



**Maynooth
University**
National University
of Ireland Maynooth

Ollscoil Mhá Nuad

Maynooth University

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND ASSURANCE

PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY

ACADEMIC YEAR 2019

Date: May 2019

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction..... | 3 |
| 2. Peer Review Group Members | 3 |
| 3. Timetable of the site visit | 4 |
| 4. Peer Review Methodology | 4 |
| 4.1 Site Visit | 4 |
| 4.2 Preparation of the Peer Review Group Report | 4 |
| 5. Overall Assessment | 4 |
| 5.1 Summary Assessment of the Department | 4 |
| 5.2 Self-Assessment Report..... | 7 |
| 6. Findings of the Peer Review Group: Commendations and Recommendations | 8 |
| 6.1 Overview..... | 8 |
| 6.2 Commendations | 9 |
| 6.3 Recommendations for Improvement..... | 10 |
| Institutional/Strategic Recommendations | 11 |
| Recommendations to the Department | 13 |
| Appendix A Site Visit Timetable..... | 17 |

1. Introduction

The review was a 10 year quality review of the Department of Biology, aligned with the MU Framework for Quality Assurance and Enhancement. The review dealt primarily with:

1. Governance, Management, Operations
2. Staffing and staff development
3. Infrastructure and resources
4. Teaching and Learning
5. Research
6. Outreach
7. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
8. Quality Enhancement Plans

The review took place on the 10 and 11th of April 2019. The review material was provided at least 1 month prior to the visit and was very well presented and provided adequate information. The senior administrative officer, Helen Berry, was available for any request for more information.

2. Peer Review Group Members

| Name | Affiliation | Role |
|--|-------------|---|
| Dr Gordon Delap, Maynooth University | | Co-chair |
| Dr Noelle Higgins, Maynooth University | | Co-chair |
| Professor Tracy Robson, RCSI | | Co-chair |
| Professor Robin Plevin, University of Strathclyde | | Co-chair and verbal feedback nominee |

3. Timetable of the site visit

Overall, the 2 day timetable was suitable for the site visit and the time to prepare the preliminary report adequate. To note;

- Additional time for discussion with the Head of Department (HoD) at the start of the visit, or at the end to clarify a few points, would have been welcomed (although recognising the buildings tour allowed more conversation with the HoD).
- More complete representation of the Department in research.
- A meetings clerk who could have taken notes would have been useful. This would have allowed all panel members to concentrate on the review process rather than minute taking.

Timetable: See Appendix A.

4. Peer Review Methodology

4.1 Site Visit

- The site visit was well organised by Maynooth University. Staff and students were responsive and open. The approach included thirty minute meetings with different categories of staff and students.
- A tour of the Department of Biology.
- Remote engagement (phone) with external stakeholders in industry and government-linked organisations.
- Additional meetings with professional staff with the Department of Biology, and with senior officers.
- Opportunity to see some other parts of the University.

All these elements assisted the PRG to further contextualise the Department of Biology's position within the University and externally.

4.2 Preparation of the Peer Review Group Report

The roles of chair and rapporteur were rotated throughout the 2 days, allowing effective, equal contribution by all 4 panel members to discussions over the two days. Interim discussions allowed key themes to be highlighted. Using pre-documentation compiled by each member, and the notes from each session, a preliminary bullet point report was compiled, to assist with verbal feedback at the end of the site visit. This was expanded by the group into a first draft. The document was circulated via e-mail, and then further refined into a final draft.

5. Overall Assessment

5.1 Summary Assessment of the Department

The overall analysis of the PRG identifies the Department of Biology to be an excellent, well-functioning department within the University; one of Maynooth's success stories, with a

strong reputation nationally. It is very clearly committed to excellence in Research and Teaching, as well as other key areas such as Outreach and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI). It has a collegiate culture and identifies strongly with the “I am Maynooth” phenotype. It has a robust and growing research dynamic fostered by active early and mid-career academic staff supported by excellent strategic leadership, with some excellent recent academic appointments. In teaching, there is a clear willingness to reflect and improve the student experience and implement a change agenda. There is a passionate desire to support the local community through outreach and the university-led role for EDI is outstanding. The technical and administrative staff are exemplary; all demonstrating intense loyalty to the Department and the University. The Department is at a critical stage in its development; with appropriate University support there is the potential to implement a step change in both research and teaching activity, which should significantly increase success and reputation both nationally and internationally, an opportunity that should not be overlooked.

Strengths Summary:

- Research active department with strong research strands in selected areas, with improving grant income and publications in a challenging funding environment.
- Strong early-career research dynamic through excellent recent appointments. Clear potential to grow and compete nationally and internationally.
- Strong ongoing commitment to teaching and learning and improvement of the student experience.
- Outstanding outreach activities and engagement with the local community
- Impressive development of an EDI agenda- leading the University in Athena SWAN Award initiatives.
- Strong collegiate approach, supported by excellent leadership through the Head of Department with support from other senior administrators and technical staff.

The PGR recognises that a number of issues, highlighted below, have already been identified by the Department through the self-reflective review process.

Weaknesses Summary:

- The wide range of research areas does not facilitate strategic capacity building. This weakens competitiveness.
- Perceived lack of strategic focus in utilising university research support in specific areas of excellence.
- Fewer than optimal Post-doctoral researchers, and to a lesser extent, PhD student numbers, to generate a critical mass in frontline research activity.
- The equipment base for both research and teaching is limited and has the potential to significantly hinder progress in the next few years.
- Lack of available technical support for centralised equipment facilities.

- Lack of a clear management framework within the Department to widen decision making and delineate roles and responsibilities in key areas e.g. teaching improvement
- Academic staff structure is unbalanced with a predominance of lecturers, rather than senior lecturers / professors. This leaves a management/leadership gap and lack of sufficient mentorship.
- Lack of a staff appraisal/review mechanism reflected through a lack of a University promotions procedure.
- Lack of definitive plans and implementation strategies to enhance undergraduate learning delivery across the years and embrace student centred learning more effectively.
- Limited development of generic skills for undergraduate (writing, presentation, team working) and need for further modernisation of class content specific for graduate skills and destinations.
- Lack of some common social/networking/discussion space limiting connectivity and communication.
- Teaching laboratory space is not sufficient for class sizes. Overpopulated spaces create issues with health and safety, and therefore University legal compliance.
- Lack of a consistent and well executed system to monitor PhD progress, engagement and well-being.
- Lack of facilities to grow computer-assisted learning for delivery of modern biology.
- Lack of central support and upskilling to ensure administration and technical staff can engage with centrally devised online systems (e.g. payments) and programmes to optimise operations delivery. Compounded by a suboptimal university timetabling system.
- Lack of internationalisation activity, out with Europe.
- The commitment to outreach, whilst excellent, may also be a weakness when implemented in the absence of a considered strategy.

Opportunities Summary:

- Potential to grow the research capacity of the Department around specific key areas which can be competitive externally; this must be linked to strategic distribution of departmental research funding.
- To build upon the excellent recent academic appointments and grow critical mass through positive support, mentorship and retention strategies.
- To rebrand and reposition within the modern health/biological sciences market both nationally and internationally. A move to a School of Life Sciences would facilitate this important strategic opportunity.
- To develop synergies with the Health Sciences Institute.
- To develop new MSc courses in strength areas and emerging disciplines which are income generating and can aid international recruitment.
- To enhance and modernise the content and delivery of undergraduate teaching and to be a preferred destination for applicants across Ireland.

Threats Summary:

- Lack of investment in equipment has the potential to reduce the quality and number of research outputs, reduce grant success, and compromise staff retention.
- University vision limits strategic investment in research, including lack of appointment of senior research staff and limited leveraged funding to enhance stipend/consumable support for IRC funded PhD studentships.
- Lack of a transparent and accountable promotions procedure resulting in reduced staff morale and motivation affecting staff retention. This is compounded by a lack of an internal development review for all staff
- Lack of investment in equipment and facilities for teaching may reduce student experience and damage recruitment numbers.
- High student: staff ratio may negatively impacts on student experience with potential loss in student numbers and reputational damage.
- Failure to modernise teaching and continue to base delivery on traditional singular view of the learning landscape. This limits growth in student numbers.
- Failure to engage in internationalisation, resulting in weakened potential for the enhancement of income streams via teaching and recruitment of both undergraduate and postgraduate students.
- Research facilities and infrastructure are not up to standard to support cutting edge research, reducing competitiveness. Noted examples are the Bio-resource unit and the plant facilities.
- Succession planning imperative to ensure that the two administrative staff, due to retire in the next 1-2 years, are covered appropriately.

5.2 Self-Assessment Report

The Self-Assessment report was well written and was of a good standard throughout, allowing a balanced picture of the Department to be generated. The supporting appendices were informative, and further allowed quality assurance to be assessed, particularly in teaching. Some welcomed additional degranulation could have included:

- Conversion of the workload model into work hours for each member of staff
- Similarly, no individualised grant income and paper outputs.

Whilst recognising it was important not to individualise these outputs, it would have still have been useful to understand better the strengths and weakness in different research areas as this is significant for future strategic investment.

- A risk register/analysis for the Department would be a useful operational tool to use in supporting both SWOT and PESTEL analysis of the department.

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

6.1 Overview

The Department's activities and structures comply with the Maynooth University Framework for Quality Assurance and Enhancement. The Department functions at a level which allows delivery in all areas of activity. The approach of the department enables room for reflection and improvement as per the guidelines. Examples of good practice presented in the review documentation include the analysis of pass marks in first year and a root and branch review of EDI across the department.

Departmental governance and organisation is good. The HoD shows strong strategic leadership and mentorship. Whilst there is clearly a flat line management structure, all roles and responsibilities are delivered appropriately. There are appropriate avenues for academic and support staff to voice their views. This needs to be extended to other groups, for example, post-doctoral and PhD studentship through appropriate representation on Departmental committees. There is still a preponderance of formal roles and responsibilities in few hands, e.g. HoD, senior administrator, and head of technical services. A broader management structure needs to be developed without excessively adding to bureaucratic burden. This would provide important leadership opportunities for junior staff.

Research management lacks an obvious structure, but this does not imply that there are major deficits; several research focus areas are engaged in very high quality research, with significant income and outputs. The Departmental is somewhat reliant on the significant research success of the HoD; this needs to be further supported by freeing him up to concentrate his efforts in this area, whilst providing support and mentorship to early career researchers. A research committee/group may facilitate co-ordination across the different research themes and also engage PhD and post-doctoral activities. This group can again feedback to the HoD.

The pre-documentation and appendices indicate that teaching was delivered to appropriate standards and delivery modes structured appropriately for each year. Reflection of teaching delivery is ongoing and in accordance with the framework. Research is appropriately conducted, and delivered to a strong standard; adequate internal and external scrutiny occurs through grant and paper review.

The staff: student ratio is high and further academic/teaching appointments may be appropriate. Opportunities for staff development are supported but are mainly ad hoc and informal, there is a lack of a yearly development review system (reflected in a lack of an appropriate promotions system within the University). Support for early-mid career academic staff is not defined and a consistently well delivered mentorship system is lacking. A consistent support and annual progression framework for PhD students requires improvement to ensure alignment with university procedures and best practices. Better formal support for post-doctoral researchers is essential and Representation at staff meetings appropriate.

Resources and facilities vary across the two buildings. There is sufficient laboratory space to deliver current research, but the Department may benefit from the development of open plan space, and more integrative social/research networking space. Animal house (BioResources) facilities are at full capacity – this situation may create risk in the delivery of research, particularly with regard to compliance with European guidelines. Equipment to support cutting edge research needs improvement. Laboratory space to deliver teaching is at maximum capacity, with the potential to breach safety regulations. The equipment is old, and maintenance is an issue. There are no Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) laboratories within the Biology department.

Internal and external interactions are mixed with room for some improvement. There are clearly good personal interactions between Biology staff and a number of colleagues across the University. However professional services support could be improved. National and international connectivity is good at the personal level, but this is not enshrined within any explicit departmental strategy.

There is evidence for the implementation of recommendations from the previous review within the Department. There is a perception that the recommendations from the previous review were not fully implemented at the University level and some issues are still outstanding. A 10 year review in the absence of any other reviews (teaching accreditation etc.) may be too long. This does not assist the Biology department to consistently align strategy with the University vision.

6.2 Commendations

There are a number of areas in which the Department should be commended, and the following list does not cover all areas of note:

- Overall departmental success is considerable given the external challenges to funding and support for Universities in Ireland over the last decade. Strong strategic leadership and commitment from the staff have underpinned this success.
- A strong research dynamic exists in several thematic areas with the potential to grow and increase competitiveness.
- Excellent early career appointments who have been successful in highly competitive grant funding rounds, e.g. from SFI etc.
- Improving internal approaches to support research quality and capacity; consumable support for PhD, targeted support for active researchers, internal grant review, multidisciplinary projects and restricted teaching load for early career staff.
- Success in growing student intake and delivering a number of different bespoke courses. Commitment to supporting a highly diverse range of students from different backgrounds.
- Success in delivering courses which develop excellent graduate attributes for the work place. Biology students from Maynooth were commended by external stakeholders.

- Excellent and growing EDI agenda- the first Maynooth department to apply for Athena SWAN Departmental Bronze Award.
- Outstanding outreach activities supported by a committed technical staff.
- Excellent administration and technical support
- Department has reflected well on practice and proposed a number of new initiatives to further enhance and improve success and growth of the department across teaching, learning and research.

6.3 Recommendations for Improvement

The tables below categorise recommendations as being institutional/strategic or department level, in line with the guidance notes accompanying this template.

Institutional/Strategic Recommendations

| Number | Recommendation | Additional PRG Comments |
|--------|--|--|
| S.1 | Support the development of a School/Institute for Life Sciences and a rebranding/badging of the department. Department is “unknown”. “Biology” is no longer innovative. Life Sciences will be more appealing to potential students. | Considerable potential within the Department for growth which requires a clear University vision and strategy to be realised fully. |
| S.2 | Strategic investment in new equipment for core facilities and other resources is essential to support growth in Biology. | <p>There is tremendous potential to grow the Department of Biology around recent staff appointments (and other mid-career research academics). It will not take a massive amount of investment to retain and develop these staff but some is required.</p> <p>The University needs to recognise that running a science department is more expensive than other departments; the Department of Biology needs resources that reflects this if the University wants to ensure the continued success of this department.</p> |
| S.3 | Support 2-3 strategic appointments at a more senior level to increase research capacity and increase critical mass. Potential to re-shape department to increase competitiveness. Loss of HoD is a major risk, so support is vital here. | Funding success is disproportionate; strong with the HoD and early career investigators. Unclear if research excellence is across the whole department. Indicative of a need to re-shape. |
| S.4 | Support the departmental ambition to implement a change agenda around teaching with a view to modernise and become a market leader. | May need a promotions structure for teaching only staff which may be relevant to Department of Biology. |

| | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Will need to implement an effective centralised timetabling system that incorporates laboratory classes.</p> <p>University needs to incentivise staff to attend what was described as an excellent Post-graduate course in university teaching; yet staff do not have the time to attend. Most universities make this compulsory for promotion and at the same time this upskills staff with innovative teaching solutions.</p> |
| S.5 | Develop a long term business plan to have a single modern building to house the School/Institute of Life Sciences to coincide with a Health Faculty | Depends on the vision for Biological and Health Sciences at Maynooth. |
| S.6 | A short-term, low cost refurbishment strategy to open laboratories and create social/networking /office space | There seems to be adequate research space but not always effectively used. Research labs are small, so lots of dead space. |
| S.8 | Implement an open and accountable promotions strategy, coupled to a departmental yearly staff accountability and development review. | This current position is not in keeping with a modern university and needs to be implemented to ensure that staff feel valued |
| S.9 | Recommend stronger lines of communication between senior university staff with the Department of Biology. Also recommend a post-review progress away day in 2 years' time hosted by VPs academic and research. | Communication is key to align the department with the University vision. A 10 year review period is too long. |
| S.10 | Provide a computer-assisted learning laboratory for Department of Biology | Promote modernisation of Biology learning delivery (and obviate the need for more traditional laboratory space and the associated technical resources) |

| | | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|--|
| S.11 | Further support of EDI initiatives | Equality and unconscious bias training needs to be mandatory across the University |
|-------------|------------------------------------|--|

Recommendations to the Department

| Number | Recommendation | Additional PRG Comments |
|---------------|---|--|
| U.1 | <p>Implement appropriate committees/working groups covering; teaching and learning improvement, research strategy, onsite operations, EDI etc. with appropriate chairs. Bring decisions to executive for discussion and implementation.</p> <p>Representation should involve; Early Career, Post-doctoral researchers and PhD students where appropriate (see below).</p> | <p>Extend and spread responsibility and decision making while at the same time strengthening operating/management structure.</p> <p>Working groups must be effective and appropriately chaired (and not just increase bureaucracy).</p> <p>HoD is not expected to sit/chair on all these groups but to provide strategic insight and clarity of purpose. All groups should report back to him as Chair of Executive committee.</p> |
| U.2 | A yearly review mechanism for all staff. | <p>The HoD should not be expected to review all staff. Senior staff within appropriate categories should review. Specific training for review staff such that the workload is spread.</p> <p>Review needs to be assigned with an open and transparent University promotions procedure.</p> |
| U.3 | Research income from the University should be invested more strategically rather than “shared”. Top slicing for specific | Unlikely that all areas of research can be equally funded. HoD is working strategically, but should be further supported |

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| | initiatives is strongly recommended based on potential to realise grant income. Includes targeted PhD support. | |
| U.4 | <p>Continue with an innovative teaching and learning strategy to build on the current good practice. Reflect on graduate characteristics and skills. Renewed focus on presentations, writing, team working and other generic skills. Refocus on student-centred learning (including flipping the class room, use of in-lecture technology to quiz students etc.).</p> <p>A teaching and learning committee consisting of programme leads could be responsible for implementing these changes.</p> | <p>Need to co-produce teaching improvement across department and not rely on old style teaching and individualised approaches that are not optimal. Modernisation is the key.</p> <p>The PRG is cognisant of student numbers and challenges in student staff: ratio to allow effective delivery and student entry levels which may require additional support mechanisms.</p> <p>Programme committees would also be useful to ensure that coursework submissions don't all fall on the same day/month; as fed back from student groups.</p> |
| U.5 | <p>Delivery of laboratory practical classes needs to be reviewed. Close alignment with learning outcomes is essential and consideration of resources/space/time required for delivery. Mix of simulations and wet labs could be explored.</p> | <p>Recommend establishing a computer assisted learning (CAL) laboratory for bioinformatics/cheminformatics and other tailored workshops in biology (which can be around formative assessment). Technical staff may need to upskill or change approaches.</p> <p>Feedback from students suggests that they are "spoonfed". Practicals that allow more independent learning, might help to upskill students. Less is more here.</p> |
| U.6 | <p>Undergraduate voice must be incorporated into teaching strategy through student/staff committees, 2 per semester. Use a "You said we did" form of feedback to the student body.</p> | <p>Careful but consistent implementation is the key here; strong engagement with student representative about roles. Students could chair meetings with early career co-chair (and have pizza to promote engagement and collegiality).</p> |

| | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| | Use a learning charter to cement co-expectations across all years between students and staff. | Need initial meetings with all years to discuss charter and agree philosophy. |
| U.7 | Review graduate attributes in teaching related to curriculum content. | Student feedback: why mathematics, particularly algebra if it's not needed for biology students? Perhaps data management and biostatistics might be more appropriate. |
| U.8 | Potential to expand and grow MSc courses based on excellent research-directed teaching. | Must be planned and be cost-effective in the longer term. |
| U.9 | <p>Consistent implementation of PhD support and monitoring/management of progress. Support for generic skills training enshrined in policy.</p> <p>PhD students should be provided with opportunities to contribute to teaching; however, they should be appropriately recognised.</p> | Must be in both directions expectations must be shared (use supervision/student agreement). Poor progress and the reasons for it must also be dealt with early. Currently, the feedback from students was that the structured PhD programme could be improved by better communication with the centre on what modules/training was available and development of more relevant modules would be appropriate. A working group to develop these would be appropriate. If engaged in teaching, PhD students must be supervised appropriately to ensure quality assurance (time for marking reports etc). |
| U.10 | Review of support for Postdoctoral researchers within the Department; improvements as appropriate. | Good support from PIs is apparent and commended. But overall, there is little scope for this group to meet and participate in other departmental activities. They need a representative on Departmental committees. Whilst there is a "Post grad and post doc committee" which runs an internal seminar programme; attendance by PIs is poor and therefore more engagement is needed in some sort of format. |

| | | |
|-------------|--|---|
| U.11 | Maintain and extend the excellent EDI strategy. | May require fuller engagement with all staff and some additional resource. |
| U.12 | Review Outreach strategy. Have a working group to ensure balanced participation across the department; technical staff are heavily relied upon for these activities. | Whilst outstanding, value is not clearly quantified. Over commitment may be restricting activities in other areas. Summer activities may not be cost effective. Ensure good balance. Keep some of these activities focussed on attracting undergraduate and post-graduate PhD students. |
| U.13 | Review internationalisation strategy to improve position based on research and teaching excellence. Could involve new MSc for the international market, a health sciences summer school etc. | University support required to examine possibilities and to action. Co-ordinated visits to international partners (funded and organised centrally). Need nominated person to lead from Department of Biology. |

Appendix A: BIOLOGY DEPARTMENT PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT TIMETABLE

| Tuesday, 9 th April, 2019 | | |
|---|---|--|
| Time | Description | Venue |
| 19:00 | <p>Convening of the Peer Review Group.</p> <p>Briefing by: Professor Aidan Mulkeen, Vice President Academic and Registrar</p> <p>PRG agrees a Chair and discuss the visit.</p> <p>Identification of any aspects requiring clarification or additional information.</p> <p>Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group, Professor Aidan Mulkeen, VP Academic, Registrar and Deputy President</p> | <p>Booked Carton at 7.00pm for 6 people under the name Mulkeen</p> <p>Aidan Mulkeen Tracy Robson Robin Plevin Gordon Delap Noelle Higgins</p> |
| Wednesday, 10 th April, 2019 | | |
| Time | Description | Venue |
| 8:30-9.00 | Convening of Peer Review Group | John Hume Boardroom |
| 9.00-9.30 | Professor Paul Moynagh, Head of Department | John Hume Boardroom |
| 9.30-10:30 | Meet All Departmental Staff (Head of Department recused) | John Hume Boardroom |
| 10.30-12.00 | Tour of Department with refreshments escorted by HOD and Michelle Finnegan (CTO) | Department |
| 12.00-12.30 | <p>Meeting with Staff Group 1 (Teaching and Learning)</p> <p>Dr James Carolan, Lecturer Professor Bernard Mahon Professor Christine Griffin Dr Marion Butler, Lecturer Dr Paul Dowling, Lecturer Dr Rebecca Owens, Lecturer Dr Conor Breen, Lecturer (contract)</p> | Council Room |
| 12.30-13.00 | <p>Meeting with Staff Group 2 (Research)</p> <p>Dr Emmanuelle Graciet, Lecturer Dr Joanne Masterson, Lecturer Dr Martina Schroeder, Lecturer</p> | Council Room |

| | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| 13.00-14.00 | Working Lunch | Reserve Pugin Hall/Table with service for Quality/4 people |
| 14.00-14.30 | Meet with Postdoctoral Fellows (8) | Council Room |
| 14.30-15.00 | Meet with Undergrad Students (12) | |
| 15.00-15.30 | Meet with Postgrad Students (11) | |
| 15:30-16.00 | <p>Meeting with Staff Group 3 (Technical and Administrative Staff)</p> <p>Ms Aine Butler, Senior Technician Patricia Colton, Senior Technician Dr Ilona Dix, Research Senior Technician Mr Noel Gavin, Senior Technician Mr Nicholas Irani, Senior Technician Dr Frances Tinley, Senior Technician Dr Noreen Curran, Technician Mr Alan Hildebrand, Technician Ms Gillian O'Meara, Senior Technician Ms Michelle Finnegan, Chief Technical Officer Mr Austin Power, Chief Technical Officer Ms Jean Burbridge, Senior Executive Assistant Ms Terry Roche, Administrative Officer</p> | Council Room |
| 16.00-16.30 | Break | Council Room |
| 16.30-17.00 | <p>Meet with Other Academic/Admin Staff</p> <p>Professor Ray O'Neill, VP Research Dr John Scanlon, Commercialisation Office Dr Natalie O'Neill, Education Dept</p> | Council Room |
| 17.00-18.00 | <p>Phone Calls to External Stakeholders</p> <p>17.00 Natasha Gordon, Airmid 17.15 Helen Grogan, Teagasc Shirley O'Dea, Avectas 17.30</p> | Council Room |
| 17.45-18.15 | PRG Group meeting | Council Room |

| | | |
|-------|----------------------------|--|
| 19.00 | PRG private working dinner | Booked Carton House Hotel at 7pm for 4 people under the name Higgins |
|-------|----------------------------|--|

Thursday, 11th April, 2019

| Time | Description | Venue |
|-------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 9.00-9.30 | Convening of Peer Review Group | Council Room |
| 9.30-10.00 | Meeting with Staff Group 4 (Infrastructure) Professor Kay Ohlendieck Dr Conor Meade, Lecturer Ms Michelle Finnegan, Chief Technical Officer Ms Terry Roche, Administrative Officer | Council Room |
| 10.00-10.30 | Meeting with Staff Group 5 (Embracing Equality) Dr Karen English, Lecturer Professor Bernard Mahon Ms Clementina Sidoli-O'Connor, Executive Assistant Ms Gillian O'Meara, Senior Technician Dr Joanne Masterson, Lecturer Mr Nicholas Irani, Senior Technician Dr Paul Dowling, Lecturer Dr Ronan Bergin, Postdoctoral Researcher Mr Johana Isaza Correa, Postgraduate Student Ms Merissa Cullen, Postgraduate Student | Council Room |
| 10.30-11.00 | Meeting with Staff Group 6 (Outreach) Dr David Fitzpatrick, Lecturer Ms Michelle Finnegan, Chief Technical Officer Dr Manuel Lopez-Vernaza, Lecturer (contract) Dr Sinead Miggin, Lecturer | Council Room |
| 11.00-11.30 | Break | Council Room |
| 11.30-12.00 | Meet with Other Academic/Admin Staff Professor Aidan Mulkeen VP Academic, Registrar & Deputy President Ms Catherine O'Brien, Examinations and Timetabling Ms Marie Murphy, Graduate Studies Officer | Council Room |
| 12.00-12.30 | Meeting with Staff Group 7 Recently appointed staff (last 5 years) Dr Andrew Hogan, Lecturer Dr Joanne Masterson, Lecturer Dr Eoin McNamee, Lecturer Dr Mark Robinson, Lecturer | Council Room |
| 13.00-14.00 | Lunch | Reserve Pugin Hall/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. | Renehan Hall |
| 17:00 | Refreshments and Exit of the PRG | Renehan Hall |