Maynooth University
National University of Ireland Maynooth

Ollscoil Mhá Nuad

Maynooth University

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND ASSURANCE

PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT

ENGINEERING

ACADEMIC YEAR 2018-19

Date: 24th July 2019

Contents

1. Introduction

The review considered the quality framework and strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats pertinent to the Department of Electronic Engineering and its collaborative programme provision with other departments, in the context of the wider university and national standards. Self-evaluation documents were compiled by the Department of Electronic Engineering in Q1 2019 and made available to the Peer Review Group two weeks ahead of the site visit, which took place on May 7, 8 and 9th, 2019.

2. Peer Review Group Members

Name	Affiliation	Role
Professor David Owens	University of Sheffield	Chair & External Reviewer
Professor John Gray	University of Manchester	External Reviewer
Dr Catherine Leen	Maynooth University	Internal Reviewer
Dr Tatiana Andreeva	Maynooth University	Internal Reviewer

3. Timetable of the site visit

The timetable for the visit is provided as an appendix. The timetable provided for engagement with all student cohorts and staff by cohort and function, as well as internal and external stakeholders. Arrangements were completely suitable if a little intense.

4. Peer Review Methodology

4.1 Site Visit

The site visit formed the core of a review process, which was structured in this way:

- review of the Department's reflective self-assessment report and additional supplied materials and data;
- elaboration of initial inquiry themes and approaches by the peer review group; and engagement with staff, students and internal and external stakeholders to explore initial inquiry themes and emergent areas of interest.

4.2 Preparation of the Peer Review Group Report

The Peer Review Group Report was compiled and drafted through a process that began with a focus on identifying the core recommendations and commendations, based on a review of materials and interviews, for the exit presentation on the afternoon of May, 9. This initial step involved the review group engaging collectively to compile the important themes.

On the basis of that, the Chair of the panel drafted the report, which was then edited and contributed to by all panel members. All panel members agreed on the final version by communicating by e-mail.

5. Overall Assessment

5.1 Summary

This was a complex assessment that is reflected in the long and detailed form of this report. A degree of repetition is included to aid the narrative and support the overview and recommendations.

This is a small agile, innovative Department with a number of well-developed Engineering courses. It operates in a highly competitive student recruitment market. It has a number of strengths including world class research activities in at least two technical domains, innovative teaching procedures, planned new courses to support recruitment and has a fully committed academic and support staff who have successfully created a supportive teaching and learning environment. There is evidence to support the observation that student experience is good and that the students themselves are happy with the support that they receive. In meetings with undergraduate, doctoral and postdoctoral students, the feedback was overwhelmingly positive. Students clearly feel well supported and commented on the very positive experience they had in the Department. They also expressed satisfaction with the open access labs and facilities and the fact that there was a clear progression in the material they studied across the years of the undergraduate programme. They also noted that the staff-student committee provided a forum in which to raise any issues they may have and that this committee worked effectively as a means to solve any problems.

The Department does, however, face significant challenges in student recruitment, which are the result of low CAO requirements, lack of cognate engineering support, relatively high staff loading, a shortage of resources, governance and leadership issues, low external image and the lack of a strong marketing strategy. The Department is also coming to the end of a grant cycle, which means that some postdoctoral students cannot be rehired until the grant is renewed. PhD numbers are also declining.

The Department is small for its commitments but punches way above its weight. Many Engineering Faculties worldwide, span several Engineering disciplines and typically have a greater number of academic staff. The benefits of size lie in the width and depth of expertise within the staff, the ability to share work and release time for research and innovation in teaching and infrastructure, flexibility for students for degree transfers and a wider base of project and related activities. Size also provides greater stability by reducing vulnerability to staff changes/losses, enhances the capability to formulate new courses to meet market opportunities and provides a greater pool for succession planning at all levels.

A number of key issues were identified that require urgent attention:

a) The Department should prepare and consolidate, with the help of the University, a strategic plan for the next ten years placing particular emphasis on its degree portfolio, major research groupings, its target market and the necessary conditions for sustainability including staffing (numbers, expertise and age/experience distribution) and infrastructure.
b) The appointment of a Head of Department to lead the Department into its next phase of development is an urgent need. The person should have strong leadership qualities, experience of person-management and have an international reputation in a discipline related to the Department’s Strategic Plan. It appears that there is no

internal candidate willing to take on the role, and so it was recommended that the position be advertised externally. It was also noted that the role is onerous and time-consuming and that it needs to be properly remunerated in order to attract suitably qualified candidates.

c) The establishment of a proper staff development processes to include
    i. a succession planning mechanism combined with
    ii. formal mentoring processes to support new staff and
    iii. invigoration of staff activities using annual ("critical friend") review processes to help staff both evaluate their performance, discuss their plans and evaluate success or failure with a view to giving them support at the next stage. The process should be a two-way exchange of views. Both teaching and research should play a part, but research should be seen as the driver for both activities. The process must, inevitably, include some component of "target setting" if staff are to become more focused on the portfolio of success that is needed.
d) The generation of a more inclusive and open research culture through
    i. Breaking down barriers between "silos" by mechanisms including the creation of a Departmental seminar programme with both internal and external speakers and making attendance at such seminars part of the career development of all postgraduates and postdoctoral workers.
    ii. The exploration of possibilities for joint research programmes with related Departments/institutes including Computer Science, one or both Physics Departments, the Hamilton Institute and, where opportunities emerge, appropriate Departments in other universities.
    iii. An expansion of attempts to raise research funding from sources including the EU, an effort that will enhance teamwork, provide partners throughout the EU and create a higher profile for the Department externally.
e) A review of and greater focus on the vital issues of process and activity at both Departmental and University levels that impinge on the success of the accreditation process and hence on the acceptability of graduates to employers. Advice here can be obtained from the relevant external agencies and any review should include the benefits or otherwise of policies originating at the University level, such as compensation strategies in assessment processes (a process mentioned by an Engineering body, when contacted, as being an important part of their process of accreditation).

In addition, there is a need to

A. give wider consideration to software support for students when working remotely. Such efforts would greatly improve their access to MATLAB and LABVIEW for example,
B. provide additional resources for the Robotics course to ensure the proper quality of delivery, a proper student experience and an external perception that both the course and its graduates are up to market needs in knowledge and experience and
C. create an Industrial Advisory Committee from carefully selected areas and companies to provide a real-time, external view of curriculum, project work, student facilities and opportunities and provide another voice for the Department in the external world.
D. Also, consideration must be given, in our view, to the very high risk to quality of delivery associated with the imminent new course initiative in China. Few members of staff seemed to be aware of the needs, detail, benefits or current status of the initiative, despite the fact that it is said to have its first intake in October 2019. Without full staff involvement and proper preparation, the University should be

concerned about the delivery of the programme, its sustainability and any reputational damage should the initiative not succeed. Some members of the Department expressed concern not only about the lack of consultation about this new initiative but the fact that it may damage an existing collaboration with another Chinese university, which has been in place for ten years.

Finally, an extensive review of gender issues within the Department revealed no evidence of embedded gender-related decision making of a negative sort. The gender balance in the Department is recognized as being primarily due to external factors beyond its control and the available evidence suggests that the Department recruits both staff and students in a gender neutral way. The Department is to be commended for successfully attracting female students on different levels in such a difficult context. However, the lack of female permanent faculty may be problematic for future development. We therefore recommend that an action plan to address this issue be developed and implemented. The introduction of a formal mentoring process could help to retain female students, while the lack of female role models could be rectified, in part, by inviting female academics as part of a guest lecturer and/or seminar series.

5.2 Self-Assessment Report

The report provided is comprehensive, informative and refreshingly frank. It does in our view provide a realistic overview of the current state of the Department and the issues outlined in the various SWOT analyses align closely with the impression gained by the panel in the review process. The methodology employed in the presentation is excellent.

6. Findings of the Peer Review Group

6.1 Overview

Governance

Most of the necessary governance is in place, but most of the management and administrative procedures are currently operated in an informal way. Clearly, a formal management and reporting structure is required to meet modern standards. In particular, emphasis must be placed on leadership and staff development issues including the fact that,

1. Currently, the Department is lacking a Head and leadership succession is a major issue, which is influenced by factors that must be addressed at University level.
2. Effective mentoring and annual or biennial staff reviews aimed at increasing focus and setting targets will improve communication and improve the alignment of staff activities with Departmental vision and aspirations. Their use in identifying problems, setting targets and agreeing a positive way forward is essential.

In any changes, the excellent teaching performance achieved to date should be maintained, but the creation of research time and opportunities is crucial.

Teaching, Learning, Assessment, Feedback

A number of Electronic Engineering courses are offered that appear to be well attended and appreciated by students. Teaching links with other Departments seem to work effectively, although constant attention will have to be directed at the effective teaching of mathematics to satisfy both course and accreditation needs.
In addition, there was anecdotal evidence of the need to ensure that pre-requisites provided by other Departments are timely and in a format that students can absorb.

Teaching methods appear to be appropriate. Of note is an innovative project-based learning procedure, which is widely used and effective but does increase staff loading because of the nature of the teaching methodology and the low staff numbers. Some members of staff noted that not all colleagues are involved in delivering PBL and therefore have significantly fewer teaching commitments.

Overall feedback from the staff, students and graduate employers contacted (two) indicate that the quality of the learning experience is excellent and that it is delivered within a welcoming and supportive environment However

1. The Department does lack a structure for formal monitoring and reporting on teaching quality and other issues.
2. There appears to be no formal tutoring system, no monitoring of student attendance and no formal, well-understood structure for monitoring student concerns and wellbeing. The postgraduate students were very positive about their supervisors but noted the lack of collaboration among postgraduate students and that they would welcome the possibility of collaborating more with other students.
3. Discussions with students supported the fact that they have a good and supportive experience but issues did arise, including access to software when working remotely. For example, students gave access to MATLAB and LABVIEW as two examples where the situation could be improved greatly.

   The equipment and laboratory infrastructure needs review to meet the needs of the degree courses. In particular, greater investment in the needs of the Robotics degree is essential to meet the students' needs and the needs of the graduate market.

Finally, and vitally to the Department's long-term viability, there needs to be a greater focus on the key issues of process and activity, at both Departmental and University levels that impinge on the success of the accreditation process.

Research

There are at least two research groups that operate at an international level and more than half of the staff are research active. Funding income and research output are good but focus on a small number of academics and there seems to be a reliance on SFI funding as well as an unexpected and relative dearth in EU funding income. Concern was expressed by some staff about the lack of information on travel funding available to staff and the lack of clear goalposts for promotion. A number of staff commented that their heavy teaching loads made it difficult for them to have time to write grant proposals Progress in research is essential for the Department's future health, sustainability and proper development as a player on the national and international stage.

The essential ingredient of future research success lies in identifying and consolidating a

research niche (and portfolio) that the outside world will associate with Maynooth. A target of three or more high profile, successful groups is a reasonable aspiration but, once agreed, a balanced staffing base and equipment infrastructure must be established to give parity of opportunity.

Part of the way forward lies in giving consideration to the staffing profile and numbers (both expertise and experience) to provide a wider base of expertise and leadership. At a wider level, it is essential to generate a more inclusive and open research culture through

i. The exploration of possibilities for joint research programmes with related Departments/Institutes, including Computer Science, one or both Physics Departments and the Hamilton Institute.
ii. An expansion of attempts to raise research funding from sources including the EU, an effort that will enhance teamwork, provide partners throughout the EU and create a higher profile for the Department externally.
iii. Making staff review processes include research plans, output and development a central part of staff mentoring, monitoring and support.

The process must aim to change culture towards research without disadvantaging teaching and student experience and make Maynooth a destination of choice for academic staff aspirants and research students and staff.

Staffing and Staff development

The relatively low numbers of academic staff and associated support staff should be seen as an issue in all developments. There is clear evidence to support the assertion that opportunities may be being lost because of insufficient staff to service the many processes required by a complex Engineering Department aspiring to work at an international level.

Clearly, there is a requirement to formulate a Departmental staff technical profile to meet identified current and potential teaching/research opportunities and implement a plan to achieve this profile to ensure the long-term viability of the Department.

Low staff numbers inevitably mean that the technical skill base is narrow. Not only does this limit opportunities for current students, but it also limits the Department's ability to address new opportunities for course development or research and may deter, in the worst-case scenario, external investment or recruitment of new staff and students.

An essential part of the way forward is greater attention to staff development and cohesion. There appears to be no formal staff assessment procedures to assist in staff development or staff consultation procedures to ensure involvement in key decision-making processes. The introduction of annual or biennial reviews for each member of staff can help to identify challenges, focus the mind on contributing to the delivery of the outputs desired by the Department and University, set individual targets, review achievements and identify any support that may be needed. Operating in a "critical friend" mode can make such approaches very effective.

Finally, it is noted that the Department employs a number of part-time staff to deliver its technical programme. This should be a short-term solution, as it affects the continuity of delivery and ultimately the quality of teaching experience.

Resourcing and Facilities

The academic staff appear to be stretched to meet the current teaching commitments.

Delivery of Year 4 of the robotic course will generate challenges in teaching/laboratory/workshop resources and the imminent new course initiative with the Chinese university is still an unknown factor amongst the teaching staff.

Technical support appears to be excellent but under stress; administrative assistance is excellent.

The Department clearly lacks space for its teaching and research. There is a shortage of provision of personal computers and common learning support software tools, such as MatLab and Labview, which should normally be freely available to students.

Staff commented on a serious issue with toilet facilities that are frequently out of order, problems with access because the lift in the building does not work, and problems with inadequate heating.

Internal and External Engagement

Informal engagement within the Department appears to be excellent at all levels within the staff-student community. A close working link with the Computer Science Department already exists and opportunities for future co-operation with both Departments of Physics were identified at postgraduate level.

However, the Department appears to have a low external profile in an environment where it faces competition from major, well-recognised universities. There is no doubt that informal outreach activities can be identified, but there does not appear to be any formal marketing strategy for the Department or planning mechanism for the development of links with Departments in other institutions in Ireland or the EU.

Links with industry appear to be good in some research areas but less so with respect to recruitment and employment aspects. The feedback from companies that have had MU students on placements was very positive, with one manager noting that their experience with MU has been so positive that the company does not look elsewhere when they have placements to fill. The excellent interpersonal skills of MU students were also noted by employers, and they commended the professionalism of mature students in particular.

There is some evidence to suggest that, despite its excellent performance in some areas, external engagement can be improved to the benefit of all. In particular,

1. links to accrediting bodies could be improved as a mechanism for ensuring that policy and process development at both University and Departmental levels supports the Department's plan and the perception of external stakeholders. The example unearthed during the visit is the danger of loss of professional accreditation unless compensation methods used in assessment meet the requirements of external accrediting bodies.
2. Accreditation is a regular but infrequent external monitoring mechanism. A more regular mechanism that also adds the benefits of real-time engagement and input is the creation of an Industrial Advisory Board chosen from the external business and engineering community. Not only will this provide another "critical friend" but also a pool of expertise and input for course and/or career development for students.

Implementation of previous recommendations

With the exception of the establishment of the Industrial Advisory Board, the Department appears to have addressed the key issues raised within the financial constraints imposed by the university. The new Robotics course, for example, appears to be a positive outcome, but there is a need to provide follow through to ensure a proper student experience and sustainability.

6.2 Commendations

Interviews with staff at all levels either collectively or on an individual basis reveal a culture of collegiality and a total commitment to the Departments objectives as currently understood. There were no dissenting voices on almost all issues.

1. All UGs and PG/RA's interviewed confirmed the quality of the teaching and learning process and stressed the warm supportive nature of the learning environment.
2. The staff cope well in an environment of relatively low resourcing, producing a quality set of graduates Indeed, the small number of industrial employers appear to be well pleased with the quality and work ethic of their graduate intake.
3. Joint degree programmes seem to work well, with collaborating Departments praising what has been achieved and seeing the potential for new initiatives, particularly in research.
4. There is clear evidence of outstanding research output recognized both nationally and internationally.

Overall an impressive achievement, given the low staffing levels and the limited resources available.

6.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations are, by necessity, succinct. More detail is available in the preceding sections. Most of these recommendations require constructive collaboration between the University and the Department for effective policy and process development and sustainability. It is particularly important that both sides openly discuss issues and constraints to ensure that a full and mutual understanding is achieved.

Institutional/Strategic Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
S.1	The University should work with the Department to develop a strategic plan that ensures enhancement of its capabilities, sustainability and an improvement in its external profile.	The Department needs support to create a clear niche to establish its place in the market and the attract the internal and external resources needed to achieve the agreed objectives.
S.2	The University should, as a matter of urgency, seek a new Head of Department to provide leadership through a time of change and add to the	The Department requires leadership of an inclusive but objective-focused form to take it through a period of change and introduce or enhance capabilities in a currently under-represented area (e.g. Robotics).

	Department's research portfolio.	Current staff age and experience profiles suggest that the University would be well-advised to seek a candidate externally. Ideally, the appointment should be at the professorial level and enhanced by other appointments to provide a healthier distribution of seniority, critical mass in his or her research area and a proper process of succession planning/management for the future. In all such initiatives, the full involvement of, and/or communication with, staff is essential to ensure an effective outcome.
S.3	The University should review its many processes and their impact on Engineering to ensure compatibility and consistency with the requirements of external accrediting bodies.	Accrediting bodies are focused on the quality and appropriateness of graduate experience and curriculum for future engineering employment. This includes assessment processes. Compensation/condoning criteria in assessment are known, for example, to be an area where they can be critical. Loss of accreditation for undergraduate programmes would affect recruitment, graduate employment prospects, the reputation of the Institution and, if not resolved, the viability of the Department.
S.4	The University should introduce annual or biennial staff review processes.	The University should help the Department to introduce recognized, and properly documented, annual or biennial staff review processes aimed at achieving its vision for staff development, teaching innovation and expansion of its research portfolio and reputation. Staff mentoring is essential, as is the alignment of staff activities and priorities with the strategic plan. A proper, supportive process of discussion, target setting and but focused support in a "critical friend" mode is a way forward used by many institutions.
S.5	The University should consider, as a matter of urgency, resourcing issues related to student experience and external perception of its current undergraduate degrees in Engineering.	In view of the current and planned teaching commitments, the Department appears to be under-resourced in terms of academic and support staff, space and teaching equipment, learning tools This is particularly relevant to the Robotics course, which for quality delivery will require more resources than were evident at the review.
S.6	The University should review its current plans for degree developments in Fuzhou, more fully inform Engineering staff of	Consideration must be given, in our view, to the unacceptable risk to the Department's current activities and aspirations and to quality of delivery

	the current needs and expectations and assess the risks of failure on Departmental morale and workload and Institutional reputation.	associated with the imminent new course initiative in China.
S.7	The University should support Departments, including Engineering, to give access to software for remote study and project work via site licences for selected software packages.	Student feedback suggested that the provision of copies of relevant software packages such as MATLAB and LABVIEW would greatly benefit their study. Some of these packages are relevant to several Departments and may need coordination at University level.
S.8	The University should support, at a senior level, the creation of an Industrial Advisory Committee for Engineering to enhance contact with external stakeholders and provide regular external views and input.	It is best practice and beneficial on many fronts to create an Industrial Advisory Committee from carefully selected areas and companies to provide a real-time, external view of curriculum, project work, student facilities and opportunities and provide another voice for the Department in the external world. Members ideally will be senior members of staff or CEOs of the organization.
U.9	The University should review and improve its liaison with Departments on matters to do with estates and building defects.	There was evidence to suggest that the perceived lack of university response and/or slow response to requests from the Department to address simple issues, such as building defects affects staff perceptions and morale. A more effective communication procedure should be introduced to avoid what seems to be an unnecessarily disruptive issue.

Recommendations to the Department

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
U.1	The Department should work constructively with the University in developing and implementing the recommendations to the University.	An agreed way forward and partnership between the Department and the University is essential for effective policy and process development and sustainability. It is particularly important that both sides openly discuss issues and constraints to ensure that a full and mutual understanding is achieved.
U.2	The Department should develop a ten-year strategic plan covering all aspects of its activities.	A long-term plan can ensure enhancement of its capabilities, sustainability and an improvement in its external profile as a provider of quality engineering graduates and contributor to global research output. The Department needs to create a clear

		niche to establish its place in the market and work with the University to attain the resources to achieve the agreed objectives. It is important that all members of staff have a voice in the process to ensure buy-in to its outcomes.
U.3	The Department should actively seek a new Head of Department to lead it through the changes required.	See the entry for the University. This appointment should be a strategic appointment aimed to provide leadership and either introduce a new capability (at critical mass levels) or substantially enhance an existing, successful disciplinary such as Robotics. Current staff age and experience profiles suggest that it would be well-advised to seek a candidate externally.
U.4	The Department should review and establish more formal quality control methods where necessary.	The Department would benefit from the establishment of formal quality control, monitoring, recording and feedback procedures in all its activities, This is particularly important in aspects of quality delivery, student progression, accreditation requirements and student well-being.
U.5	The Department should review and invigorate the processes and culture that support its research activity.	The Department should review its processes and activities to break down research silos and encourage multi-disciplinary cross-fertilization and career development for research students and research staff. Being a small Department, it is essential for the health of the community, and the career development of its members, that all academic and research staff communicate, exchange views and meet regularly in both formal and informal arenas with both internal and external research workers.
U.6	The Department should widen its base of research funding.	The Department should search for mechanisms to enhance research income and extend funding to sources including the EU. Research income is a major indicator of external profile and the extended teams required by the EU would increase the profile of the Department internationally.
U.7	The Department should review its marketing strategy and external engagement activities including the creation of an Industrial Advisory Committee.	The Department should review its marketing strategy and external engagement activities and, in particular, set up an Industrial Advisory Committee that meets regularly (2-3 times annually). Being small, the profile of the Department externally is crucial to success.

		Undergraduate and postgraduate recruitment and recruitment of high quality academic staff are essential. An Industrial Advisory Committee would increase profile locally and nationally and improve the perception by accrediting bodies.
U.8	The Department should review its tutoring and student feedback procedures.	The Department should introduce, monitor and record a student tutoring procedure and establish formal staff/student groups to provide feedback on teaching, resource provision and problems as they arise.
U.9	To pro-actively promote gender diversity in its staff and its student body.	Encouraging young women to enter the engineering profession has been a major thrust of Engineering Institutions for several decades. They represent an essential source of skills that is needed now and, increasingly, will be needed in the future. It is recognized that success has been limited however by many external factors. Note that, currently, only around 12% of professional engineers in Ireland (and the UK) are women. The support of external Professional Institutions, an Industrial Advisory Board and the Office of the VP for Equality and Diversity may be of value in addressing this issue

Appendix 1:

ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING: PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT TIMETABLE

Date: Tuesday 7th May		
Time	**Description**	**Venue**
19:00	Convening of the Peer Review Group Briefing by: Aidan Mulkeen, Vice President Academic and Registrar PRG agrees a Chair, and discuss the visit Identification of any aspects requiring clarification or additional information Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group, University Executive Member	Booked Carton House Hotel at 7pm for 6 people under the name Mulkeen Aidan Mulkeen David Owens John Gray Tatiana Andreeva Catherine Leen

Date: Wednesday 8th May		
Time	**Description**	**Venue**
8:30- 9.00	Convening of Peer Review Group	Council Room
9.00-9.45	Professor Ronan Farrell, Head of Department	Council Room
9.45 -10.30	Group meeting with all Department staff (Head of Department recused)	Council Room
10.30-11.00	Dean's slot: Professor Aidan Mulkeen, VP Academic	Council Room
11.00-12.30	Tour of facilities of Department escorted by HoD	Department
12:30 - 13.00	Staff Group 1: **academic staff (3)** Dr Rudi Villing, Lecturer Dr John Dooley, Lecturer Dr Klara Stokes, Lecturer	Council Room

13.00 - 14:00	Working Lunch	Reserve Pugin Hall/ Table with service for Quality/4 people
  14:00 14:45 14.45-15.30	**Meet with Students:** Undergraduate Students (8) Postgraduate Students (4)	Council Room
15.30-16.00	**Staff Group 2 academic staff (4)** Dr Bob Lawlor, Lecturer Dr Bryan Hennelly, Lecturer Mr Andrew Meehan, University Tutor Dr Arman Farhang, Lecturer	Council Room
16.00-16.30	Break	Council Room
16.30-17.00	**Meet with User Group 1** Professor Ray O'Neill, VP Research	Council Room
17.00-17.30 17.00 17.10 17.20	**External Stakeholder/Phonecalls** Aaron Joyce, Butler Technologies John Mcauley, Compliance Engineering Ireland Damien Owens, Engineers Ireland	Council Room
17:30-18.00	PRG meeting – identification of any areas for clarification and finalisation of tasks for following day	Council Room
19.00	PRG private working dinner	**Booked Carton House Hotel at 7.00pm for 4 people under the name Leen**

Date: Thursday 9th May		
Time	**Description**	**Venue**
9.00-9.30	Convening of Peer Review Group	Council Room
9.30-10.00	Meeting with **Postdoctoral Researchers** (2) Dr Kevin O'Dwyer (Biomedical Electronic Research) Dr Demian Garcia-Violini (Centre for Oceanic Energy Research)	Council Room
10.00-10.30	**Meet with Heads of Other Departments** Dr Joe Timoney, HOD Computer Science Professor Anthony Murphy, HOD Experimental Physics Dr Jonivar Skullerud, HOD Theoretical Physics	Council Room
10.30-11.00	**Staff Meeting 3:** Dr Seamus McLoone, Senior Lecturer	Council Room
11.00-11.30	Refreshments	Council Room
11.30-12.00	**Staff Group 4:** Technical Staff Mr Denis Buckley, Senior Technical Officer Mr John Maloco, Chief Technical Officer Mr Jim Kinsella, Technician	Council Room
12.00-12.30	**Staff Group 5:** Administrative Staff Ms Joanne Bredin, Senior Executive Assistant Ms Ann Dempsey, Executive Assistant	Council Room
12.30-13.00	**Staff Meeting 6** Professor John Ringwood	Council Room
13:00-14:00	Working Lunch	Pugin Hall/Reserved Table with service for Quality, 4 people
14:00-16:30	Preparation of Exit Presentation	Council Room
16:30-17:00	Exit presentation to all departmental staff, made by the Chair of the PRG, summarising the principal commendations and recommendations of the Peer Review Group	Council Room
17:00	Refreshments and Exit of the PRG	Council Room