



NUI MAYNOOTH

Óliscoll na hÉireann Mhí Nuad

Quality Review of the Department of French

15 - 17 February 2011

Peer Review Report

Peer Review Group:

External Reviewers:

**Professor Mary Bryden,
Professor of French Studies,
University of Reading;
Professor Rachel Killick,
Professor of Quebec Studies &
19th Century French Studies,
University of Leeds.**

Internal Reviewers:

**Dr Bernard Mahon,
Dean of Faculty of Science &
Engineering,
NUI Maynooth;
Dr Thomas O'Connor,
Dean of Faculty of Arts, Celtic Studies
& Philosophy,
NUI Maynooth.**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The external reviewers are grateful to the wide range of people who contributed information for the purposes of this review. These include:

Acting President, NUIM: Professor Tom Collins

The members of the Quality Promotion Unit:
Dr Richard Watson; Ms Marguerite Lohan

The internal reviewers of the PRG:
Dr Tom O'Connor, Dean of Faculty of Arts, Celtic Studies and Philosophy;
Dr Bernard Mahon, Dean of Faculty of Science and Engineering

Former Heads of the French Department:
Professor Jim Walsh, Deputy President
Professor Peter Denman, Department of English

Head of the School of Modern Languages, Literatures and Cultures:
Professor Florian Krobb

Academic staff of French Department (alphabetical):
Dr Anne Cameron
Dr Francesca Counihan
Mr Jean-Baptiste Dubin (Lecteur)
Dr Éamon Ó'Ciosáin (Subject Leader)
Dr Julie Rodgers
Dr Kathleen Shields
Professor Ruth Whelan
Executive Assistant: Ms Michelle O'Reilly

Subject Leaders of other SMLLC Departments:
Dr Catherine O'Leary (Spanish)
Dr Arnd Witte (German)

Language Centre:
Ms Anne Gallagher (Director)
Mme Brigitte McNeely (Language Tutor, French)

Subject Librarian: Ms Regina Richardson

International Office: Ms Wendy Cameron

Dean of Graduate Studies: Professor Honor Fagan

Student Representatives:
Undergraduate students in First Year, Second Year, and Final Year
Postgraduate students

1. Introduction

1.1. The external reviewers found the peer review exercise to have been meticulously organised, and wish to commend the efficiency and helpfulness of Dr Watson and Ms Lohan from the Quality Promotion Unit. Relevant information was sent out prior to the exercise, and any supplementary information which we requested was promptly provided. Our on-site visit took place over three days, from Tuesday 15 to Thursday 17 February inclusive. Careful thought had been given to ensuring that we had access to a very wide range of people, including senior management, academic and administrative staff from the French Department, representatives of the undergraduate and postgraduate student body, colleagues from other groupings within the School of Modern Languages, Literatures and Cultures (SMLLC), as well as from other University units which support and interact with the Department. It was made clear to us that we had free rein to ask to see other personnel who might appear relevant to the exercise: an example of this was our requested dialogue with the Dean of Graduate Studies, who made herself available at short notice and supplied very useful input.

1.2. We had been warned in advance that the visit would be an intensive one, with a packed timetable. This was indubitably necessary in order to ensure that our evaluation of the Department's activities would be based upon as thorough and wide an exposure as possible. However, because of the friendly and thoughtful back-up which we received at every stage, the schedule was perfectly manageable, and the times which had been built in for ongoing discussion helped us to form our impressions without feeling undue pressure. We also found that the members of the French Department all entered into the exercise in a very committed fashion, and took care and trouble to contribute the insights they thought would be relevant and helpful.

2. Self Assessment Report (SAR)

2.1. The SAR provided a helpful introduction to the department from the varied perspectives of teaching, research, and administration, including its teaching linkages to the Language Centre and the Library and its administrative linkages to the SMLLC. Additional information was received in the form of appendices covering, on the staff side, conferences organized, publications, presentations, research funding, and external assignments, and, on the student side, module descriptors, student numbers, progression rates, and student evaluation. On arrival in Maynooth, hard copies of the student handbooks were also available.

2.2. The external reviewers did however consider that the SAR, as an account of departmental activity, tended to underplay the significant strengths and achievements of a small departmental unit, successfully committed both to a teaching mission, embedded in the local community and embracing wide, mixed ability student access, and to a research vision, oriented towards international recognition of high-quality outputs.

2.3. Inevitably perhaps at a time of severe economic retrenchment, the SAR tended to focus instead on areas of perceived difficulty (notably, diminished academic and administrative staffing) without however suggesting ways in which such challenges could be successfully met and proactively managed.

2.4. Changing staffing arrangements over recent years, including a senior retirement and temporary replacement of staff on sickness or research leave, have inhibited the formulation of such a strategy. This is reflected in the descriptive nature of the multi-authored SAR. In 2011-12, however, the four permanent staff will have returned to the Department and this will provide an opportunity for coordinated strategic discussion of the ways in which the Department can move forward on issues identified both in the SAR, and as part of the review visit.

2.5. The review visit has already demonstrated to the external reviewers a positive departmental consensus on the need for a proactive move forwards. They hope that the process of quality review will in itself have been helpful in promoting strategic reflection and that the review report will be a useful tool in further discussion and strategic planning in the French Department and in the SMLLC.

3. Curriculum Design and Delivery

3.1. Language curriculum

3.1.1. Language Curriculum and Review.

The language curriculum is delivered by all the academic members of staff in the French Department, the French lecturer (an annual exchange appointment from the University of Toulouse-Le-Mirail), and two members of Language Centre staff, both native French speakers, who are also responsible in the Language Centre for the institutional provision of *ab initio* and lower level French tuition. The French Department has been mindful of the varied experience and knowledge of its mixed-ability students in respect of their language competence and language skills, and has over recent years undertaken an ongoing review of its language modules, taking account, amongst other things, of the comments of external examiners. The latter commend the language skills of the strongest candidates, but they also discern a wide range of performance and an over-lengthy ‘tail’ of poorly performing candidates. The First-Year Handbook stresses that the language classes are ‘essential’ and ‘indispensable’, and that attendance is noted on record cards. Nevertheless, the reviewers learned that attendance could often be patchy. There is perhaps a case for shifting the terminology from ‘essential’ and ‘indispensable’ to ‘compulsory’. It is clear from past Peer Review Reports from the Departments of German and Spanish that the French Department is not alone in experiencing problems of attendance at language classes, wide disparities in performance, and concerns about the limited staff time available for providing supplementary support to weaker students. The external reviewers did not gain a clear sense of what structures and processes exist in the Department or may be being envisaged in the School to enable discussion of, for example, shared language acquisition strategies or exchange of best practice. The issue of language pedagogy does, however, recommend itself for discussion in a regular committee or working group.

3.1.2 Contact hours and self-study.

Students receive three hours’ language tuition per week over the three years of the degree programme, a standard level of provision for French degree programmes. The

Year 1 and Year 2 students to whom the reviewers spoke were nevertheless keen (as is generally the case in language departments) for more contact hours in practical language. Some of the students also claimed to be confused about the role of the Language Centre in their tuition and notably about the possibilities for independent language-study in the Digilab and in the Language Centre self-access facility. The Language Centre perception, on the other hand, was of a lack of proactive engagement on the part of some students with the language curriculum and a reluctance to avail themselves of the considerable resources in the Language Centre for independent language study that would complement contact hour tuition. There is scope here, it seems, for a more forceful enunciation of what the learning of a language entails, how competence is built not only by practical language training as delivered by grammar classes and exercises, or even self-study in a language lab, but also by the independent reading and listening, through which an instinctive awareness of the linguistic and cultural functioning of the target language are slowly nurtured and absorbed. Experience gained from departmental participation in the Learning Outcomes project could be useful here in promoting a clear enunciation by the language teaching team of the multiple requirements of successful language learning and of the many different inputs vital to the process of advanced language acquisition.

3.1.3. Residence Abroad

Language departments typically have residence abroad as a mandatory feature of their degree programme. The period may vary from a semester to a year, with the year being the normal requirement for all degrees involving BA Honours French, except for modern language programmes involving French and a further language where other arrangements are necessary to accommodate the needs of both languages. Currently at NUIM a year's residence in France is mandatory for students taking French in the BA European Studies and in the BA International Finance. For all other honours students in French, the year abroad in France is strongly advocated but the default position on residence abroad is three months' (not necessarily continuous) residence in France. It is noted that a residential period of three months in a French-speaking country is mandated by the Teaching Council of Ireland for qualification to teach French at post-primary level. The external examiners' reports ascribe oral weakness amongst a significant minority of Final Year students to their limited experience in France. A countervailing feature however is the accessibility of the NUIM French BA degree to mature and other non-standard students for whom extended residence in France may be impossible or impractical. Nevertheless, the external reviewers suggest a change of culture could be effected by adopting the year abroad as the default position for NUIM students of French, with the alternative of three months' minimum residence in France limited to individual students in negotiation with the Department. They thus concur with the similar recommendation in the Quality Review of the Department of Spanish (March 2010) and join with the Spanish external reviewers in urging that the SMLLC review arrangements for residence abroad and put in place a consistent school-wide policy on the year abroad as the default position for all BA Honours students in modern languages.

3.1.4. Language of Delivery.

Delivery of all modules in the target language is a further possible way of expanding student exposure to language, and one largely favoured by the Year 1 and Year 2

students to whom the reviewers spoke. However, even within this self-selected group, there were some who felt that total immersion in the target language would have been counterproductive in the early stages of their degree programme. One of the External Examiner reports also voices the concern that across-the-board teaching of content modules in the target language, especially in the early stages, carries the risk of ‘disillusionment’ on the part of students whose linguistic skills are far from being yet on a par with their analytical skills. This is an issue on which NUIM French department staff, along with modern languages colleagues elsewhere, have differing, equally valid opinions encompassing the competing claims of the enhancement of language competence in French, the promotion and enhancement of intellectual debate, the enhancement of cogent and articulate argument in English, not to mention consequential issues such as the relationship between the language of module delivery and the language of module assessment. There is clearly no one absolute truth in this debate, leaving flexibility as the probable best option. Use of English is obviously necessary in collaborative cross-departmental modules within the School (for example, European cinema), and may also, in some other cases, have the advantage of opening up selected French modules to a wider institutional clientele. At the same time, options taught in French may be the preference not only of staff but also of students. Provided clear information on the language of delivery is available to students as they make their option choices, variation in practice should not, in itself, pose a problem. The Learning Outcomes project furnishes, once again, a useful basis for the succinct and ready provision of such information.

3.2. Content curriculum

3.2.1. The module portfolio. Year 1

Unlike Years 2 and 3, Year 1 does not contain any module optionality. This is undoubtedly sensible, given the complexity of harmonising so many three-subject timetables. The use of Moodle quizzes in testing language proficiency seems to be operating effectively and is popular with students. Lectures in the content modules are not accompanied by seminars. Given the lack of space in the Year I curriculum for additional contact hours, Moodle clearly has a part to play in terms of supplementing and supporting learning in the content modules as well in the language ones. However, though this possibility was sometimes being used and was welcomed by the students, the reviewers were not sure of the extent to which it is deployed on a routine basis. Thought also needs to be given to the desirability or otherwise of Moodle-attracting credits. The students to whom the reviewers spoke were largely satisfied with the overview provided by the content modules, though some felt the need for more visual content to illustrate the texts and ideas covered.

3.2.2. The module portfolio. Years 2 and 3.

The introduction **at NUIM** of a modular system, allowing a choice of options, produced an adjustment rather than a re-envisioning of the French content curriculum for Years 2 and 3, and the current 2.5-credit options are fundamentally residual survivals of pre-modular arrangements. Though their titles present them as broad in scope, they are sometimes (as the external examiners have remarked) limited to a single text, albeit ones that merit detailed study. As the SAR notes, however, and as emphasized by staff during the review visit, staff reductions have limited the number

of available options, so that they are in fact options no longer, but have become a set menu. The time is therefore ripe for a thorough revisiting of the French content curriculum for Years 2 and 3, bearing in mind principles both of breadth and depth, progression of student learning from Year 2 to Year 3, the integration of French modules within the modular system of NUIM as a whole, the apportioning of different types of contact time, the most effective and efficient handling of assessment, and the need to achieve the best and most efficient management of staff time. A major recommendation by the external reviewers would be a general move to 5-credit options, rationalizing and rethinking provision to offer a real choice for students, for example two modules out of four (as opposed to the fragmented, 'no choice' set menu of six mini-modules) and also opening up space for some seminar provision (see 3.2.3 below). These could be broadly based in Year 2, and more specialized with in-depth focus in Year 3. Depending on what is being offered (and the Department has a great range of potential choice, especially if team-teaching were involved), this could also have the advantage of encouraging increased take-up of BA Honours French at the end of Year 1. Broader options in Year 2 might involve such topics as language policy, religion and the state, women's writing, etc.; more specialized possibilities to add to the various topics already available in Year 3, could include options such as Translation for Business, Introduction to Interpreting, etc.

3.2.3. Module delivery.

Alongside a revisiting of content, the development of new modules should also encompass renewed consideration of teaching methods, the apportioning of contact hours, and the links to assessment. The external reviewers were particularly struck by the exclusive use of lectures for the delivery of the content curriculum and by the absence of accompanying seminar hours. Students, for their part, commented on the lack of opportunity for formative discussion and debate and the disconnection with an essay assessment based on the unpractised presentation and defence of an argument. Meanwhile there was comment from staff on the drain on resources (human and financial) brought about by over-assessment. A change to 5-credit modules could be material in alleviating these difficulties, allowing a more productive use of staff and student time and providing, in tandem with module rationalization, an opportunity for seminar discussion complementing lecture provision.

3.2.4. Dissertation.

The dissertation initiated in Year 2 and written in Year 3 is an extended essay conceived as an introduction for students to independent research. There are however a number of key problems noted by the whole range of external reviewers, external examiners, members of staff and students. The SAR identifies ambiguities of nomenclature, confusing to students, around 'dissertation', 'assessed essay', 'long essay', and 'extended essay'. Choice of a possible subject is a yet more significant difficulty for students, still only in their second year, especially as the arrangements for supervision seem, as they described them to the external reviewers, patchy and not clearly defined. Students often moreover change their minds about their initial choice of subject, and this is all the more likely in the case of those undertaking a year abroad. Should the School and the Department opt for the default position of a year abroad as standard, this situation will become increasingly frequent. It was also noted by staff that work on the dissertation is included in the assessment of two different

modules in two different years, FR224 *Discussion littéraire / Mémoire de licence 1* in Year 2; FR313 *Discussion littéraire / Mémoire de licence 2* in Year 3, and may also figure in the Oral examination (FR323). Dissertations, as we understand it, are also double-marked internally, with each dissertation subsequently marked again, for a third time, by the external examiner. A robust system of sampling might be advisable here. For some students, as observed by one external examiner, the dissertation is an opportunity for a display of intellectual and linguistic competence and even flair. In other cases there is a problem in guaranteeing the independence of student work, whilst overall disparity of subject can make comparative evaluation difficult. Like the external examiners, the external reviewers would not wish to deny the value of a dissertation module, particularly for students who may be envisaging subsequent postgraduate research. There are however a number of significant problems here which the French department needs to consider when reviewing its curriculum portfolio. For student learning, these bear on the best way to provide an intellectually challenging and satisfying experience across the mixed-ability range of their student body; and for staff, on the most fruitful and efficient use of their teaching and assessment time.

4. Postgraduate Provision

4.1. MA provision. There was no recruitment in 2010-11 to the taught MA in the French Department, and there is a consensus among the French staff, shared by the external reviewers, that the unpredictabilities of taught MA recruitment and consequential difficulties in staffing and workload allocation are combining to make taught departmental MAs highly problematic. Instead there was an enthusiasm for pursuing and expanding interdisciplinary taught MA provision, with the School providing a helpful consolidating focus for the furtherance of such collaborative MA programmes. Such collaboration might also proceed both on a wider institutional basis, and possibly also on a regional basis, building upon distinctive Maynooth specialisms and library holdings. Meanwhile the MLitt is available as a research-based alternative to taught MA programmes. Thematic ideas which arose during discussion encompassed a variety of areas such as conflict resolution, minority languages, lexicography and European women's writing. The subject librarian was enthusiastic about augmenting the collaborative role of subject librarians, and also pointed to the possibility of exploiting special collection holdings on the Irish in Europe, including material on Irish Colleges in France and Spain.

4.2. Doctoral provision.

At the doctoral level the French Department currently has four students, all in receipt of university or external funding. Future doctoral recruitment may well follow the pattern of the integrated PhD, and here again the School, along with the recently instituted Graduate School, is set to provide a supportive framework for postgraduate students of French.

4.3 SMLLC and the Graduate School.

The facilities and possibilities offered by these frameworks were considered welcome developments by the three French research students out of four whom the reviewers were able to meet. All three were positive about the supportiveness of their individual

research supervisors, but the two students currently approaching completion of their doctorates regretted the absence of a broader graduate infrastructure in the earlier stages of their degree, and the consequent lack of opportunity for participation in research workshops and research training programmes. They also felt that websites could be more informative in terms of making clear what events and facilities were available for postgraduate students. In contrast, the third student, currently at an earlier position in his doctorate, felt himself to be clearly benefitting from the frameworks and opportunities now in place, through the Graduate School. This postgraduate infrastructure is of key importance for a small department such as French, facilitating, to the benefit of students, the delivery of a basic research training within a broad-based multidisciplinary environment, whilst simultaneously maximizing specialist input to the development of collaborative MA programmes and enhancing the specialist supervision of doctoral studies. It will be important that French staff engage as fully as possible with this significant strategic initiative.

5. Research

Given the many pressures and demands of teaching and administration in a department with reduced personnel, impressive levels of research activity continue, including books, articles in high-profile journals, international conference papers, and conference organisation. Members of staff are active in a number of subject associations, external examining, as well as participating in a range of international networks. They have also been successful in securing research funding. This commitment is all the more remarkable when one takes into account the further fact that the sabbatical arrangements underpinning some of these achievements involve the relinquishing of a portion of salary, albeit with a tax break if study outside Ireland is required. A range of research expertise covering various aspects of the inter-relationships between Ireland and France contributes to a distinctive departmental research profile, closely aligned to the objectives of An Foras Feasa, as well as to the status of the Language Centre as the Government-designated provider of Irish language teacher training. At the same time, translation and translation studies, and research in women's writing, are other areas of particular expertise linking with parallel interests in the School and with a broad swathe of international research. The developing focus on research groupings within the SMLLC and NUIM is a significant strategic initiative that usefully promotes some interesting research links and possible future research collaborations for the staff of the French Department.

6. School of Modern Languages, Literatures and Cultures

6.1. The reviewers found the inception of the School to be a development unanimously welcomed by all members of the French Department as also by those of German and Spanish, as offering a more coherent environment for the collaborative and collegial development of modern languages teaching and research across the constituent departments, whilst simultaneously providing a greater visibility to languages in the institution.

6.2. The school, one year on from its inception in February 2010, is still at an early stage in its development opportunities for the sharing of best practice, the evolution of mechanisms to calibrate and coordinate teaching strategy, module and programme approval and review, and the building of critical mass in research through the

enhanced possibility for research collaborations. The reviewers were pleased to be told of ongoing conversations already taking place, but these now need to be worked into the development of school committee structures, within which the planning and fine-tuning of academic practices and procedures can be discussed and agreed. The Learning Outcomes project, in which French has played a significant part at departmental and school level, is a clear initial indication of the developmental benefits that accrue from a ‘whole-school’ approach, in this case to learning and teaching.

6.3. As the School goes forward, it will also be a priority to agree upon lines of governance and reporting lines, so that what is currently an unclear division of executive, administrative and strategic authority between the Head of School and the Subject Leaders, and between Subject Leaders and their Departments, can become transparent and defined. The drawing-up of flow-charts would be a useful step in helping to determine how best to develop the interacting frameworks of School and Departments to the greater benefit of both.

6.4. The organic development of any new structure takes time, and the process is not facilitated by unavoidable budgetary constraints. In this context it will be vital, once matters of organisation and line management have been worked out, to ensure that there is parity of workload and presence with regard to administrative support. This is an issue of particular significance for French, which currently, at least on paper, has half the administrative support of each of the German and Spanish Departments.

6.5. Building interdepartmental collegiality will be a further crucial element in the development of the School. Some members of staff expressed the view that it would be desirable to have a room which would facilitate informal encounters and exchanges, though pressures on space are clearly a difficulty here. Another approach would be to plan periodic School ‘away-days’ in a pleasant place to share best practice in learning and teaching and in research, and to discuss and develop strategic planning in the School and its Departments.

6.6. It was perfectly appropriate on this occasion for the quality review of French to take place on a departmental basis, to complement the exercises carried out separately by the German and Spanish Departments in March 2010, just a few weeks after the establishment of the School. However, the reviewers are of the opinion that the next quality review of languages would be more appropriately undertaken on a School-wide basis. This would not only achieve economies of scale, but would also reflect the collective identity which by then should have become more firmly delineated.

7. Summary of recommendations

7.1. Language curriculum

Recommendation: *that the department work towards providing for clearer enunciation of learning skills, learning inputs, learning outcomes.*

7.2. Year Abroad

Recommendation: *that the default position regarding residence abroad be reviewed.*

7.3. Content curriculum

Recommendations:

7.3.1. that the modular portfolio of Years 2 and 3 should be reviewed and redesigned to achieve the continuing provision of real choice by moving from 2.5- to 5-credit modules

7.3.2. that modes of delivery be reviewed with a view to introducing some seminars to accompany and complement lectures

7.3.3. that consideration be given to the place and arrangements of the dissertation

7.3.4. that consideration be given to possible streamlining of some current assessment procedures.

7.4. Postgraduate provision

Recommendation: *that consideration be given as to how best the French Department can participate in and profit from the new structures provided by SMLLC and by the Graduate School, not only to offer an optimal research experience for students, but also to make the most stimulating and effective use of staff expertise.*

7.5. Research

Recommendation: *that consideration be given as to how best to maximize the distinctiveness of French as a research discipline in NUIM, especially perhaps in relation to the various aspects of the Irish-French heritage through An Foras Feasa, and also through shared interests in the SMLLC, such as translation studies and women's writing.*

7.6. SMLLC

Recommendation: *that consideration be given as to how French can best contribute to, and gain from, the inception of the School and the role French staff can play in the effective development of school-wide managerial and administrative structures and in the formulation and execution of the School's strategic objectives.*

8. Conclusion.

8.1. French in Maynooth has a strong historical importance reaching back to the end of the eighteenth century. Its continuing importance in NUIM as an area of activity valued in the University was confirmed to the external reviewers by NUIM Senior Management, notably the Acting President and the internal PRG members. The physical environment for learning on campus, including the remarkable buildings of the main quadrangle, is undoubtedly a major asset for Maynooth.

8.2 At NUIM, as in French Departments throughout Ireland and the UK, French is facing the challenges posed by a difficult funding environment, the declining position of languages in schools, and the perceived difficulties of language learning and consequent lack of higher-level take-up of languages amongst their pupils, notwithstanding the demand in the employment market for English mother-tongue

graduates with highly-developed language skills in one or more other languages. Despite this, the French Department in Maynooth is still succeeding in attracting, from a shrinking pool, a healthy number of undergraduates. In harmony with NUIM's pro-active stance towards widening access, recent cohorts exhibit commendably different access routes, and the undergraduate and postgraduates encountered on the peer review visit contained a full range of Irish students entering university from high school, mature students across a wide variety of age-groups, and students who were non-native speakers of English. Quality assurance and enhancement processes at NUIM are underpinned by the principle of 'the centrality of the student experience as a core value'. It was indeed clear, from the evidence of questionnaires and from discussion with external reviewers, that students were extremely appreciative of the French Department staff and their research-led teaching, and positive also in respect of staff commitment to supporting students both collectively and in response to individual needs as they arose.

8.3. Meanwhile, closely mirroring institutional priorities laid out in NUIM's strategic plan, the Department continues to maintain and develop its international orientation in research, building on a successful ongoing performance in publications and in conference and workshop organisation, and on the new possibilities opening up with the establishment of the SMLCC and of yet broader research groupings within NUIM and beyond.

8.4. The inception of the SMLLC is a further positive factor for the development of French at NUIM. The Memorandum of Understanding asserts that French, German, and Spanish will continue to retain a certain measure of autonomy, and to operate as individually viable units, and the French Department is now in a good position to explore, in dialogue with the German and Spanish Departments, ways in which the School can arrive at a mutually agreed functioning and reporting structure, achieve savings in both expenditure and staff time, and undertake high-profile ventures which will achieve continuing visibility and prestige for all three Departments. The external reviewers hope that, as the aspirations and ideals of the School become more firmly embedded in operational practice, all the individual and specialized contributions of the French Department staff, along with those of their colleagues in German and in Spanish, will increasingly blend together into a mutually supportive and mutually beneficial team culture. This process has already begun under the energetic and consensual leadership of Professor Krobb. The reviewers wish the Department and the School well in their successful furtherance of this goal, and once again thank all the participants in the review for their warm welcome and for their constructive and helpful comments.

**Professor Mary Bryden,
External Reviewer**

**Professor Rachel Killick,
External Reviewer**

**Dr Bernard Mahon,
Internal Reviewer**

**Dr Thomas O'Connor,
Internal Reviewer**