



**Maynooth
University**
National University
of Ireland Maynooth

Ollscoil Mhá Nuad

Maynooth University

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND ASSURANCE

PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

ACADEMIC YEAR 2014/15

Confidential

May 2015

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Peer Review Group Members	3
3.	Timetable of the site visit	3
4.	Peer Review Methodology	4
1.1.	Site Visit	4
1.2.	Peer Review Group Report	4
5.	Overall Assessment	4
1.1.	Summary Assessment of the Present State of the Unit	4
1.2.	Self-Assessment Report	5
6.	Findings of the Peer Review Group: Commendations and Recommendations	6
6.1	Overview	6
6.2	Commendations	8
6.3	Recommendations for Improvement	10
	Strategic Recommendations	14
	Whole of Unit Recommendations	16

1. Introduction

The Review of the University took place between Tuesday 28th and Wednesday 29th April 2015. The Library is a central function providing services to all members of Maynooth University (MU) and the Pontifical University, St Patrick's College Maynooth. There are two main buildings on campus – the recently extended John Paul II Library, and the Russell Library, which houses primarily pre-1850 material. The Library also manages the University Archive and Research Centre at nearby Castletown House, in collaboration with the Office of Public Works and University colleagues. The small library service at the Kilkenny Outreach Campus also receives practical help from the MU Library.

2. Peer Review Group Members

Name	Affiliation	Role for Regional & Spatial Analysis
Mark Boyle	Maynooth University	Director, National Institute for Regional & Spatial Analysis
Fiona Lyddy	Maynooth University	Dean, Science & Engineering
Jon Purcell	University of Durham	University Librarian
Jan Wilkinson	University of Manchester	University Librarian & Director of the John Rylands Library

3. Timetable of the site visit

See Appendix A

In terms of receipt of paperwork and instructions and guidance in advance of the meeting, the timetable was appropriate. In terms of the visit itself, the timetable was both challenging and rewarding. Certainly the organizers ensured that all relevant constituencies were made available to the reviewers and the timetable was tightly packed. It felt at times a little too

compressed and condensed. A pre-review informal dinner, allied with tremendous attentiveness from the University Librarian and his team however lubricated the schedule greatly and the reviewers were shepherded through the process smoothly and by and large according to the time schedule. Perhaps a slightly less congested timetable, allowing more space for introspection and reflection, might have been helpful. In addition, the telephone conversations with outside stakeholders was perhaps the least valuable component of the timetable and could have been reduced in scope. Overall though, this was an intense timetable but one which made maximum usage of the reviewers time. It was sufficient to allow a deep engagement with the review process to be undertaken.

4. Peer Review Methodology

4.1 Site Visit

The site visit for the Review was conducted over two intensive days which gave the Peer Review Group (PRG) excellent opportunities to see parts of the Library estate, and to meet with a cross-section of University staff and students. We enjoyed the positive engagement with all of the groups we met, and our telephone calls with individuals representing external organisations with which the Library has a relationship. The PRG wishes to acknowledge the significant amount of preparation in the months and weeks leading up to the visit, and to express our thanks to all staff for their efforts to ensure that our time in Maynooth University Library could be used as efficiently and effectively as possible. We also very much appreciated the warm hospitality associated with our visit. Each member of the PRG found the experience an intensive but enjoyable and rewarding learning experience. Our congratulations go to the entire staff for such a thorough, well-organised event.

4.2 Peer Review Group Report

The PRG worked closely together throughout the period of the Review, and collectively formed a summary overview of the current state of the Library. As a result of continuous dialogue during the site visit, we unanimously reached agreement about our findings, commendations and recommendations in readiness for a presentation to Library staff and University senior managers as our conclusion to the proceedings. These are summarised in the pages that follow.

5. Overall Assessment

5.1 Summary Assessment of the Present State of the Unit

The Library is currently between strategic plans, the last one having been 90% completed in 2012. The development of a new plan has been deferred for reasons relating to the implementation of a Quality Improvement Plan arising from the last Peer Review in 2010, and the complex work associated with the move to the new Library building in 2013. The Library intends to submit a new Strategic Plan to the University Executive later in 2015. This will be an important next step to ensure that its future development is closely aligned to the University Strategic Plan 2012-17, informed by good quality data, and the outcomes of this

current Review. Without such a plan the Library risks fragmentation of focus; already it is trying to do so much with relatively small amounts of resource.

The PRG was positively impressed by the significant progress of the Library since the last Quality Review in 2010. One of the Group was involved in that visit and commented on the major change that has been achieved. The new building is the most marked achievement and obviously a resounding success. Continuing investment will be important in a building that receives such a high level of footfall and through almost all weeks of the year. Other parts of the Library estate also warrant attention, with the Russell Library crying out for refurbishment, and a shortage of adequate storage space for future needs. A number of other previous weaknesses have also been addressed: the embedding of a new organisational structure, development of a research support service, extended opening hours, acquisition of a number of archives and unique and distinctive collections, support for academic writing, are to name just a few. The extensive range of services on offer from the Library, with its relatively modest staffing level, is reflected in the positive feedback received.

Relative to standards in the sector, the Library is underfunded but manages to punch above its weight, both in terms of service delivery, and its profile nationally and internationally. A particular strength is in the quality, flexibility, and commitment of staff, their desire to innovate, and the general 'can do' attitude that pervades the Library culture and reflects very positively on its leadership. That said, demand for the Library's services seems insatiable, and likely to continue to grow with rising student numbers. A combination of thinly spread staff and the skills gaps identified in many academic libraries raise questions about the possibility for, and sustainability and scalability of, new services. The Library rightly aspires to compete with its larger and better-funded counterparts in Europe, but current funding levels will make this hard to achieve going forward. There are some weaknesses emerging that will need prompt attention in the coming months and years. PRG noted already several potential points of failure as a result of the concentration of expertise in just one or two individuals and a shortage, in terms of numbers, to be able to address this. An obvious threat to the Library's continuing success will be in its ability, or otherwise, to recruit to key posts.

Equally, the Library's collections, while an undoubted strength in some areas, also leave the institution unable to compete with its counterparts further afield. IRel, while in many ways a strength, has become a dependency for access to digitally published outputs. This, and a disproportionately small Library acquisitions budget, leaves the University vulnerable, especially in terms of research support.

5.2 Self-Assessment Report

The PRG very much welcomed the Library's Self-Assessment Report prior to the visit, and its accompanying blog and supplementary documentation to demonstrate the wide range of activity in which the Library is involved. The involvement of staff in preparing the Report was noted and appreciated by the Review Group as entirely consistent with the inclusive culture of the Library. The Report itself was well-structured, helpfully analytical and information-rich, yet admirably succinct and accurate. The SWOT, and the Quality Improvement Plan, were found to be particularly helpful at the outset of the Review, given the lack of a current Strategic Plan for the reasons stated above.

6. Findings of the Peer Review Group: Commendations and Recommendations

6.1 Overview

- **Unit governance and organisation**

The Library is one of three units which, together with the Computer Centre and the Innovation Value Institute, report to the University Executive through the Vice-President for Innovation. The University Librarian submits a draft annual report to a sub-committee of Academic Council each year and makes a formal submission to Academic Council. Outside the formal reporting mechanisms, the Librarian presents at a variety of University Committees as required to ensure that the Library is aligned with University strategy and responsive to stakeholder agendas. The Vice-President for Innovation outlined the benefits of this arrangement which he hoped would deliver closer collaboration between the Library and Computer Services.

The SAR outlined the Library's organisational structure, implemented in 2012, which corrected many of the functional difficulties of the previous structure, which had been in place for 15 years. The current structure benefits from clearer reporting lines, is more responsive to the service needs of users, facilitates staff flexibility and cross-section working, integrates the Russell Library with Special Collections and reflects a tighter and flatter management structure which benefits from a layer of Assistant Librarians.

- **Services and engagement with user groups**

The Library delivers an impressive range of services to an ever expanding clientele. This is partly due to the success of the new Library extension, significantly increased demand across all services, an increase in the numbers of service users and the Library's role in becoming the cultural and intellectual hub of the campus with a 280% increase in events. The very impressive range of services offered by a comparatively small Library staff are testament to the hard work, enthusiasm and professionalism of the staff but with the caveat that many of these activities may not be sustainable within existing staffing levels and growing demand.

The Library provides a fairly typical, but broad, range of products and services which support the University's research and education strategies. These include, for example, the provision of differentiated study spaces, lending and enquiry services, research support and access to key resources and academic skills development. These services are well developed and take-up by user groups is high.

Programmes which support the development of students' academic skills are considered to be a national exemplar of good practice, with the Library Information Skills Tutorials (LIST) of particular note. The inclusion of LIST content in the new curriculum being developed is an important development and one to be encouraged. The Library's new Teaching and Learning Strategy will provide an opportunity to review the existing portfolio of information skills, align these with the new curriculum and further embed the programmes into under-represented areas of the curriculum.

Research support is an aspect of Library provision which has seen significant development and investment since the 2010 Quality Review. The appointment of a dedicated Research Support Librarian, the development of specific research services, research specific study spaces, a new research blog, the implementation of Open Access services including research data management, and the new Special Collections suite are all positive examples of the Library's renewed commitment to research support.

The launch of a 3D printing service, the first in Ireland, is another example of Library innovation and development and responding to a perceived research need. The SAR also details a variety of services and activities which support collections and access. Digitisation, the use of discovery tools, the further development of digital collections, the integral use of IReL as a core element of the Library's electronic collections strategy, a significant expansion of archive collections and a higher profile for special collections are all evidence of the Library's impressive ability to use existing resources, both human and financial, to extend access to library collections and services while also improving physical and electronic access.

- **Staffing and staff development**

The Library has 52 staff (42.25 FTE). As this report will indicate elsewhere, a comparatively small cohort of staff deliver an impressive range of ever increasing and developing services. The PRG questions the sustainability of some current areas of activity, and wishes to highlight some areas of potential risk, especially in the areas of research support, digital and electronic collections and the growing importance of the Russell Library and Special Collections. It is to the credit of Library staff, together with creative and positive leadership, that the Library is able to deliver the range of services that it does.

The recent LibQual Survey indicated that the level of service provided by the Library is considered to be above minimum expectations. The opinions expressed to the PRG by University and Library staff, students and external organisations, all reinforced an impression of a Library where staff are hardworking, committed, engaged, well-managed, friendly and proactive in aligning the Library to the research, education and external engagement activities of the University.

Staff development is taken seriously, both by Library management and by Library staff. 4.68% of the Library's non-pay budget is allocated to staff training and development; an increase from 2.65% in 2010. The SAR indicates an impressive array of internal and external staff development activities engaged in by Library staff with active staff involvement in national and international activities, academic writing and conference presentations. This is an impressive commitment in times of financial stringency.

- **Resourcing**

While deeply impressed with the professional dedication of Library staff and their obvious enthusiasm for service development, PRG members were struck by the relatively low level of investment in the Library. The SAR indicates a number of strategies to increase operational efficiency, including greater use of shelf ready books, an extension of Electronic Data Interchange and sustained weeding of the collection. The SAR indicated that total income

had increased 3% between 2010 and 2014. The Maynooth academic community relies on IReL, and a number of other libraries, starting with Trinity College Dublin, to meet the full range of its research needs.

- **Internal and external communications**

An impressive variety of internal and external communication methods are used by the Library including social media and blogging. Feedback from user group representatives is generally supportive but also indicated that despite strenuous efforts to improve communications, some Library users were poorly informed about services. This is not a problem unique to Maynooth! The Library intranet is also commended as a vital internal communication tool.

The Library is also engaged in a number of engagement activities with local schools, local libraries and the wider Maynooth community. The Library is commended for the widest possible extent of its communication and engagement activities which have both a national and international reach adding much to the Library's reputation

- **Implementation of recommendations for improvement made in Peer Review Group Report arising from last quality review.**

A Quality Improvement Plan stemming from the 2010 Quality Review was implemented and used by the Library to underpin and inform planning in the intervening period. It should be noted that all of the recommendations from the 2010 Quality Review were acted upon and that a new shorter term Library Strategic Plan 2015-2017 will be informed by the recommendations of this Quality Review.

6.2 Commendations

The PRG wishes to congratulate the Library on the following achievements:

1. The transformational nature of the changes made and the progress observed since the last Review in 2010. Most notable is the Library building itself, but also the advances made on a whole range of product and service developments. We especially commend the staff of the Library for their customer focus, attention to their own personal and professional development, and their general level of engagement with both the University's and the Library's aspirations.
2. The PRG chooses to single out the Library Building, which opened in June 2013, for particularly special attention. The new space has achieved so much in terms of overall satisfaction for its inspiring ambience, increased room for study, and vastly improved exhibition facilities. Its high level of community use, including its appeal for University-wide events has also created a central hub placing the Library right in the heart of the University campus.

3. In addition, we commend the successful integration of the Russell Library within the structure of the University Library, and note the resulting increase in usage. A commendable increase in archive acquisition and alignment with University.
4. Since the last Review, in 2010, the Library's new organisational structure has been rethought in response to the changes to the physical environment. Evidence suggests that this is working well in most cases, with clearer reporting lines and a better fit with current trends in service demands. This impression is supported by the excellent evidence, gathered by the PRG, of staff working across formal team boundaries and the exceptionally positive feedback we received from academic staff and students. A culture of strong commitment at the individual level, with openness to innovation, a 'can do' mindset gave us a strong sense of collegiality, which is paying dividends for the University in terms of service development and improvement.
5. The PRG wishes to commend the Library's new emphasis on the development of services to support research. The creation of a new role (Research Support Librarian) to work closely with researchers and with University research-related offices, and to lead this important initiative, will enable more focused effort in the complex world of bibliometrics, researcher impact, citation analysis and altmetrics, help to advance Digital Humanities within the University, and promote further the national and international Open Access agenda through the University's Institutional Repository.
6. The Library's Information Skills Tutorials (LIST) combined with a range of bespoke skills sessions embedded into programmes and modules, are singled out here for commendation. The relevance of these tutorials to student learning, and the development of information skills to contribute to student success, is significant, both for their time at Maynooth, and in the world of employment when they leave.
7. The PRG wishes to highlight the impressive development of the Library as a cultural hub within the University through its involvement in events and exhibitions. We also commend the display of art within the Library building as a source of inspiration for its users, and as a way to make an institutional building feel welcoming, creative and unique.
8. We were particularly struck by the high level of engagement by the Library - locally, regionally, nationally and increasingly internationally. This includes work with local schools, the local public library, and collaboration across Ireland through exhibition loans, guest lectures and placements for the School of Information and Library Studies at UCD and DBS. The Library is also extremely active professionally, with staff often holding officer roles on library and related bodies such as IRel, CONUL, etc. Internationally, senior staff are well-connected with libraries in the UK and North America, through visits, hosting return visits, and through representation on some of SCONUL's and one of IFLA's groups.
9. Finally, though not exhaustively, the Review Group wishes to highlight the excellent leadership shown by the Librarian and his senior team. In our view, the Library is punching well above its weight, achieving a great deal that is of key relevance to the University's strategic ambitions, and gaining positive feedback from the recipients of its services. Particularly in the context of the resources provided, the University should be rightly proud of its Library and what it manages to achieve.

6.3 Recommendations for Improvement

Having considered fully the Self-Assessment Report, and the findings from our visit, the PRG would like to suggest that the following recommendations are taken into consideration in the Library's next planning period.

1. **Sustainability and scalability** of the current range of services is a risk to the Library's continuing success. The Library offers an excellent portfolio of services across a huge and impressive range, and during long periods of opening. However, we have a concern that the 42.25 FTE staff are already operating close to full capacity, and are spread too thinly in some key areas. This leaves services vulnerable to absence, hard to sustain for long periods, and impossible to scale beyond existing levels as take up increases through increased student numbers, or raised levels of awareness among existing customers. In addition, it reduces the flexibility of the Library in its ability to respond to new initiatives, such as those emerging from the Curriculum Initiative. In the short period of our visit, we identified some obvious potential points of failure, such as research, IT, and administrative support, but it is likely that more would emerge on closer examination. We recommend that the University gives serious consideration to the level of resourcing in some areas of Library activity, paying particular attention to its own strategic priorities and the support of new skills needed for the Library's further development.
2. **Increased focus.** We also encourage the senior staff of the Library to increase the selectivity applied to what the Library chooses to engage in going forward. While the current energy and enthusiasm is to be acknowledged and celebrated, a tighter focus for staff on what is most important to the University would be highly beneficial, especially in the current funding environment, but also as a discipline for good planning. We recommend that the opportunity of a new Strategic Plan is used to identify where this focus should be and in which order of priority these needs should be addressed. A two year, interim, strategic plan will help to identify the changes necessary following the University's Curriculum Implementation Project, from this Quality Review, and also realign the Library's planning cycle with that of the University's next Plan.
3. **Collection Development.** The Library's current approach to Collection Development is a particular concern. While undergraduate students seem fairly well-catered for in terms of their reading material (particularly textbooks), research collections have developed idiosyncratically over many years in a number of discipline areas. The reasons for this appear to be two-fold: low levels of funding for purchase of library materials, and the almost total dependence on academic staff for their selection. We recommend a thorough review of the Library's approach to materials acquisition. As a minimum, we suggest a more balanced approach is adopted with the Library working more collaboratively with its University partners in teaching and research, both to fill obvious gaps in current holdings, and as a way to ensure that, in the future, the Library gives appropriate attention to disciplinary depth. We also suggest that thought is given to the entire notion of Collection Development in a digital age. What does a Library need to *own*, just in case it is one day needed, in an age when fast delivery is possible, via a third party supplier or partner, *just in time*? And will the concept of Collection Management still have meaning in light of technological developments in the future?

4. **The Subject Librarian role.** The PRG wishes to endorse the recommendation previously made, in the 2010 Library Review Report, in calling for an urgent review of the role of subject librarian. While we acknowledge the value attached, particularly by academic staff, to a single point of contact with the Library, we also wish to challenge the possibility that those occupying these roles can, for the most part, operate as subject experts. The staff numbers are too small for this, with each person trying to cover a broad subject/discipline range. In addition, expectations are increasing all the time that the Library will need to align itself with the priorities identified in the University's curriculum review, in addition to the continual demand for service innovation. It is hard to imagine how all of this can be achieved without a fundamental review of the subject librarian role. We believe the recent appointment to the role of Senior Librarian for Learning & Research Information Services makes this review all the more timely.
5. **Summon as a search tool.** Attention should be given to understanding negative feedback/usability in relation to Summon and improving ease of access to the 'old' library catalogue search facility.
6. **Event management.** While the development of the Library as a cultural hub and events venue is valued widely across the University (including within the Library) and the performance of the Library in this seen as exemplary, the PRG believes that this level of event involvement is unsustainable. This new responsibility draws on already scarce resources, and equally does not play to the Library's core strengths or *raison d'etre*. We recommend, therefore, that the exhibitions and events hosted by the Library are reviewed with a view to developing a policy that reduces Library involvement to key strategic events and that the appropriate departments of the University (Communications, Alumni Office, Campus & Commercial Services, etc.) work together with the Library to review the current arrangements for event management and to agree a limited schedule of events to be hosted annually, with priority for high profile University/strategic events and events that play to the Library's core strengths.
7. **Library funding.** The Library budget has been historically defined, with no dedicated funding, or process for signing off for new programmes, or new areas of strategic priority. We recommend that a review of the model used by the University to determine the allocation of funding to the Library is conducted and note that this is overdue. In particular, the salaries and collections budgets need protection from any further erosion for the University to be able to compete with its peers in library terms. The Academic Programmes Committee might consider library resources and funding required when deliberating on new programmes.
8. **Work Force planning.** In view of 7 above, we recommend that the Library take a structured, professional approach to planning its workforce, identifying the issues it faces in modernizing for future need. This will include, as a minimum, close examination of the current staff profile, known skills gaps, anticipation of roles needed in the next five years or so, with an accompanying action plan for how to address the current issues.

9. **Capital projects.** The PRG recognises the significant investment made in the Library estate in recent years. Looking ahead, we recommend that future investment will need to be directed at:
- (a) redevelopment of original parts of the John Paul II Library
 - (b) refurbishment of Russell Library
 - (c) improvements to the Kildare store so that it can be fit for purpose for increased stock relegation
 - (d) continuous up-keep of the new part of the John Paul II Library.
10. **Quick wins.** In addition to the substantive recommendations made above, the PRG believes that a significant difference can be made to improve the experience of Library users through a series of 'Quick wins', as follows:
- Improved signage and classification guides on each floor would be of considerable benefit and address feedback from students and researchers about the difficulties they experience when trying to locate books on shelves.
 - Current policy with regard to the usage of the post-graduate room should be reviewed and usage prioritised to support the goals of the Strategic Plan. The purpose of the room should be clearly articulated; is it a quiet space or 'home base' for research students; is it a dedicated meeting and study space for all postgraduates etc. This is a hugely emotive issue, exacerbated by a lack of a 'home' base for some PhD students. In these cases, the post-graduate room in the Library *is* their home for study purposes and there are issues relating to noise, and the use of the space by some as a group study area. The space cannot be all things to all students; the best use of the space might be negotiated via the Graduate Studies Office and the Postgraduate Research Council.
 - The absence of a facility to leave books overnight is a source of extreme frustration, to post-graduates in particular, in that the (non-loan) books they are using must be returned to their shelf location at the end of each day. This issue is exacerbated by the length of time it can sometimes take for books to be re-shelved by staff in that they will likely not be available first thing the following morning.
 - Improved provision of lockers in the post-graduate room, and clarification as to who can use them would be welcome.
 - A review of opening hours, based on need, at evenings, weekends and vacations is called for. This should include the opening hours of Special Collections more generally.
 - A review of the one day loan category would be welcomed by many students who seem to regard it as too short to enable books to be taken off campus.
 - It seems that demand is considerable, and there is a willingness on the part of the Library to install a suite of Apple Macs, but this has been delayed for reasons beyond the control of the Library. The need for Macs and support for users should be considered within the context of an overall Library IT Strategy.

- A policy is needed to enable the Library to deal with the serious issue of students locking computers and then leaving their desks for long periods, preventing others from using these.
- The cycle for replacement of laptops needs to be reviewed within the context of a Library IT Strategy.
- Leaders on social media should be identified among Library staff and appropriate support put in place to capitalise on advances in this area.
- The reporting line of the Facilities Team would benefit from reconsideration.
- An integrated approach to front desk support should be taken, with all staff here working to the same service standards, so as to provide excellent service to students with regard to queries on Library, IT services and general University support.

Strategic Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
S.1	That the University gives serious consideration to the level of resourcing in some areas of Library activity, paying particular attention to its own strategic priorities and the absence of new skills needed for the Library's further development. (R1)	
S.2	A review of the current arrangements for event management is needed, with a view to reducing the role of the Library. (R6)	
S.3	A review of the model used by the University to determine the allocation of funding to the Library is overdue. In particular, the salaries, and collections budgets need protection from any further erosion for the University to be able to compete with its peers in library terms. (R7)	
S.4	<p>Future capital should be directed at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) redevelopment of original parts of the John Paul II Library b) refurbishment of Russell Library c) improvements to the Kildare store so that it can be fit for purpose for increased stock relegation 	

	d) continuous up keep of the new part of the John Paul II Library. (R9)	
--	--	--

Whole of Unit Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
U.1	We recommend that the opportunity of a new Strategic Plan is used to identify where this focus should be and in which order of priority needs should be addressed. A two year, interim, strategic plan will help to identify the changes necessary following the University's Curriculum Implementation Project, from this Quality Review, and also realign the Library's planning cycle with that of the University's next Plan. (R2)	
U.2	A thorough review of the Library's approach to materials acquisition is needed. (R3)	Although this is listed as a 'Whole of Unit' recommendation, it is vital that University backing is given to this, and at the most senior levels. Engagement of academic staff in this matter will be key.
U.3	A fundamental review of the role of subject librarian is urgent to enable the Library to align itself with the priorities identified in the University's curriculum review, in addition to the continual demand for service innovation.(R4)	
U.4	The Library should take a structured, professional approach to planning its workforce, identifying the issues it faces in modernizing for future need. This will include, as a minimum, close examination of the current staff profile, known skills gaps, anticipation of roles needed in the next five years or so, with an accompanying action plan for how to address the current issues. (R8)	
U.5	A significant difference can be made to improving the experience of Library users through the series of 'Quick wins' listed in	

	Recommendation 10.	
--	--------------------	--

Sub-Unit Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
1.	Attention should be given to understanding negative feedback/usability in relation to Summon as a search tool.(R5)	

Jan Wilkin

Ms Jan Wilkinson
University of Manchester
External Reviewer

Jon Purcell

Mr Jon Purcell
Durham University
External Reviewer

Mark Boyle

Professor Mark Boyle
Maynooth University
Internal Reviewer

Fiona Lyddy

Dr Fiona Lyddy
Maynooth University
Internal Reviewer

APPENDIX A

LIBRARY QUALITY REVIEW

April 2015

TIMETABLE

Tuesday 28th April

TIME	DETAIL	PURPOSE OF MEETING	VENUE	PRESENT
08.30-9.00	Depart from Carton House Hotel		Foyer, Carton House Hotel	Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson
9.00-9.15	Meet President		President's Boardroom	Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Philip Nolan
9.15-9.45	Welcome, Introduction & Tea/Coffee	Discuss quality review process, timetable, logistical issues & paperwork	President's Boardroom	Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Siobhan Harkin Jim Walsh
9.45-10.15	PRG Meeting		President's Boardroom	Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy
10.15-11.00	Tour of JPIL & Coffee	Provide relevant information on the Library & University	Tour	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Cathal McCauley Helen Fallon
11.00-11.30	Library Senior Management Team Meeting		Deputy Librarian's Office	Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Cathal McCauley/Librarian Helen Fallon/Deputy Librarian Lorna Dodd/Senior Librarian LRIS Hugh Murphy/Senior Librarian CMS

11.30 – 12.30	Meeting all Learning Research and Information Services Team		Library Meeting Room	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Lorna Dodd
12.30 – 1.30	Lunch (with table service) Ronan Reilly (Dean of International & Graduate Studies), Alison Farrell (Teaching Development Officer), Deirdre Watters (Director of Communications), Karen Kelly (Alumni Officer), Rosaleen McCarthy (Director of HR), Michael Rafter (Director of Campus & Commercial Services , Brian Carolan (Director of Computer Centre) Anne O'Brien (Kairos)	Lunch and discussion	Pugin Hall/Reserved Table (12)	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Ronan Reilly Alison Farrell Deirdre Watters Karen Kelly Rosaleen McCarthy Michael Rafter Brian Carolan Anne O'Brien
1.30-2.00	Tour of Russell Library		Russell Library	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Cathal McCauley Barbara McCormack
2.00-3.00	Meet Collection Management Services Team		Library meeting room	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Hugh Murphy
3.00-3.45	Meeting with Academic Staff Marian Lyons (History) David Stifter (Early Irish) Josephine Finn (Adult & Community Education) Rowena Pecchenino (Dean, Social Sciences) Peter Cassells (Edward M Kennedy Institute) John Lowry (Chemistry) Ciaran Mac AnBhaird (Maths & Statistics) Rosemary Monahan (Computer Science)		Library meeting room (Helen Fallon will collect at reception)	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Academic Staff x8
3.45-4.00	Tea/Coffee		Librarian's Office	Mr Jon Purcell

				Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy
4.00-4.30	External Stakeholders 4pm Mary Heffernan, (Office of Public Works): 087 8203063 (the library works closely with the OPW on a number of areas including the Archive and Research Centre at Castletown House 4.15pm Philip Cohen (President of the library association of Ireland): 402 7803		Librarian's office	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy
4.30-4.45	Meeting with Library Administration	Discuss library administrative issues	Librarian's Office	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Ms Jacqui Morrissey
4.45-5.45	UG Students		Library Meeting Room	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Jan Wilkinson
5.45	Return to Carton House Hotel			Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson
7.30 pm	Dinner		Carton House	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Fiona Lyddy Mark Boyle

Wednesday 29th April

TIME	DETAIL	PURPOSE OF MEETING	VENUE	PRESENT
08.30-9.00	Depart from Carton House Hotel		Foyer, Carton House	Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson
09.00 – 9.30	PRG Meeting		Librarian's office	Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy
9.30-10.30	Postdocs Postgrads/Research and Taught		Library meeting room	Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy
10.30 – 11.00	Ray O'Neill, Vice President for Innovation		Librarian's Office	Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Ray O'Neill
11.00 – 11.30	Reverend Hugh Connolly, President, St Patricks College Maynooth		Librarian's Office	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Hugh Connolly
11.30 – 12.15	Jim Walsh, VP Strategy & Quality		Librarian's Office	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Jim Walsh
12.15 – 13.05	External partners 12.15: Jakki Burns (Transition Year Co-ordinator Maynooth Post Primary School) 086 0520347		Librarian's Office	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy

	<p>12.30 Kate Kelly (RCSI/3U Partnership) Ph: 402 2412</p> <p>12.45 Professor Christopher Ridgway Curator in Castlehoward (home of the Morpeth roll) Ph: 44 07891 265105</p>			
13.15 – 14.00	Lunch (with table service) with Librarian and Deputy Librarian		Pugin Hall	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Cathal McCauley Helen Fallon
14.10 – 15.25	Preparation for exit presentation		Librarian's Office	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy
15.30 – 16.00	Exit presentation		Library Meeting Room	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Library staff
16.00 – 17.00	Reception		Library Lunch Room	Mr Jon Purcell Jan Wilkinson Mark Boyle Fiona Lyddy Library staff