublin City University Business School, Ireland (Rapporteur)

26 April 2005

## Introduction

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

1. An internal team in the School being reviewed completes a detailed self-assessment report (SAR). It should be noted that this document is confidential to the School and to the Review Panel and to senior officers of the University.
2. This report is sent to a team of peer assessors, the Peer Review Group (PRG) – composed of members from outside DCU and from other areas of DCU – who then visit the School and conduct discussions with a range of staff, students and other stakeholders.
3. The PRG then writes its own report (follows here).
4. The School produces a response (in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty), in response to the various issues and findings of the SAR and PRG Reports.
5. The PRG Report and the School response are then considered at a follow-up meeting, chaired by the Director of Quality Promotion and attended by an external (if possible) member of the original Peer Review Group, the Head of School (and another representative from the School), Dean of the Faculty and the Deputy President, Registrar and Vice-President for Research (on behalf of Senior Management), who address recommendations in the Peer Review Group Report, that fall outside the control of the School or that require additional resources. Arising from this meeting, School, Faculty and University-based action plans are approved. Together, these are termed the Quality Improvement Plan (QulP).
6. A summary of the Quality Review is sent to the Governing Authority of the University, who may approve publication in a manner that they see fit. Following the approval of the summary report by the Governing Authority, it is published on the University website. The full text of the Peer Review Group Report and the Quality Improvement Plan is also published on the Quality Promotion Unit website.

## Table of Contents

## Page

1. Profile of the School .....	4
2. The Self-Assessment Process .....	5
3. The Peer Review Group Process .....	6
4. Findings of the Review Group .....	8
5. Recommendations for Improvement 1 .....	13
(School, Faculty and University)	
6. Recommendations for Improvement 2 .....	16
(Specific University Management Issues)	

# Peer Review Group Report

## 1. Profile of the School

### Location of the School

SALIS is centrally located in the Henry Grattan building in Dublin City University. Lectures and language training are carried out in flat and tiered rooms mainly in this building and also in other rooms elsewhere in the University. There is one room available for students to use computers and printers alone (CG08b), and one room that can only be used when a lecturer is present (CG08a). Another room that is used for 12 hours a week is equipped with interpreting facilities. One School office with two administrative staff is located on the first floor of the building. The post room, photocopier and two network printers are located together in a small space also on the first floor. Academic staff offices are mostly located in an extension of the building that overlooks a communal student area 'The Street'.

### Staff

The School has two full-time administrative assistants (Grade 2) and 49 academic staff. An overview of academic staffing levels and contract types is provided below:

Full-time permanent/ contracts of indefinite duration		Full-time contract (3 years)		Full-time contract (1 year)		Part-time contract	
Professor	1	Lecturer (below bar)	2	Lecturer (above bar)	1	Tutor (1 year)	8
Associate Professor	2	Lecturer/Teaching Fellow (below bar)	1	Lecturer/Teaching Fellow (below bar)	1		
Senior Lecturer	7			Lectora/Lektorin	2		
Lecturer (18 above, 6 below bar)	24						
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>		<b>3</b>		<b>4</b>		<b>8</b>

### Core Undergraduate Programmes

Programme Title	Code	Description
BA in Languages for International Communication	LIC	Students study either one or two modern languages to degree level and also specialise in one of the following: Translation Studies, Intercultural Studies or French/German/Hispanic Studies. Compulsory third year abroad.
BA in European Business	EB	Joint degree with two years in DCU and two years in a European partner institution leading to a dual qualification.
BA in International Business and Languages	IBL	Provides comprehensive understanding of the academic disciplines underpinning national and international business along with advanced language skills in Japanese alone or two of French/German/Spanish. Compulsory third year abroad.
BSc in Chemistry with French or German and Physics with French or German	CF/G or PF/G	Common first year called Science International, this programme is offered in the Faculties of Science and Health and Engineering and Computing. Compulsory one semester abroad.
BEng/MEng in Electronic Systems	ES	Offered in Faculty of Engineering and Computing. Students must spend semester 6 in France and may study for the MEng in France in their host Grande École.

### **Postgraduate Programmes**

Graduate Diploma/MA in Translation Studies  
Graduate Diploma/MA in Intercultural Studies  
Graduate Diploma/MA in Comparative Literature  
Graduate Diploma in Applied Languages and Intercultural Studies  
Graduate Certificate in Community Interpreting

### **Service teaching carried out by SALIS staff**

BA in Accounting and Finance  
Bachelor of Business Studies  
BA in Communication Studies  
BA in Journalism  
BA in International Relations  
BA in European Business (Transatlantic)  
BSc in Computer Applications  
BEng in Electronic Engineering  
BEng in Mechanical Engineering  
BSc in Nursing

### **Overall statistics**

<b>Degree, module, student, staff numbers</b>	<b>Number</b>
Degree programmes taught on	20
Individual modules delivered	230
Undergraduate students	512
Postgraduate students (taught)	63
Postgraduate students (research)	19
Academic staff members	49

## **2. The Self-Assessment Process**

### **The Co-ordinating Committee**

SALIS Quality Assessment Team (SQuAT) Membership:

Dr Heinz Lechleiter (Chair)  
Dr David Denby (SL)  
Dr Angela Leahy (L)  
Ms Fiona Gallagher (L)

Ms Margarita Morillo (Admin)  
Dr Minako O'Hagan (L)  
Prof. Jenny Williams (Head)  
Ms Marion Winters (PG)

### **Methodology Adopted**

The SQuAT members met 15 times in all over the period from March 2004 to February 2005. The team set up four focus group meetings with staff, students and Alumni of SALIS and administered staff and student surveys both within and outside the School. An 'Away Day' was also organised to ensure as much staff participation, input and involvement as possible in the quality review process and the self-assessment report (SAR).

Background materials, minutes and other documentation were kept in a folder accessible to all staff in the School office to ensure openness, transparency and constructive criticism. Staff were also informed of the work being carried out at regular School meetings culminating in the Away Day on 17 January 2005. The SALIS SAR was completed in February 2005.

### 3. The Peer Review Group Process

#### Site Visit Programme & Attendance

During the meetings indicated below all PRG members had the opportunity to ask questions of all interviewees.

#### **Day 1 Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> March 2005**

14.00-15.00	First meeting of members of Peer Review Group (PRG). Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion.	All PRG
15.00-16.00	Group discussion about work schedule and allocation of tasks. Dr Arnd Witte elected as Chair.	All PRG
16.00-17.30	Consideration of self-assessment report with School quality committee (SQuAT).	All PRG
19.30-21.30	Dinner for members of PRG, Head of School, SQuAT and Director of Quality Promotion.	All PRG

#### **Day 2 Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2005**

09.00-12.00	Meeting with School teaching and learning representatives (3). Meeting with School research representative. Meeting with Head of School. Meeting with technology and language teaching representative. Meeting with School student recruitment officer. Meeting with other School staff member.	ALL PRG
12.00-13.00	Visit to core facilities of School: Computer labs, languages labs, administrative facilities, academic staff offices and classrooms.	All PRG
13.30-14.00	Visit to DCU library to meet SALIS library officer.	MH, AW & RMA
14.00-16.15	Meetings with 1 <sup>st</sup> year, international, and taught postgraduate students.	GM & RMA
14.00-16.15	Meetings with 2 <sup>nd</sup> year, 4 <sup>th</sup> year and research postgraduate students.	MH & AW
16.15-16.45	Meeting with employer representatives (2) and Head of Careers Service.	All PRG
17.00-18.00	PRG Meeting to consolidate findings and finalise tasks.	All PRG
19.30-21.30	Working dinner for PRG.	All PRG

#### **Day 3 Friday 11<sup>th</sup> March 2005**

09.00-09.45	Meeting with President, Deputy-President, Vice-President for Learning Innovation/Registrar, Representative for Director of Human Resources (Director of Quality Promotion in attendance).	All PRG
10.00-10.45	Meeting with Vice-President for Research.	All PRG
11.00-11.45	Meeting with Dean of Faculty of Humanities.	All PRG
12.00-12.30	Meeting with Head of School.	All PRG
13.30-16.00	PRG meeting to discuss and prepare presentation to School and begin final report.	All PRG
16.00-16.45	Exit presentation to all staff of School (Director of Quality Promotion in attendance).	All PRG AW presented

## **Review Group's View of the Self-Assessment Report**

- The self-assessment report (SAR) was overall a clear, concise and accurate representation of the School's activities. One notable absence was however a comparison of research indicators, such as number and quality of publications and research supervision levels, with other Irish universities.
- The appendix to the SAR was very comprehensive and it was clear that a lot of background research had been undertaken to compile the report.
- The School is to be highly commended for organising an Away Day to facilitate the final compilation of the report and to include all staff views.
- Extra information regarding programme and module documentation as well as data regarding staff members currently registered for a PhD, and how many research students are being supervised by each staff member, was requested from the School and provided promptly.

## **Overall Comments on the Visit**

- The SALIS self-assessment report and appendices were provided well in advance of the PRG visit. However information regarding the duties and responsibilities of the PRG were not provided to all members until the start of the visit, apart from the rapporteur who specifically requested it. It would have been useful to have these details in advance to facilitate preparation.
- The initial briefing session provided by the Director of the QPU was very informative and prompted several questions. A short summary of the whole process at the start would help group members see the totality of the overall process more clearly.
- The timetable of events was very intensive over the three-day visit and left little time for reflection, discussion or report writing. The PRG suggest that this be examined for future reviews.
- The DCU secretary did not attend the senior University management meeting and no representative was provided in his absence.
- The liaison provided by the QPU was very good both before and during the visit and the liaison provided by SALIS was excellent throughout the review.

## **Report Methodology**

At each meeting detailed in the schedule above, all members of the PRG made their own notes and asked questions of the interviewee as required. During breaks between meetings the findings at each stage were discussed, and summary notes were compiled by the rapporteur. For the exit presentation the PRG discussed the four headings of Teaching and Learning, Research and Scholarship, Community and Public and Organisation and Management and developed a number of positive findings. A series of recommendations under these four headings was also outlined at the presentation.

The coordination of the compilation of the PRG report was carried out by the rapporteur and the responsibilities for writing the first draft of the report were as follows:

1. Rapporteur to report on sections 1, 2 & 3
2. RMA and GM to report on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and concerns for the first three headings in Section 4.

3. MH and AW to report on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and concerns for the final three headings in Section 4.
4. All members to review recommendations already developed for Sections 5 and 6 and suggest revisions/amendments.

The four sections above were incorporated into a first draft by the rapporteur and distributed to all PRG members. A week was then allowed for comments and feedback. MH and AW commented on RMA and GM's sections and vice versa, while all members commented on Sections 1-3 and the final recommendations. Based on these comments the second draft of the report was then drawn up by the rapporteur and distributed to all members. Further feedback and other minor revisions resulted in the final report being submitted to the DCU Quality Promotions Unit (QPU) on 8 April 2005. The School then reviewed the PRG report and its response covered three areas: factual changes, clarifications and matters of interpretation. All members of the PRG assessed the School response and the report was amended slightly and resubmitted by the rapporteur to the QPU on 26 April 2005.

#### **4. Findings of the Review Group**

##### **Background and Context**

###### ***Strengths & Opportunities***

- Outstanding reputation of SALIS among national and international translation and language training institutions.
- Strong international staff presence consisting of eight nationalities.
- Major role played in developing the international dimension of the University and fostering awareness of interculturality.
- Involved in a wide range of cross-campus activities and initiatives and represented on a number of DCU committees as well as a broad range of local, national and international activities including major European research projects such as Lolipop and EIWP.
- Forerunner in uniting all languages under one organisational umbrella, offering two-language degrees, undergraduate and postgraduate translation studies programmes, joint honours degrees and business-related degrees combined with languages.
- Home of one University dedicated research centre: CTTS (Centre for Translation and Textual Studies) and one School research centre: CLS (Centre for Language Studies).
- Growing research activity earning an international profile and attracting high-profile European funding and internal grants.
- Excellent relationship with a plethora of external bodies including embassies, cultural institutes, foreign organisations, national and international universities, Schools, and trade unions.
- Esteemed teaching methodology evident in the numerous teaching and learning awards won by SALIS staff.
- Excellent employment record of graduates in a wide variety of areas.
- Dedicated staff committed to maintaining quality and standards despite challenging context and accommodation/technology inadequacies.
- The most obvious physical opportunity is a major refurbishment or replacement of Henry Grattan building.
- The good reputation already enjoyed by the School should serve as an excellent basis for improving its profile and identity (internally and externally) through consistent and aggressive promotion of its activities.



### ***Weaknesses & Concerns***

- Dilapidated physical environment well below University standards.
- Top floor of Henry Grattan dedicated to other academic staff and administrative offices appear to have been painted and refurbished to a much higher standard than SALIS staff offices.
- Poor visibility of School in comparison to counterparts, School name not transparent and does not adequately reflect the work being carried out.
- Reduction in staff numbers draining SALIS of innovative energy.
- Inadequate information about School on SALIS website.
- Programme boards appear to have become an obstacle to innovation.
- Low staff morale in certain areas.
- Lack of student representation at School level.

## **Organisation and Management of the School**

### ***Strengths & Opportunities***

- Recent restructuring appears to be working well in setting the agenda for the future development of the School.
- Generally strong, supportive, collegiate atmosphere.
- School functioning well through difficult circumstances in terms of declining numbers of students and restricted accommodation, technological and other resources.
- Clarity and transparency of present workload document.
- The developing Faculty structure at DCU provides an opportunity for SALIS to drive its agenda in cooperation with other Schools and units.
- Consolidating undergraduate programme management under fewer chairs would reduce the administration burden and improve consistency of practice across programmes.
- Communication tools such as the electronic newsletter provide a means to improve morale through promotion of School/ individual achievements.

### ***Weaknesses & Concerns***

- Declining numbers of undergraduate/postgraduate students.
- Temporary contracts renewed too late.
- Undergraduate and postgraduate studies board posts vacant.
- High levels of overall administration.
- Insufficient flow of information and guidance.
- Incorrect or outdated module descriptors posted on website.
- Inadequate information available on year abroad.
- Poorly planned sabbatical leave.
- Very poor orientation of undergraduates, postgraduates and new staff.

## **Programmes and Instruction**

### ***Strengths & Opportunities***

- Programmes are highly regarded by employers.
- Innovative learning structures, teaching materials and handouts are highly rated by students.

- The international element of the programmes (year abroad) is a very positive experience and very beneficial in terms of career prospects.
- The intercultural nature of the programmes, which overcomes the traditional divisions between languages, is particularly praiseworthy. This allows the provision of innovative courses that are unique in Ireland.
- Many staff make very good use of virtual learning environments.
- Development of new programmes such as community interpreting to address the social needs of an ever-increasing multicultural Ireland.
- Expansion of postgraduate activities to include three new programmes.
- Restructuring of BA in Applied Languages to a more broadly based BA in Languages for International Communication.
- Joint degrees with other disciplines
- In terms of opportunities, the information gathered from students, employers and academic staff provides an excellent basis for a major review of the balance of oral versus other elements of language degrees at DCU.
- A full assessment of the technology infrastructure available in the School, library, and via the Internet and satellite TV for language learning should enable SALIS to prepare a plan for developing this crucial aspect of its work.
- There is potential for student recruitment through degrees with language as a minor rather than major element, as well as the development of new programmes based on the English language to which School staff could contribute.

### ***Weaknesses & Concerns***

- Assessment system/marketing schemes vary for different teachers and languages.
- Deadlines for continuous assessment not well coordinated/rigorously imposed.
- Absenteeism in language learning modules is viewed as having a negative impact on overall class progress, particularly by students who have full attendance.
- Insufficient contact hours for language-specific modules.
- Better oral skills required. Employers remarked on declining standards in pronunciation and accents.
- Maximisation of group sizes in language-specific modules detrimental to the acquisition of good communication skills in the foreign language.
- Lack of computing/technological/self-access learning facilities.
- Contrast between *ab initio* and intermediate language modules, *ab initio* modules very intensive, intermediate slow-moving and often demoralising.
- Copyright issues causing lack of clarity regarding teaching materials.
- Report on language technology provision (LinguaSpace) requested by School Executive and completed in June 2003 by a number of staff volunteers was not responded to or developed.

## **Scholarship and Research**

### ***Strengths & Opportunities***

- Innovative projects are taking place, attracting high calibre research students.

- Weekly Research Seminars for students and staff provide a constructive research environment, which is conducive for students and some staff members alike to undertake PhD research.
- Growing research orientation in School, fostered in particular by the existence of two research centres within SALIS: the *Centre for Language Studies* and the *Centre for Translation and Textual Studies* which was awarded the status of a University Designated Research Centre (UDRC).
- Good relationship between students and staff who are considered to be approachable and helpful.
- Opportunities exist to introduce a system of joint research supervision in order to tap competencies of temporary staff and to avoid marginalisation.
- Involving a significantly higher proportion of permanent staff in research would broaden the School's research profile, given the unique structure of the School, and improve the career development of staff.
- SALIS is one of the best-placed Schools in DCU to participate in EU research programmes, many of which have a high cross-cultural character and strong humanities focus.
- The next PRTL I programme is likely to require cross-University co-operation, and the School is well placed to take initiatives in this regard.

### ***Weaknesses and Concerns***

- The percentage of staff involved in research supervision is below national and international standards.
- Competent temporary staff are not involved in research supervision.
- There is no system in place to carry out national and international assessments of the School in terms of research indicators.
- All possible funding resources are not sufficiently explored.
- Inadequate desk-space and IT resources for postgraduate students has resulted in unequal treatment of such students.
- A code of conduct for postgraduate supervision and research is lacking.
- Insufficient importance and urgency is attached by the School and University to the survival and long-term development of the UDRCs.
- In general, the strong bias towards science and engineering in DCU research funding applications under PRTL I has led to the view that the humanities are seen as the poor relation. Unless this is addressed, it will continue to have a negative impact on research activities and self-perception within the School and its research centres.

### **Social and Community Services**

#### ***Strengths & Opportunities***

- Active involvement of SALIS in outreach programmes in order to facilitate a smoother transition of students from second to third level education and in order to attract students.
- Provision of in-service support for language teachers and community interpreters.
- Input into language education policy both nationally and internationally.
- High awareness of the need for a high standard of information on the School's website which is particularly relevant for international students.
- Employers are impressed by SALIS graduates who are well trained, flexible and possess a range of transferable skills.

- Opportunities exist to increase the number of languages offered. E.g. the availability of German and Japanese would make it easier to respond to demands from employers to introduce related languages like Dutch, Nordic Languages or Chinese.

### ***Weaknesses and Concerns***

- School has no clear identity on campus. No evidence of coherent strategy to improve image of SALIS.
- Research and other activities are not communicated efficiently and effectively within the DCU community.

## **Staffing, Accommodation and Resources**

### ***Strengths & Opportunities***

- Very dedicated, approachable and competent staff many of whom have won awards for excellence and innovation in teaching.
- The virtual learning environment, *Moodle*, is strongly supported by many in the School and is highly regarded by students.
- An opportunity exists to develop the inner coherence of the School and Faculty by creating a communal space/coffee room.
- A further opportunity would involve the School and Faculty developing an outline plan for the refurbishment of the Henry Grattan building, including essential resources for teaching and suitable office accommodation for staff and post-graduates, and request that it be implemented by the University.

### ***Weaknesses and Concerns***

- The Henry Grattan building is in urgent need of renovation or rebuilding. Many offices are not accessible for persons with disabilities which falls short of legal requirements. Many lecture rooms are dirty and dated and thus do not provide a stimulating learning environment.
- The offices overlooking 'The Street' are stuffy. If the windows of these offices are opened, the noise levels are very high which is not conducive to a productive working environment.
- Sometimes there are delays in getting support from Computer Services.
- There is no satellite system provided for students to receive foreign TV programmes which would help students' language/cultural awareness.
- Self-access learning facilities are lacking.
- Apparently high staff-student ratio in DCU budget model, but language teaching should only take place in small groups. If this is not recognised by DCU, e.g. by resourcing language teaching according to international best practice the climate of reducing staff numbers will continue to have a negative effect on staff morale.
- Low percentage of senior staff in the School compared to the University as a whole; in the Language Studies section, which has the largest proportion of staff, there is only one above Lecturer level.
- Resource allocation to SALIS has fallen in recent years even though there is a clear need for a recovery plan to be developed and funded.
- Apparent disagreement within the Faculty on approaches to the development of the Henry Grattan building.

## 5. Recommendations for Improvement 1 (School, Faculty and University)

The opportunities listed in the previous four sections may be reviewed in conjunction with the recommendations developed by the PRG. The tables below indicate recommendations for SALIS in four main areas. The following nomenclature is used to define the importance of each and the level at which it should be addressed:

- P1: A recommendation that is important *and* requires urgent action.
- P2: A recommendation that is important, but can (or perhaps must) be addressed on a more extended timescale.
- P3: A recommendation which merits serious consideration but which is not considered to be critical to the quality of the ongoing activities in the School.
- S: Action by School
- F: Action by Faculty
- U: Action by University Executive/Senior Management

A	Teaching and Learning - Recommendations	Importance & Level
A1	Review numbers of contact hours for language teaching and investigate whether student absenteeism in language teaching classes is having a negative effect on grammatical progression and overall rate of class progress.	P1-S
A2	Agree common assessment and marking schemes for different languages to ensure broad compatibility.	P1-S
A3	Introduce a grammar progression table to set out what should be achieved at each stage for each language.	P1-S
A4	Draw up cross-language essay writing formats for post-graduate studies.	P1-S
A5	Identify and explain more clearly to students the holistic benefits of undertaking a language based degree in terms of the transferable skills that students develop. i.e. develop a sense of the degree being important as it stands without having to have an add-on qualification such as business studies.	P1-SF
A6	Have defined targets and methods and develop proposals to increase the number of students. Develop new subject combinations to develop a greater variety of degree types.	P1-SF
A7	Improve and promote language-learning facilities in library.	P1-SU
A8	Ensure availability of listed course reading material in library. Provide more dictionaries particularly during exam periods.	P1-SU
A9	Investigate whether the provision of independent language learning facilities are important for SALIS students and if so establish activities on a cost-sharing basis if required with the University.	P1-SFU
A10	Introduce closer supervision of undergraduate theses and introduce a fixed penalty system for late submission of projects.	P2-S
A11	Focus more on conversational skills/phonetics in years 1&2 and address deficiencies in the teaching of intermediate language modules in year 1.	P2-S
A12	Encourage more use of <i>Moodle</i> where appropriate.	P2-SF
A13	Spread out and coordinate deadlines for continuous assessment.	P2-SF
A14	Provide basic IT skills for students to overcome wide variations in abilities within student body.	P2-SFU
A15	Encourage self-learning/autonomous learning.	P3-S

<b>B</b>	<b>Research and Scholarship - Recommendations</b>	<b>Importance &amp; Level</b>
B1	Investigate a variety of ways to obtain funding for research students through OVPR and their contacts.	P1-S
B2	Respond to research post-graduate students' document on best practice/code of conduct in research supervision process.	P1-S
B3	Revise workload allocation document to actively encourage research rather than assuming everyone is actually working on research projects.	P1-S
B4	Initiate regular meetings with VPR to facilitate increased communication about SALIS's research activities and to develop connections with other faculties in terms of lobbying/applying for research funding.	P1-SF
B5	For a project idea select the Funding Scheme most appropriate to the project.	P1-SF
B6	Promote/extend use of second supervisor for Master and PhD theses, particularly among temporary contract staff.	P1-SF
B7	Offer more support to research students in writing funding applications.	P1-SF
B8	Strengthen research training within School and in conjunction with Faculty.	P1-SF
B9	Foster and encourage individual and team-based research among staff particularly those who are less research active at present.	P1-SF
B10	Initiate discussions within DCU and with partner institutions in order to strengthen research-funding applications.	P1-SFU
B11	Plan and communicate the development of a post-graduate area if there is one being developed (student comment).	P2-S
B12	Prepare and publish an annual report to demonstrate the School's research publications and activities.	P2-SF

<b>C</b>	<b>Community and Public - Recommendations</b>	<b>Importance &amp; Level</b>
C1	Produce more informative materials for prospective students and employers, both web and non-web based.	P1-S
C2	Be more active in promulgating SALIS identity and activities and research throughout the DCU community.	P1-SF
C3	Look outside the School for future developments in teaching and research.	P1-SF
C4	Improve and regularly update School web content.	P1-SFU

D	Organisation and Management – Recommendations	Importance & Level
D1	Reduce levels of overall administration e.g. consider reducing the number of programme chairs through amalgamation.	P1-S
D2	Review the mentoring and year head co-ordination systems, particularly for 1 <sup>st</sup> year students, to ensure they are working correctly.	P1-S
D3	Remove unsightly wheelie bins for student assignments – replace with project boxes as in other areas of the University.	P1-S
D4	Ensure posts of Chairs of UG and PG studies boards on School executive are filled as soon as possible.	P1-S
D5	Review module descriptors – aim to make them clearer and more transparent.	P1-S
D6	Improve management of sabbatical leave process so that senior levels of staff are not substantially reduced.	P1-S
D7	Ensure information on year abroad is provided well on time and start the information process in 1 <sup>st</sup> year.	P1-S
D8	Establish social area for staff and postgraduate students.	P1-S
D9	Revise workload document to encourage research.	P1-SF
D10	Continue to encourage staff to apply for progression and promotion within University structures.	P1-SF
D11	Investigate ways in which present inadequate levels of physical accommodation and teaching resources could be improved and make proposals to University.	P1-SFU
D12	Ensure changes to module descriptors get made in a timely fashion as web-based methods of information are extremely important for potential SALIS students.	P1-SFU
D13	In order to maintain staff numbers, the School should direct its efforts to increasing student numbers.	P1-SFU
D14	Prepare an induction package and process for new staff and postgraduate students.	P1-SFU
D15	Examine the extent and effectiveness of the current programme of informal academic and social activities to ensure support for, and integration of, international students.	P1-SFU
D16	Provide disabled/wheelchair access to staff offices.	P1-SFU
D17	Provide additional/better quality printing/copying/post room facilities for staff.	P1-SFU
D18	Agree with University and Faculty revision of SCR allocation in line with international best practice.	P1-SFU
D19	Revisit procedures for access to computer facilities in order to make best use of space and to facilitate increased student usage.	P1-SU
D20	Allow temporary contracts to be renewed much earlier than September of an academic year in order to facilitate planning and workload allocation.	P1-U
D21	Increase student representation at School level.	P2-S

## 6. Recommendations for Improvement 2 (Specific University Management Issues)

6.1	<p>Urgently and significantly improve the current inadequate accommodation for both staff and students with regard to offices, lecture rooms, computer access, language learning technology, disabled/wheelchair access. More specific recommendations in this area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide area near or within offices for meeting student groups.</li> <li>• Provide adequate storage facilities in School office and staff offices.</li> <li>• Redesign lecture rooms to allow for interactive learning.</li> <li>• Replace damaged, broken and outdated furniture.</li> <li>• Repair broken windows and blinds.</li> <li>• Repair/replace loose/broken ceiling tiles.</li> <li>• Replace blackboards with white boards.</li> <li>• Remove loose bundles of cables in lecture and other rooms (safety hazard).</li> <li>• Improve cleaning service particularly in lecture rooms, ground floor toilets and <i>The Street</i>.</li> </ul>
6.2	Urgently attend to heating and ventilation problems in Henry Grattan building in classrooms, labs and offices, particularly the offices situated over <i>The Street</i> .
6.3	In conjunction with School urgently review recommendations put forward in LinguaSpace report to improve language-learning environment.
6.4	Provide wheelchair/disabled access to staff offices or provide a suitable private wheelchair accessible room for staff/student consultations.
6.5	Promote more widely the availability of ECDL courses to students so that their IT skills can be improved.
6.6	Promote inter-faculty research applications to encourage research in humanities.
6.7	Develop procedures to ensure that changes to module descriptors and other web-based information is updated on a timely and regular basis.
6.8	Allow temporary contracts to be renewed much earlier than September of an academic year in order to facilitate planning and workload allocation.
6.9	Prepare and deliver an induction package for new staff and postgraduate students.
6.10	Review current programme of activities to provide better support for and integration of international students.
6.11	Define required levels of leadership for UDRCs and prepare a clear statement of University policy regarding the provision and continuity of funding for UDRCs.
6.12	Identify international best practice for teaching language subjects and implement such practice in DCU.
6.13	Improve general learning environment in library which is poor in comparison to other universities.
6.14	Review staff allocation/SCRs (subject weightings) for language learning modules.