



## Reengagement Panel Report

### Assessment of Capacity and Approval of QA Procedures

#### Part 1 Details of provider

##### 1.1 Applicant Provider

Registered Business/Trading Name:	IBAT College Dublin
Address:	16-19 Wellington Quay, Dublin 2
Date of Application:	01 August 2017
Date of resubmission of application:	16 March 2018
Date of panel meetings:	12 October 2017 and 06 April 2018
Date of recommendation to the Programmes and Awards Executive Committee:	20 June 2018

##### 1.2 Profile of provider

IBAT College Dublin was established in North Dublin in 2004. It was formerly known as the Institute of Business and Technology and IBAT College Swords. It is registered as a Limited Company in the Republic of Ireland named I.B.A.T. Limited. The College offers programmes in business, information technology, marketing, management, sport and tourism; it also provides English language training. Most of the College's provision takes place at its campus on Wellington Quay, Dublin 2. It also offers some of its English language provision from premises in Dawson Street. IBAT is privately funded and is not in receipt of any public funds. In October 2016 IBAT became a wholly owned subsidiary of Global University Systems (GUS), which acquired a controlling stake in I.B.A.T. Limited.

Following a Section 46 review of IBAT by QQI, the report of which was published in January 2017, the College has not been in a position to recruit new students to its current QQI programmes. These programmes are due to expire in January 2019 when current students have completed the relevant programmes. IBAT is currently engaged on a franchise basis with University of Wales Trinity Saint David for the awarding of MBA and BA programmes. The English School at IBAT College is recognised by the Accreditation and Coordination of English Language Services (ACELS). IBAT is also



a Recognised Education Provider (REP) for the Project Management Institute. The College describes itself as being a 'study-centre' for Arden University, the Code Institute, and the Digital Marketing Institute; in these cases, all programme/ learner-related academic decisions are the responsibility of the respective entity rather than IBAT. The College has introduced three new (blended) Master's programmes with Arden University and three part-time undergraduate programmes with University of Wales Trinity Saint David (Original Self-Assessment Report, p. 13).

A re-engagement Panel, appointed by QQI, met with IBAT on 12 October 2017. The Panel found that that IBAT was not in a position to re-engage with QQI at that point. The Panel was of the view that IBAT should be allowed to re-submit its quality assurance procedures within six months for a second evaluation. IBAT subsequently resubmitted re-engagement documentation on 16 March 2018.

## Part 2 Panel Membership

Name	Role of Panel member	Organisation
Dr Annie Doona	Chair	President, Dun Laoghaire Institute of Art, Design and Technology (IADT)
Professor Veronica Campbell	Subject-Matter Expert	Bursar and Director of Strategic Innovation, Trinity College Dublin
Ms Sinéad O'Sullivan	Subject-Matter Expert	Director of Quality Assurance & Statistical Services, National College of Ireland (NCI)
Ms Emma Dwyer	Student Representative	Programme and Training Manager, Irish Council for International Students (ICOS)
Professor Chris Maguire	Subject-Matter Expert	Dean of Academic Affairs and Proctor, BPP University
<b>Other Attendees</b>		
Dr Trish O'Brien	Independent Secretary	O'BRIEN / Governance Design
Mr Walter Balfe	Observer	QQI
Ms Marie Cotter	Observer (first panel meeting)	QQI

Professors Veronica Campbell and Chris Maguire attended the first meeting on 12 October 2017 but were unable to attend the second Panel meeting on the 06 April 2018. However, both Panel members provided written feedback to the Chair on the documentation submitted by IBAT, and the points they raised were represented during the Panel visit.



## Part 3 Findings of the Panel

### 3.1 Summary Findings

The focus of the Panel meeting was primarily on how IBAT had responded to the *mandatory changes* identified by the Panel following its re-engagement meeting with IBAT on 12 October 2017. The Panel was also interested to hear the progress made by IBAT in implementing the Panel's *advised changes* to its QA procedures. The Panel was impressed with the systematic way IBAT has addressed both mandatory and advised changes in its resubmitted documentation, and it valued the examples offered by the College of how it has implemented its QA procedures over the last six months.

Following the Panel's review of IBAT's QA Handbook (2018) and its meeting with the senior management of the College, the Panel is now satisfied that it can recommend to QQI that it re-engage with IBAT. The Panel has, however, identified several *advised changes* to the quality assurance procedures of IBAT; these are detailed below. The Panel strongly recommends that the College addresses these *advised changes* and submits amended quality assurance documentation to QQI that reflects these changes, where appropriate, in advance of the meeting of the Programmes and Awards Executive Committee (PAEC).

### 3.2 Advised changes to QA procedures

The Panel advises the following changes to the QA procedures of IBAT:

- 3.2.1 That more precise language is used in the written descriptions of the roles of the Academic Director and the Registrar, in order to clarify responsibilities around setting and implementing quality standards (QAH, pp.18-19, and p. 64);
- 3.2.2 The Audit Sub-Committee has an evolving remit. This remit should be monitored and further clarified over time in its terms of reference and in its operating practices;
- 3.2.3 It is advised that the benefits of student and staff representation on the Board of Governors of IBAT is considered;
- 3.2.4 The process for determining not to run an advertised programme due to lack of demand or for other reasons, and the timing of the communication of this decision to students, should



be documented and published;

- 3.2.5 The process that IBAT is currently operating to sign-off on minor changes to programmes should be documented to avoid any unintended impact of amendments to related programmes;
- 3.2.6 It is advised that what is currently referred to as Self-Evaluation (QAH, p.69) is given a title that better reflects its role in compiling and synthesising the outcomes of quality processes that have taken place throughout the academic year, rather than being a *de novo* self-evaluation;
- 3.2.7 It is advised that IBAT requires that internal audits are carried out by someone, internally or externally, who is independent of the function being audited;
- 3.2.8 It is advised that the arrangements the College has in place for student health services are included in its learner support documentation (QAH, Chapter 7); and,
- 3.2.9 The manner that it is intended the Appeals Board (QAH, p.150) is appointed should be corrected in the corresponding procedure.

### **3.4 Recommendation of the Panel to the Programmes and Awards Executive Committee of QQI**

The Panel is recommending to QQI's PAEC that it approves the draft quality assurance procedures of IBAT and formally re-engages with the College. Subject to the agreement of the PAEC to this recommendation, IBAT will be eligible to seek validation of programmes by QQI within the scope requested by the College.

### **3.5 Format of this Report**

The following report preserves the findings of the Panel's original re-engagement meeting with IBAT on 12 October 2017. It then documents the findings of the Panel following the resubmission of QA procedures by IBAT and the site visit of the Panel to IBAT's premises in Wellington Quay on 06 April 2018.



## Part 4 Evaluation of provider capacity

### 4.1 Legal and compliance requirements:

- 4.1.1(a) **Criterion:** *Is the applicant an established Legal Entity who has Education and/or Training as a Principal Function?*
- 4.1.2(a) **Criterion:** *Is the legal entity established in the European Union and does it have a substantial presence in Ireland?*
- 4.1.3(a) **Criterion:** *Are any dependencies, collaborations, obligations, parent organisations, and subsidiaries clearly specified?*
- 4.1.4(a) **Criterion:** *Are any third-party relationships and partnerships compatible with the scope of access sought?*
- 4.1.5(a) **Criterion:** *Are the applicable regulations and legislation complied with in all jurisdictions where it operates?*
- 4.1.6(a) **Criterion:** *Is the applicant in good standing in the qualifications systems and education and training systems in any countries where it operates (or where its parents or subsidiaries operate) or enrolls learners, or where it has arrangements with awarding bodies, quality assurance agencies, qualifications authorities, ministries of education and training, professional bodies and regulators.*

### Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017

IBAT is a private College with education and training as its principal function. It is registered as a Limited Company in the Republic of Ireland. Its activities are based in Ireland only. The parent company of IBAT is Global University Systems (GUS) and this relationship, including shareholding details, is clearly set out in its application for re-engagement. Other relationships of IBAT, including with the University of Wales Trinity Saint David, are also detailed in its application. IBAT confirms that it is compliant with applicable health and safety, fire, and disability regulations (Application Form for Re-engagement, p. 20).

IBAT was the subject of a Section 46 review by QQI which culminated in the withdrawal of validation by the awarding body, to take effect in January 2019 to facilitate the teaching out of currently enrolled learners. IBAT confirmed that it is in good standing with the University of Wales Trinity Saint David. This relationship, as part of a wider review of University of Wales Trinity Saint David, was the subject of an external review by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in 2015. IBAT was one of several providers in Ireland linked with UK awarding bodies that were subject to a collaborative review by the QAA in 2017. The College reports that the feedback from QAA was positive. The Panel has been informed that GUS is in good-standing within all jurisdictions that its



companies operate (Original SAR, p.8). As IBAT is acting as a study-centre for Arden University, it will also be subject to oversight by QAA through this relationship.

## Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018

The findings above stand.

### 4.2 Resource, governance and structural requirements:

- 4.2.1(a) **Criterion:** *Does the applicant have a sufficient resource base and is it stable and in good financial standing?*
- 4.2.2(a) **Criterion:** *Does the applicant have a reasonable business case for sustainable provision?*
- 4.2.3(a) **Criterion:** *Are fit-for-purpose governance, management and decision-making structures in place?*
- 4.2.4(a) **Criterion:** *Are there arrangements in place for providing required information to QQI?*

## Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017

IBAT acquired its premises in Wellington Quay in 2011 and invested quite substantially in customising the College to the required standard (SAR, p.2). Its English language training provision is provided from a second location on Dawson Street. The College claims to have accumulated a substantial asset base, to be free of debt, to be tax compliant, and to be without reliance on third parties for financing.

IBAT was acquired by Global University Systems (GUS) in October 2016. GUS is a global network of higher education institutions and holds a controlling shareholding in IBAT. The IBAT and GUS relationship is at an early stage of development, but it appears to be providing a stable foundation for the College in terms of financial standing. During the Panel meetings with the College, the GUS representative assured the Panel that GUS would provide any required protections for learners in the event that IBAT was to cease operating for any reason; in addition to the formal Protection for Enrolled Learners arrangements in place.

During meetings with the Panel, the College was able to provide the Panel with an understanding of how it is currently recruiting international students and its intention for increasing Irish participation in its programmes. It did not provide evidence of academic planning which is proactively targeted at learner profiles, and so it is difficult to comment upon its future business



case for sustainable provision. However, the College's track-record of being in business since 2004 must speak to its abilities in this regard. Considering the employment-focussed nature of the programmes of IBAT, the re-introduction of a Business Advisory Group as part of its governance structure may assist it in further developing these academic plans.

Whilst acknowledging the focus that IBAT has placed on its governance, management and decision-making structures, the Panel had significant difficulties with these arrangements, as elaborated upon in sections 1, 2, and 5 of Part 5 below. In brief, the Panel found the governance structure somewhat ill-defined and not consistently understood by staff; it found that there was overlap, inconsistency and confusion around some key staff positions; it also found that several quality assurance procedures regarding governance and academic management were internally inconsistent.

IBAT's IT systems, notwithstanding some concerns regarding risk management that are discussed in section 8 under Part 5 below, appear to be capable of providing QQI with required information. IBAT notes in its SAR (p.16) that the Registrar has been assigned responsibility for providing required information to QQI.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

The Panel saw significant improvements in the description and consistency of governance and staff roles in the resubmitted documentation that it reviewed. Notwithstanding the importance of collaboration between the Academic Director and the Registrar, the Panel has advised some changes in their role descriptions to further demarcate their respective responsibilities. The Panel also considers that the role and remit of the Audit Sub-Committee that is forming part of the governance structure of IBAT should be kept under review.

#### **4.3 Programme development and provision requirements:**

- 4.3.1(a) **Criterion:** *Does the applicant have experience and a track record in providing education and training programmes?*
- 4.3.2(a) **Criterion:** *Does the applicant have a fit-for-purpose and stable complement of education and training staff?*
- 4.3.3(a) **Criterion:** *Does the applicant have the capacity to comply with the standard conditions for validation specified in Section 45(3) of the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act (2012) (the Act)?*





- 4.3.4(a) **Criterion:** *Does the applicant have the fit-for-purpose premises, facilities and resources to meet the requirements of the provision proposed in place?*
- 4.3.5(a) **Criterion:** *Are there access, transfer and progression arrangements that meet QQI's criteria for approval in place?*
- 4.3.6(a) **Criterion:** *Are structures and resources to underpin fair and consistent assessment of learners in place?*
- 4.3.7(a) **Criterion:** *Are arrangements for the protection of enrolled learners to meet the statutory obligations in place (where applicable)?*

### **Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

It is evident that IBAT has experience of designing, developing and delivering programmes as its programmes led to the awards of the Higher Education and Training Awards Council (HETAC) from 2006, and subsequently to QQI awards. It is also currently providing higher education programmes leading to the awards of University of Wales Trinity Saint David.

The College has recently made some key academic management appointments which, when fully operationalised, should significantly increase the stability of its staffing base. IBAT's lecturing staff are primarily employed on a contract basis. However, there is evidence that several lecturers have worked with the College over an extended period of time and are capable of bringing their concurrent professional experience to their lecturing practice.

The standard conditions for validation specified in the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act (2012) include, co-operation with and assistance to QQI in the performances of its functions; the establishment of procedures for the fair and consistent assessment of learners; and provisions for the protection of enrolled learners. From the documentation submitted and the meetings with the executive, the Panel considers that, on balance, the quality assurance system of IBAT can support the standard conditions for validation, notwithstanding some observations it makes under section 6, part 5 regarding the formulation of several of its assessment procedures.

The College is operating from two buildings, one on a long-term lease (Wellington Quay), and the other on a short-term lease. This is a strategic decision as the College wishes to be able to accommodate growth without having to operate from more than two locations. In its Self-Assessment Report (SAR), IBAT confirms that it has three computer labs available for learners, and open-access computers in its library and student social areas. It has libraries in both its Wellington Quay and Dawson Street buildings (SAR, p.12).





IBAT has included access, transfer and progression procedures in its QA Handbook. It also confirmed that admissions decisions are made at the local level by IBAT and without influence from its parent company. The College's framework for assuring fair and consistent assessment of learners has been in operation, and has evolved, since its relationship commenced with HETAC as an awarding body in 2006. Whilst there are areas for clarification and improvement, IBAT informed the Panel that External Examiner reports have been positive. The strengthened academic staffing of the College will also contribute to the management and quality assurance of IBAT's assessment processes.

IBAT confirmed that it has arrangements in place for the protection of enrolled learners including bonding arrangements for programmes leading to QQI awards, and an affidavit with University of Wales Trinity Saint David for learners pursuing programmes leading to those awards. It is also a member of Marketing English in Ireland (MEI) which activates protection arrangements for English language students if a provider ceases to operate. In addition, the representative of GUS with whom the Panel met, provided additional reassurances regarding the protection provided to learners through the parent company.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

IBAT has signed a 25-year lease at its premises in North Frederick Street. It has also now completed works on the basement of Wellington Quay and students were reported to be positive about this development. In addition, IBAT reported that its library services and its IT lab have been refitted. Emphasis was placed by the College on the positive impact of introducing a library staff of 4 (2 part-time and 2 full-time); the corresponding improvement in services this has resulted in for learners; and the ability it has provided to extend library opening hours from Monday to Saturday. The senior management appointments made by IBAT have now had more time to become embedded in the organisation and many of the benefits the College anticipated to arise from these new roles were apparent to the Panel. The College resubmitted significantly improved assessment procedures in its QA Handbook (2018).

#### **4.4 Overall findings in respect of provider capacity to provide sustainable education and training**

Following an examination of the revised re-engagement documentation provided by IBAT, including its QA Handbook, and having met with the College, the Panel is satisfied that IBAT has the capacity to provide sustainable education and training and satisfies the associated criteria.



## Part 5 Evaluation of draft QA Procedures submitted by IBAT College

*The following is the Panel's findings following evaluation of IBAT College's quality assurance procedures against QQI's Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines (April 2016). This section of the report follows the structure and referencing of the guidelines.*

### 1 GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF QUALITY

#### Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017

In its original application for re-engagement with QQI, IBAT explains that its rationale for appointing experienced national and international individuals to participate in its governance system was to “ensure that academic decision-making is independent of commercial considerations or the undue influence of business owners” (Application Form for Re-engagement, p.11). The intentions of IBAT regarding its governance structures are understandable and are partly in response to the outcomes of its Section 46 review by QQI. However, the Panel did experience some difficulty in understanding the rationale behind the governance structure chosen and, more importantly, in identifying decision-making authority.

At the top levels of its academic governance structure IBAT presented a hierarchy of a Board of Governors with responsibility for corporate and effective academic governance; an Academic Standards Board (ASB) to connect the Board of Governors with academic governance matters and to provide assurances regarding its efficacy; and an Academic Council with responsibility for protecting academic standards and making recommendations to the Board of Governors on academic matters. The dual reporting of the ASB and the Academic Council to the Board of Governors, led to a lack of clarity for the Panel regarding where responsibility for academic quality assurance resides, and if it is possible for the ASB to over-ride a decision of the Academic Council. The Panel was provided with assurances regarding the respective roles of these entities - and it appears that the ASB is essentially intended to provide an added layer of assurance to the Board of Governors regarding quality assurance, and advisory support to the Academic Council - but the Panel remained concerned that enough definition had not yet been built into the respective roles of these organs of governance. It also felt that there wasn't a consistent view of the roles of these entities throughout the organisation. As such, it has specified that the roles of these governance units must be fully clarified and demarcated as a mandatory change to the QA procedures of IBAT.

A further matter of governance arising in the QA Guidelines is the governance of risk, academic and otherwise. The College's QAH includes limited references to risk. The Panel was informed that matters relating to financial risk and risk appetite form part of the governance of GUS. The Panel



has included as a mandatory change to QA procedures that the College develops a procedure for the identification, control and monitoring of risk by the College itself, including reputation, academic and financial risk. Associated responsibilities for oversight of risk should be clearly included in the relevant terms of reference.

Notwithstanding the further iteration of clarity required by the Panel, it noted that the inclusion of four students nominated by the student body to the Academic Council is a positive development that represents the College's stated intention to be student-centred. It is also noted that the College intends including students in its Programme Boards. The Panel commended the intention of the College to train students so that they can fully participate with lecturers and other staff in these quality assurance forums.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

The Panel considered that IBAT has given significant attention to addressing its governance structure. The role of the Academic Council has been confirmed as the most important organ of academic governance. The terms of reference of the sub-units of governance are inter-connected and consistent.

The Academic Standards Board, the unit of governance that caused the most difficulty for the Panel in the original re-engagement meeting, has now become an Audit Sub-Committee and it has been clarified that it has no decision-making authority. The Panel welcomed the unequivocal clarification that the Audit Sub-Committee has no decision-making authority on academic matters and cannot override a decision made by the Academic Council. However, the Panel continued to have some difficulties in fully understanding the remit of this governance unit and how it would operate; this was compounded by some inconsistency in its description by the senior management team. The Panel understands that this governance unit has been established largely to advise GUS, through the Board of Governors, of any potential risks that the College might need to mitigate. The Panel was also informed that the Audit Sub-Committee will develop an audit schedule and will receive audit reports on certain matters. It was suggested that the staff responsible for areas of work would confirm for the Audit Sub-Committee that they were being carried out as intended. The Panel has advised that it would be more in keeping with an audit to have someone independent of the function, internal or external, carry out the audit for the Audit Sub-Committee. Overall, the remit of this governance unit appears to be evolving as it is being reconceptualised, and the Panel advises that it should be kept under review by the College.



The Panel was informed that an additional member of the Board of Governors will soon be appointed. The Panel noted that there was no reference in documentation to the inclusion of student or staff membership in the Board of Governors and has advised the College to consider the benefits of such inclusion. In terms of risk, the College is now operating what appears to be a robust method of capturing, categorising, prioritising, and monitoring risk; an area that is being led by the Registrar. The Panel was provided with detailed procedures to support these processes and with examples of risks identified as a result of the collaborative deliberations of the College in this regard.

## **2 DOCUMENTED APPROACH TO QUALITY ASSURANCE**

### **Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

IBAT describes the purpose of its quality assurance system as being to provide assurance to stakeholders that they can “have trust and confidence in the education and training provided by us and the resulting qualifications obtained by students” (Application Form for Re-engagement, p.15). The College also confirmed that it has referenced QQI’s QA Guidelines, and the ESG when developing its QA documentation and that the review and reformulation of the procedures was a collaborative effort of the College.

The Panel understood that the QAH developed represented a significantly revised version of IBAT’s previous quality assurance procedures. Because of this, and the fact that the College is not currently developing programmes or admitting learners to programmes leading to QQI awards, several of the procedures outlined were yet to be fully implemented. The Panel stated at the outset, and reiterated at the end of its visit, that it could only judge the College on the procedures that were available at the time of IBAT’s submission. It was noted during the review meetings with the executive that some procedures were yet to be approved by the Academic Council and so were not a confirmed part of the QA Handbook for the College. The mandatory and advised changes that the Panel has identified regarding the documented approach to QA by IBAT, are aimed at ensuring that the College is in an optimal position to roll-out those procedures across the organisation.

As noted above, the Panel has made the review and amendment by the College of the terms of reference and procedures relating to its governance structure and its academic management role descriptions and role references throughout its procedures a mandatory change to its quality assurance procedures. The Panel noted several inconsistencies in documentation that are



obscuring, albeit unintentionally, where responsibility, decision-making authority, and accountability reside. In addition, from a documentation approval perspective, the governance requirements for all documentation (policies, procedures, guidelines, codes of practice, SOPs etc.) should be clearly documented. Equally, the role of the relevant governance unit with respect to each of these types of documents should be recorded in its terms of reference and in the relevant procedures e.g., is the governance unit expected to approve, review, recommend, endorse, advise, note, etc.

The Panel also noted that several of the procedures included in the QA Handbook are more descriptive than instructive which may cause difficulties and issues at the point of implementation. The Panel advises that IBAT either includes more information regarding how procedures are implemented in its procedures, or that it satisfies itself that it has sufficient supporting Standard Operating Procedures to ensure the systematic, consistent, and coherent implementation of its quality assurance system. Who does what, and when, should be clear to all staff when the QA Handbook is finalised. To further aid understanding and communication of procedures, the Panel also advises including additional diagrams and flow-charts in the next iteration of the QA Handbook.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

In response to the changes to documentation requested and advised by the Panel in October 2017, IBAT has produced a significantly stronger QA Handbook. The document has been restructured to reflect the life-cycle of a student within the College; a map between the document and the QA Guidelines was provided to assist in orientating the Panel to this new layout. All policies and procedures have been approved by the Academic Council and by the Board of Governors, as appropriate. Standard Operating Procedures were also provided to the Panel to illustrate how certain procedures are implemented.

The Panel particularly noted the improved documentation relating to the development and delivery of programmes of education and training and to assessment. As related above, the QA Handbook has also addressed much of the inconsistency and lack of clarity between governance units and individual roles. The Panel continues to note some lack of definition in the responsibilities of the Academic Director and the Registrar (pp.16-17, p.45) in setting and implementing academic standards, and has advised that these be addressed.

Overall the Panel found the revised QA Handbook submitted by IBAT to be more instructive and helpful to those responsible for its implementation. It also noted the increased use of diagrams and



flow-charts to communicate procedures and the proactive approach of the College in testing the efficacy of these diagrams with students.

### 3 PROGRAMMES OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

#### Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017

Overall, the Programme Development and Approval procedures included in the QA Handbook are considered by the Panel to be light on detail regarding process and responsibilities. For instance, it isn't evident if there is a template for programme proposals or how financial and resource decisions are made. The Panel also had concerns regarding the description of programme review and amendment procedures and the extent to which these are aligned with current QQI policy. This view was supported by the Panel meetings with the executive where there was a lack of consistent understanding of the process for reviewing programmes. The Panel has specified that the College reviewing and amending these sections of its QAH (pp. 30-34 and 42-48), in their own right, and in the context of the *Policies and Criteria for the Validation of Programmes of Education and Training* (2016), constitutes a mandatory change to its quality assurance procedures. The Panel advises that process flow diagrams are utilised to support a revised version of these sections of the QA Handbook.

The Programmes of Education and Training section of the QA Handbook also addresses admission and progression. A key focus expressed by IBAT is to improve learner progression, including through improvements to admissions procedures (Application Form for Re-engagement, p.17). The reactivation of an Admissions and RPL Committee as part of its governance structure is identified by IBAT as another quality measure that will assist in providing oversight of the consistency of its implementation of admissions procedures (SAR, p. 21). The admissions procedures would benefit from further detail regarding the admission arrangements for mature and part-time learners. Policy and procedures for the recognition of prior learning were also included in the QA Handbook (appendix 2) and it was confirmed that the College considers all types of previous learning for advanced entry and for exemption. From an operational perspective, it is the Registrar's responsibility to ensure consistency of decision-making.

IBAT described to the Panel how it has streamlined its engagement with international agents and is now working with four agents who are known and trusted by the organisation, work with other higher education institutions in Ireland, and have been seen to recruit learners with good progression rates. The College didn't convey any sense that it wishes to increase these agent



numbers for the foreseeable future, particularly as it is placing a greater emphasis on the recruitment of Irish students. The current College profile is reported as being 40% Irish and 60% international. The Panel was informed that assessment data from July 2017 is showing positive increases in progression (Self-Evaluation, p.21). The Panel has advised the College to develop a strategic academic plan for programme development to help it to target its attention on learners that are particularly suited to its programmes and may be more likely to successfully participate. The planned review of the Teaching and Learning Strategy by the Academic Director can also support this development.

Finally, whilst benchmarking is a developing area across Irish higher education, it would be beneficial for the College to consider in more detail what types of organisations and what types of provision it wishes to compare itself with. Beyond providing very useful measures for comparison and tracking of performance, benchmarking can also contribute to solidifying mission and collective focus on objectives.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

As part of its redevelopment of its QA Handbook, the Panel considered that IBAT significantly improved its policies and procedures relating to programme development, approval and validation (QAH, Chapter 3). These procedures have been aligned with the *Policies and Criteria for the Validation of Programmes of Education and Training* (2016), where relevant. A programme proposal process and template were provided (QAH, p. 48, F3.1). A process from preliminary authorisation to proceed with programme development, to authorisation to offer a programme, have been set out in text and diagrammatically (QAH, section 3.4).

In terms of changes that can be made to a validated programme (QAH, section 3.5), it is advised by the Panel that the implemented process for authorising minor amendments to programmes should be referenced. This is particularly important in the context of ensuring that changes to one programme, however minor, do not unintentionally impact on a related programme. The Teaching and Learning Strategy for the College has been reviewed and is structured around nine strands. Cross-College oversight of teaching and learning matters will be exercised by the Teaching and Learning Committee, which was reformed and agreed its terms of reference at its first meeting in February 2018 (Resubmission SAR, p.11).

Procedures relating to admissions are now situated in Chapter 5 of the QA Handbook. Admissions procedures are detailed for CAO applicants, direct applicants, mature applicants, applicants with disabilities, and advanced standing applicants (QAH, section 5.6). The Panel has advised that the





process for determining not to run an advertised programme due to lack of demand or for other reasons, and the timing of the communication of this decision to students, should be documented and published as part of the College's Procedures for the Recruitment of Learners (QAH, 5.3).

The College is actively seeking to find appropriate measures through which it can benchmark itself against other private and public higher education providers; and to other providers under the umbrella of GUS. At a national level it has identified potential for data comparison through the Irish Survey of Student Engagement (ISSE), and the first destination studies published by the Higher Education Authority (HEA). The Panel welcomed this development and acknowledged the complexity of carrying out meaningful and appropriate benchmarking.

#### **4 STAFF RECRUITMENT, MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT**

##### **Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

Establishing a strong base of core staff has been a priority for IBAT and some senior appointments have been made in recent months. These developments are to be welcomed and should support and provide stability for the College and its learners. A key additional role is for a Head of School, which the College feels will provide it with further leverage to plan academically.

However, a key difficulty for the Panel, arising both from the QA Handbook and the meetings with the IBAT executive, are the instances of confusion around specific roles and responsibilities. This is exacerbated by the fact that some appointments are recently made, others have been made but not commenced, and others are yet to be made.

There are two levels at which clarity is required. The first, at the most senior level, are the roles, responsibilities, and reporting lines between the College Director, Academic Director, and Registrar. As the College is aware, these are crucial positions and, in terms of safeguarding quality assurance, specificity and consistency in their associated roles and responsibilities is critical. IBAT confirms in its application form that *the Director takes responsibility for the overall delivery of a quality service to stakeholders, including students, staff, employers and the wider community. In an operational context this role is delegated to the Registrar* (Application Form for Re-engagement, p. 16). In its Self-Evaluation, it describes the College Director as taking responsibility, *inter alia*, for leading, managing and directing academic activities, whilst the Academic Director is responsible for academic leadership and direction (SAR, p.15). The description of the role of the College Director in the QA Handbook includes formulating strategy, but also developing and implementing policies and



programmes, and developing and keeping under review the academic and quality assurance structures and processes of the College (QAH, p. 10). The Academic Director role is less defined, but it is specified as being the chief academic officer for the College with key responsibility for the academic leadership and management of the school. It appears that these respective roles require further consideration, and that the College should be mindful of taking the opportunity to ensure through its management, as well as its governance structures, that commercial and academic interests are demarcated. New roles haven't had an opportunity to co-exist and find their parameters yet, and this is understandable. However, due to the importance of these positions, definition is required at the outset; regardless of whether roles evolve and are formally changed over time.

At the next level, the Head of School, Programme Manager and QA Officer roles are problematical. The scope of the Programme Manager's role in the documentation drifts between administrative and academic, to the point whereby this individual seems to be inappropriately intervening in academic matters. The Panel's sense from meeting with the executive is that this is a mischaracterisation of the purpose and execution of this role and that it is in reality a student support role, with associated administrative responsibilities. The way in which the Programme Manager's role is described also raises questions as to how the Head of School role (currently being filled in an acting capacity) is intended to operate in the College. Some conflation in this regard appears to have taken place and needs to be addressed. The Head of School role is largely absent from the QA Handbook and where it does appear, for instance as a member of the Programme Board, it is in error. Finally, and as part of this working through of individual roles, how the QA Officer is expected to fulfil his/her responsibilities needs to be clarified.

In terms of the staff recruitment process, the College has identified a series of criteria that it applies to the recruitment of academic staff (SAR, p.19 and QAH, p.51). The qualification requirement is at Level 8 but the Panel was informed that the lecturer is normally required to have a qualification above the level at which he or she is teaching. The majority of its academic staff are on part-time contracts, but there is quite a high degree of continuity amongst this cohort. It was noted that a full-time contract is not necessarily the ambition of these individuals, with several pursuing concurrent careers; the experience from which can benefit learners. The Panel observed that for some non-academic posts there may be a tendency for the College to create roles around the qualifications and abilities of the post-holder. Whilst this is often a natural evolution of a role by an individual, it is important to maintain some separation between role description and the attributes of individual post-holders, with a view to succession planning.

IBAT's QAH states that its policy is to "encourage and facilitate the development of the knowledge, skills, and general competence of its staff, particularly its academic staff" (QAH, p.54). Examples of



CPD workshops were identified for the Panel, including in assessment. The College's staff recruitment procedure notes that new full-time academic staff without a qualification in the NFQ in teaching, learning and assessment are required to undertake one within 2 years of commencement of their contract (QAH, p. 54); some reasonable flexibility on the period in which this qualification is gained is allowed. The same requirement for part-time staff is not in place, but part-time staff are encouraged and supported in pursuing this route. Administrative staff also reported being supported financially in pursuing postgraduate qualifications.

Staff appraisal is described by staff as more process-driven for administrative posts. The associated procedure description identifies the College Director, in consultation with the SMT, setting individual goals and objectives (QAH, p. 55). It would seem more appropriate that the College Director would set overall goals for the organisation and that line management would then set individual objectives in that context.

Lecturers considered that they were aware of the requirements of their role and understood the level of performance required. It was explained that appraisal in this context largely relies on indicators such as student feedback and assessment outcomes. Use of these types of mid and end-point indicators for academic appraisal is relevant, but the College is also encouraged to consider how it can proactively engage with lecturers through the appraisal system at the outset of a given academic cycle.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

As noted previously, it was evident to the Panel that the Senior Management Team of IBAT has now had the opportunity to work together as a team and the respective roles of the College Director, Academic Director and Registrar, have moved from abstract to operational differentiation. Some further definition of role between the Academic Director and the Registrar has been advised by the Panel, as identified in section 3.2. above.

Other staff changes have also been made. A Head of School is in the process of being appointed and the Library staff numbers have increased to 2 full-time and 2 part-time staff. An Assistant Registrar title has been given to what was previously the Quality Assurance Officer. The Programme Manager has been renamed as the Programme Administration Manager to avoid any misconception that this individual, who plays an important role in liaising with students, can influence academic matters.



Staff appraisal is undertaken by the line manager and other sources of information, such as student feedback, are monitored throughout the year (QAH, p.217). College staff delivering on programmes awarded by University of Wales Trinity St David (UWTSD) can avail of staff development opportunities through the University (QAH, p.221). The College also provided the Panel with a schedule of CPD events for all staff (Resubmission SAR, p.12). The College articulated that it takes a holistic approach to identifying CPD requirements, in the sense that it considers all the activities of staff, regardless of the related awarding body.

## 5 TEACHING AND LEARNING

### **Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

The current Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy of IBAT was developed in 2012 and there are plans for the Academic Director to review and refresh this document. As noted previously, this may provide an opportunity to also consider matters of academic planning and tailored programme development to meet the needs of an identified learner profile and market. In broader terms, the College is clear that it intends using its teaching, learning and assessment strategy to assist learners in meeting the needs of enterprise (SAR, p.45).

The Panel noted that the sub-committees of the Academic Council do not currently include an identifiable governance unit dedicated to teaching and learning. It appears that there is an intention to establish one under the Academic Planning, Coordination and Review Committee (APCRC). The Panel supports this decision and considers that it will provide an important means of highlighting teaching and learning and identifying themes and trends that may indicate, for instance, learner and staff support requirements.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

The Teaching and Learning Strategy for the College has been reviewed and is structured around nine strands. This development is considered by IBAT to provide an effective framework for teaching and learning developments. The College has also reintroduced its Teaching and Learning Committee. Amongst other responsibilities, this Committee will provide oversight of library and information literacy matters (Resubmission SAR, p. 9).

**6 ASSESSMENT OF LEARNERS****Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

The Panel's review of the Assessment of Learners section of the QA Handbook (pp. 64-88), led to the identification of some inconsistencies, clarifications and omissions. The Panel has identified addressing the matters captured below, as being a mandatory change to the college's quality assurance procedures:

- The role of the moderator and the second-marker was discussed during the Panel meeting and it is required that these roles be better differentiated in the associated QA procedures (QAH, p.78). As part of the specification of roles, the description of the Programme Manager in this context is also likely to require revisiting. The reference to the Programme Manager facilitating resolution of issues arising between the Internal Examiner and moderator requires amendment (QAH, p.78). Equally so, the reference to the final decision regarding the design of assessment components resting with the Programme Manager (QAH, p.67);
- The procedure for assessment re-sits (QAH, p.84) refers to the Examinations Board agreeing the nature of reassessment. It was clarified during the Panel visit that in fact each module would have its own assessment strategy established at the point of programme development, which would address resubmission. The re-sits procedure needs to be revised to reflect this;
- Peer review and blind marking are currently in practice but not represented by the QA procedures;
- There is also no obvious process in the QAH for students to carry a module in the context of assessment and standards and this should be remedied;
- It was clarified that practical demonstrations that form part of assessment are likely to be recorded and this needs to feature in the revised assessment procedures. The College is also reviewing its reasonable accommodation model and being informed by Ahead in that regard. The College is considering a role for the External Examiner in overseeing 'high-stakes' continuous assessment as well as examination. Again, any conclusions arising from these considerations should be included in the revised QA Handbook;



- References to security of assessment materials and conflict of interest within the assessment process are made (QAH, p.86) but the QA Handbook doesn't include named procedures in that regard;
- There are two references to Examination Appeals in the QA Handbook with different grounds of appeal (7.1.16 and 7.1.22). These need to be standardised or, preferably, reduced to one reference;
- There is no known rationale for someone currently undertaking a programme leading to a QQI award not being able to act as an external examiner (QAH, p.68). The College should revisit this stipulation;
- In general, use of language in the assessment section needs to be tightened up. For example, there is reference to 'approval' given by the examinations office to a set of assessment results (QAH, p.50). In this section it also refers to the student viewing their results in real time and later that results are identified as provisional. There is also reference to a lecturer emailing results to the examinations office; this was clarified in the meetings with lecturers as not being the intended meaning.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

As evidenced above, the Panel identified several issues in the assessment policies and procedures of IBAT. The College addressed these by comprehensively rewriting this section of the QA Handbook and addressing each of the issues identified above. In its Resubmission Self-Assessment Report (p.9), page references are provided for each of the items above.

The Panel was satisfied that its concerns regarding the assessment procedures of IBAT had been addressed by the College in its resubmitted QA Handbook. On a point of detail, the College was directed to clarify with QQI the current regulations pertaining to the gap required before an individual acting as External Examiner can return to this role.

**7 SUPPORT FOR LEARNERS****Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

As discussed previously, a primary focus of the College is to improve progression and completion rates of learners. This is obviously in the interests of both the College and the learner. To achieve this, it has made several revisions to its recruitment and admissions procedures and processes which are discussed further under *Programmes of Education and Training*. As a further support to recruited learners, the College helps in locating accommodation (QAH, p.95). Where the College is formally playing this role, it describes a thorough process for selection of accommodation providers. The Panel noted the tragedy experienced by students of Leuven Institute and caused by sub-standard accommodation; it advised the College to cease providing an unregulated Accommodation Notice Board that is used by staff and students.

Post-admission, the College describes a proactive approach to monitoring attendance and addressing academic or practical issues with learners, and referring other issues to external counselling services, as required (QAH, p.96). A hardship fund is also available to learners. Whilst some confusion regarding the breadth of the role of the Programme Manager arises in the QAH, the role is evidently operating as a very active form of student support and is a trigger for alerting the academic side of the College, or student services, when issues arise with a learner.

The Moodle learning platform is considered by the College to provide significant support for learners and it was clear from the meetings of the Panel with lecturers that it is used to support teaching and learning. Where exchanges are enabled in the student forum of Moodle, they are tightly moderated. Whilst lecturers are largely employed on a contract basis for a certain number of teaching hours, the Panel was informed that additional support and time is provided to learners; often through lecturers making themselves available before and after classes. In addition to the student facilities referenced above, the College has also secured planning permission to develop student resource areas, which should also benefit learners (SAR, p.9).

In terms of the procedure on student complaints (QAH, p.97), non-student complaint routes should also be documented. Paragraph 8.1.22(d) takes complaints into the area of assessment where this had not been the subject of the type of complaint envisaged in the preceding paragraphs. This should be rectified.





## **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

As noted previously, the College has undertaken work on the basement of its premises in Wellington Quay and the provision of this space for students was reported as receiving positive feedback. The Panel was also informed that the College has upgraded both its library and IT facilities since the original re-engagement meeting. On the advice of the Panel, the College decided to remove its unregulated accommodation notice board.

The College has also redeveloped its complaints procedure (QAH, 7.15) and provided the Panel with an example of how this procedure has been implemented successfully. The Panel has advised that the manner that it is intended the Appeals Board (QAH, p.153) is appointed should be corrected in the corresponding procedure.

The Panel discussed the inter-cultural training that is available to staff and encouraged the College to make this available to administrative as well as academic staff. It also advised that reference to the medical support arrangements that have been organised by the College should be included in the Student Affairs section of the QA Handbook (QAH, 7.13).

## **8 INFORMATION AND DATA MANAGEMENT**

### **Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

IBAT has an integrated student information portal facility which includes Moodle access, email, data storage capacity, attendance monitoring and assessment information (SAR, p.3). The College considers this to be one of its strengths. The Panel also commended the College on how it has developed its IT systems and the reporting capacity and data connections it has made between, for instance, attendance and assessment outcomes. Strict access rights to information have been put in place that are based on staff roles. The Panel was informed that there are mirrored servers in place for the IT system and disaster recovery protocols are in place.

The IT system appears to be maintained by IBAT, and whilst this has provided it with the knowledge and flexibility to tailor the system to its needs, it does give rise to the risk of over-dependence on an expert few who are overseeing the system and its development. It also requires the ongoing and consistent documentation of how the system has been built and each amendment that has been made. As the sustainability of IT systems is a core part of maintaining, supporting, and informing quality assurance, the Panel advises that the College ensure its IT safeguards are adequate.



The College is currently finalising data protection and data retention procedures in the context of the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) that will take effect in May 2018, and expects to have these in place by the end of the year. The College's response to GDPR requirements should be included in section 9.7 of its QA Handbook, Data Protection and Freedom of Information (QAH, p.107-114), when finalised. Section 9.7 also requires further information regarding who has responsibility for student and other records referenced in this section.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

The Registrar is responsible for information and data management issues in IBAT. The Panel was updated as to the progress that has been made in documenting the College's IT system; the Panel encourages the College to continue with this process. The Registrar is currently leading a significant project on data that includes undertaking an inventory of data; developing a data retention schedule; and considering methods for raising awareness of data protection within the College. All this work is contributing to the College's readiness for the introduction of General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) in May of this year. The Panel commented on the scope and extent of this work and noted that additional resources may be required to support information and data management issues in the future.

## **9 PUBLIC INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION**

### **Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

IBAT commits itself to complying with public information provision regarding its programmes and in line with the QA Guidelines (QAH, p. 115). Primary responsibility for determining public information is with the Marketing Manager, who is advised by the Senior Management Group and informed by the checklist and notification information provided as part of the programme design and development process (QAH, p.115).

The QAH makes reference to the representation of College information by third parties and through third party websites (QAH, p.116). It refers to routinely checking this information, and to agents' commitments to good practice; however, this description doesn't describe how, when, and by whom, monitoring of this information takes place. Considering the stated importance to the College of restoring and maintaining its reputation at home and abroad, this would seem an important area in which to have robust procedures in place. The College also undertakes to publish



the outcomes of evaluations (QAH, p.117), but again whose responsibility this is, is not specified in the procedure.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

In its revised QA Handbook, IBAT clearly identifies the Registrar as being responsible for the authorisation of public information and communication. This includes information provided by third party organisations (QAH, p.90) (Chapter 11) and the publication of the outcomes of evaluations (QAH, 5.5).

## **10 OTHER PARTIES INVOLVED IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING (incl. Apprenticeships)**

### **Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

IBAT's primary external relationships of relevance are with awarding bodies, with organisations for which it is operating as a study-centre, and with international agents. As noted above, as IBAT is focussed on its reputation, the Panel advises that it document the criteria that it uses for engaging with all external parties, in order to illustrate and to exercise due diligence.

In the context of agents, the College confirms that it is currently applying the checklist included in the *Guidelines for the Approval, Monitoring and Review of Collaborative and Transnational Provision* (2012) published by the Irish Higher Education Quality Network (IHEQN).

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

The College addresses its collaborative arrangements in Chapter 9 of its revised QA Handbook. Section 9.1 outlines that approval of collaborations is based on legal, reputation and compliance requirements; resource, governance and structural requirements; and programme development and provision requirements (QAH, p.206). These are elaborated further in an appendix (QAH, 9.1). The Panel was informed the chosen criteria have continued to be influenced by the *Guidelines for the Approval, Monitoring and Review of Collaborative and Transnational Provision* (2012) published by the Irish Higher Education Quality Network (IHEQN) and the *Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of Education and Training to International Learners* (2015). The QA Handbook specifies that the Academic Director is responsible for academic due diligence and the College



Director is responsible for undertaking financial and legal due diligence. The Academic Council approves proposed collaborative arrangements (QAH, p.206).

## **11 SELF-EVALUATION, MONITORING AND REVIEW**

### **Findings of the original Re-Engagement Meeting – October 2017**

The College has provided procedures that address monitoring, review, and self-evaluation. As in several other areas, further detail could be provided as to when an action is to be taken and who is responsible for undertaking it. In the absence of this detail, procedures are descriptive rather than instructive.

The role of the Programme Manager was again discussed in the context of student feedback, in particular whether this individual is gathering, analysing, monitoring or acting on the outcomes of student feedback processes. It was clarified during the review meetings that the Programme Manager puts together data for consideration by the Programme Board; action plans are subsequently agreed by the Programme Board and submitted to the Academic Council. This verification needs to be reflected in the associated procedures.

The Panel also sought clarification on the role of audits (QAH, p. 121). The extent to which audits are integrated into / part of / informing programme and institutional review processes is not fully apparent and this is an area that the Panel suggests should be given attention when the College is reviewing the QAH.

There is some repetition and some discrepancies in relation to the description of the contribution of class representatives to monitoring (p. 48 and p. 121) that also need to be reconciled.

### **Findings of the second Re-Engagement Meeting – April 2018**

Chapter 4 of the revised QA Handbook addresses self-evaluation, monitoring and review processes. The College has included more detailed instruction in this section of the document, as requested by the Panel. The clarity of this section has been assisted by the corresponding definition around staff roles, including that of the newly titled Programme Administration Manager. Inconsistencies in references to class representatives have been resolved (QAH, p.71).

The role of annual reviews and audits were the subject of discussion during the meeting of the Panel with IBAT. The Panel has provided advice that what is currently referred to as Self-Evaluation (QAH,



p.69) is given a title that better reflects its role in compiling and synthesising the outcomes of quality processes that have taken place throughout the academic year. The role of audits continued to lead to some confusion for the Panel. The Panel acknowledges the stated need of the owners of the College to ensure that any potential risks arising are communicated to the Board of Governors at the earliest opportunity and that the audits that are requested and received by the Audit Sub-Committee are important in this context. However, the Panel has advised that IBAT requires that these internal audits are carried out by someone, internally or externally, who is independent of the function being audited.

### Evaluation of draft QA Procedures - Overall Panel findings

The Panel was impressed with the systematic way IBAT has addressed both mandatory and advised changes in its resubmitted QA documentation. It also valued the examples offered by the College of how it has implemented its QA procedures over the last six months.

Following the Panel’s review of IBAT’s QA Handbook (2018) and its meeting with the senior management of the College, the Panel is now satisfied that it can recommend to QQI that it re-engage with IBAT. The Panel has, however, identified several *advised changes* to the quality assurance procedures of IBAT; these are detailed in section 3.2 above. The Panel strongly recommends that the College addresses these *advised changes* and submits amended quality assurance documentation to QQI that reflects these changes, where appropriate, in advance of the meeting of the PAEC.

### Part 6 Proposed Approved Scope of Provision for this provider

NFQ Level(s) – min and max	Award Class(es)	Discipline areas
Level 6 to Level 8	Major, Special Purpose and Minor	Business and ICT



**QQI**

Quality and Qualifications Ireland  
Dearbhú Cáilíochta agus Cáilíochtaí Éireann

## **Part 7      Approval by Chair of the Panel**

This report of the Panel is approved and submitted to QQI for its decision on the approval of the draft Quality Assurance Procedures of IBAT College.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## **Annexe 1: Documentation provided to the Panel in the course of the second Evaluation**

The following documentation was provided by IBAT:

- Resubmission Self-Assessment Report (March 2018)
- Quality Assurance Handbook (2018)
- IBAT College Dublin Associated Policies and Standard Operating Procedures

## **Annexe 2: Provider staff met in the course of the Evaluation**

### Second Panel Meeting

Name	Role/Position
Mr Shane Ormsby	College Director
Dr Eileen Buckley-Dhoot	Academic Director
Dr Finbarr Murphy	Registrar
Professor Maurits Van Rooijen	Chief Academic Officer, Global University Systems

### First Panel Meeting

Name	Role/Position
Mr Shane Ormsby	College Director
Professor Maurits Van Rooijen	Chief Academic Officer, Global University Systems
Dr Eileen Buckley-Dhoot	Academic Director
Dr Frank McMahon	Academic Standards Board member
Mr John Vickery	Academic Standards Board member





Mr Paul Mitchell	Academic Standards Board member
Dr Finbarr Murphy	Registrar [From 01 December, 2017]
Ms Mary Doyle	Acting Registrar
Mr Mark Dean	Acting Head of School
Mr Richard O'Brien	Head of Student Recruitment
Mr Adrian Hurley	AD English Language School
Ms Marie McTigue	Marketing Manager
Ms Danielle Cafolla	Corporate Business Development Executive
Mr Adam Burns	Programme Manager PG
Ms Aisling Curran	Programme Manager UG
Ms Olga Vilenskaya	Student Affairs
Ms Jackie Kennedy	Lecturer
Ms Julie Lalor	Lecturer
Mr Brian Joyce	Lecturer
Ms Frances Keating	Lecturer
Mr Juan Fravega	Lecturer
Mr Peter Meehan	Lecturer