



**Maynooth  
University**  
National University  
of Ireland Maynooth

Ollscoil Mhá Nuad

**Maynooth University**

## **QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND ASSURANCE**

### **PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

#### ***DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY***

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2018/2019**

Date 28<sup>th</sup> March 2019

## Contents

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

## 1. Introduction

The site visit and meetings with staff took place over March 27<sup>th</sup> /March 28<sup>th</sup> 2019, with the Program Review Group (PRG), Registrar and Dean of Science and Engineering meeting up on the evening of 26<sup>th</sup> March, over dinner. When alone, the PRG exchanged their initial views of the timetable, Self-Assessment Report (SAR) and supporting information, which had been received by the panel in early March. Professor Groeger was appointed chair. Throughout, the PRG was assisted by Helen Berry (Administrative Officer), with great efficiency and charm- and we wish here to record our particular gratitude.

The Department of Psychology has been in existence some twenty years, and in that time has undergone several periods of change. In particular we wish to note, very different emphases on the psychology with which it identified. Its last quality review was a decade ago; during the period since then the Department has sought to consolidate its academic base-, embracing what is, perhaps, a broader vision of psychology as a discipline and profession. These developments are entirely consistent with the Department's mission *"To teach, research and communicate Psychology as a scientific and professional discipline, to the highest academic and professional standards, reaching a broad range of people and organisations."*

As reported in the SAR, the Department has 16 academic staff (four professors, six senior lecturers and six lecturers), four administrative staff (0.5 administrative assistant, 1 FT executive assistant, 2 \* 0.5 senior executive assistants), 1 senior technician and 12 post-doctoral research staff. It is striking that almost 50% of the academic staff were first appointed in 2017 or later. As this makes clear, the Department has benefitted considerably from the University's preparedness to invest in the former. Alas, the increasing administrative burden resulting from prodigious growth and success in winning external funding has not benefitted in the same way. As of January 2019, Psychology's undergraduate cohort stood at some 380 student FTEs attached to the department (headcount ~850 students), together with 28 students registered for research degrees (PhD/MSc by research).

We commend the University's continued support for Psychology, especially throughout a period of severe national economic challenge; despite these challenges, and the inevitable institutional and sector-wide challenges that result, Psychology at Maynooth University has been singularly successful.

## 2. Peer Review Group Members

Name	Affiliation	Role
Professor Melanie Giles	University of Ulster	External
Professor Claire Hamilton	Law, Maynooth University	Internal
Dr Stephen O'Neill	English, Maynooth University	Internal
Professor John Groeger	Nottingham Trent University	External/Chair

## 3. Timetable of the site visit

- Give the timetable of the site visit: **See Appendix 1**

The timetable gave PRG ample opportunity to gain, we believe, a real sense of Maynooth's Department of Psychology, its staff, facilities and the University context in which it is embedded. PRG expressed a wish that space be made in what was a packed schedule, so that staff might be offered an opportunity to meet PRG individually, rather than in groups, lest any issue the staff member might wish to raise with PRG be less appropriate in the group setting. This request was readily acceded to, but in fact, no staff took up this opportunity, which was offered to them at the initial general session with staff.

While PRG was happy with the opportunities provided by the timetable, meeting the same individuals on several occasions when different involvements/responsibilities were discussed, was somewhat confusing-and arguably led to a less efficient process. While we appreciate the logistical challenges, we felt that a little more careful consideration of the purpose of the various groupings might have reduced the inevitable redundancy of seeing the same individuals on a number of occasions, and perhaps allowed a little longer to pursue issues with particular groups. PRG wish to note an additional issue with regard to the schedule: the opportunity to meet with undergraduate students. While each was clearly a committed and articulate advocate of the Department, all, we understand, were course representatives, and thus perhaps less representative of the student body as a whole, and especially the far larger Psychological Studies cohort.

These slight cavils aside, PRG were highly impressed with the openness, positivity and generosity with their time of all those we met during our visit. We note particularly the flexibility and commitment demonstrated by senior members of the University executive, administrative staff and heads of other subject areas, throughout the process.

We wish to record our gratitude to each and every one of those involved, and their tolerance when our desire to hear more about the Department did not quite fit within the time available.

## 4. Peer Review Methodology

### 4.1 Site Visit

Throughout, PRG felt it was warmly and openly engaged with, and this greatly facilitated our progress. We also appreciated the convivial evening opportunities to develop a coherent way of working together as a group, and to prepare for the next day's challenging schedule. We wish to record our gratitude for the hospitality we received, the generous commitment of their out-of-office time by Professors Mulkeen and Farrell, and Helen Berry, always unobtrusively ensuring we were free to focus on our review role.

### 4.2 Preparation of the Peer Review Group Report

The Peer Review Group draft report was developed as the site visit proceeded, with opportunities for gaps in meetings used by PRG to discuss and consolidate notes. The chair undertook to summarise these and circulate a draft after the site visit concluded. The exit presentation to staff was also developed collaboratively.

## 5. Overall Assessment

### 5.1 Summary Assessment of the Department

The Peer Review Group felt it would largely endorse the Department's own SWOT as captured in the SAR, although, as outlined below we would also demur somewhat in a number of respects.

We believe that the SAR, and our site visit assured us that there is good evidence for the following **Strengths**:

- An excellent academic staff cohort with a good balance across career stages
- An excellent record of high impact research
- An excellent track record in engaged research
- Comprehensive established international professional networks
- Strong collegiality and a shared 'sense of mission' within the Department
- Strong alignment of departmental priorities with the University Strategic Plan
- Strong record of service to the profession
- Strong interdisciplinarity, both internally to the University and externally

We are less convinced that there is strong evidence of:

- A growing cohort of post-doctoral researchers
  - We met two: one has had a succession of short-term contracts over a very long period of time, but is not permanent; the other was leaving imminently. We understand there are more but the SAR provides less detail of the extent of their roles and the contractual basis of their employment.
- An excellent track record in research post-graduate supervision
  - 50 or so graduating over 20 years is hard to square with this claim, although there is good evidence of a strong current post grad climate
- An established record of excellence in undergraduate education in Psychology

- Formalised assessments of student feedback on provision would benefit from development, refinement and rigorous review, and while the profile of degrees awarded is comparable to elsewhere in the Republic, it is hard to construe this as excellence
- Strong student demand for these programmes
  - We understand that this is 4:1 for the two denominated programmes, which is no higher than for comparable programmes elsewhere
- Interlocking and complimentary department research themes facilitates research focus and depth
  - To be addressed below under 'Identity'
- Good research infrastructure
  - This refers to equipment, presumably, for all areas that require it, which is good. However space is generally of poor quality and dispersed. HoD access to research data from the University seems less than ideal, as is Admin staff having to access such data and to log expenses by using a single personal login.

We believe that the SAR, and our site visit assured us, that there is good evidence for the following **Weaknesses**:

- Challenge of maintaining/achieving Staff: Student Ratios within disciplinary norms for accreditations
  - We are concerned the effective ratio for academic staff engaged in teaching to students is far less favourable than disciplinary norms. We do not consider that the fact that SSRs are higher in other areas of the University is a sufficient response to this.
- Location of Department on more than one site
  - This is a serious weakness, and we are concerned that even the space available is of poor quality; this is especially so for both undergraduate and postgraduate students, and the designated post-grad area which suffers from various environmental challenges
- Management of workload demands
  - there is immense goodwill across the staff, but the system seems to us rather opaque
- Management and consolidation of recent growth
  - This is a severe weakness/challenge. There has been expansion in teaching and research, but a steady state in administrative support for over a decade. Further, the requirement for the HoD to be involved in most matters means the burden of this expansion has fallen very unequally, despite strong support from senior staff.

We are less convinced, or unsure that the following are weaknesses:

- Lack of a comprehensive programme of taught post-graduate provision, including professional training
  - It is unclear to us whether a "comprehensive programme" of PG taught provision is a sensible goal for Maynooth, or any Irish university- to do so would require a vast expansion in staff, competing head-to-head with established programmes (and we are unsure what the evidence for student demand is for such a comprehensive provision). However, we recognise the Department's desire to support the University's Strategic Aim of growing PG numbers, and applaud this- in so far as resources allow.
- Smallest University Psychology Departments on island of Ireland in terms of staffing
  - Size should be determined by goals/purpose/demand; other than with regard to administration it is not clear the Department is under resourced with

regard to staffing the current provision- although given the extent of the growth across all areas of academic endeavour the resources must surely be thinly spread at times, and thus the potential for risk to quality and wellbeing.

- Maintenance of entry standards to undergraduate programmes equivalent to other Irish Universities' Psychology Departments
  - With a demand ratio of 4:1 for the main programmes and less competitive entry to the Psychological Studies programme, we are unsure what this weakness refers to, unless its point is to undermine the claim made above with regard to strengths- strong student demand.

We believe that the SAR, and our site visit assured us that there is good evidence for the following **Opportunities**:

- Strong appetite for development of interdisciplinary masters programmes within the University
  - All of those with whom we spoke were very positive about Psychology's academic citizenry
- Strong reputation of the Department within and external to the University
  - As above, we note also the very positive discussions we had regarding the Department with external stakeholders
- Brexit opens new research collaborative opportunities.
  - Alas this is so.

We believe that the SAR, and our site visit assured us, that there is good evidence for the following **Threats**:

- University procedures and constraints limit potential for new programme development
  - We feel that the wider University is very supportive of Psychology, and its ambitions. Inevitably the fiscal challenges of recent years, and growth across the institution, means support is not always available. However, we wish to note very positive conversations with regard to flexibilities in the University's requirements concerning student feedback, sabbaticals and promotion (discussed below).
- Very low level of exchequer funding available per student continues or deteriorates.
  - A significant problem, but one not peculiar to Maynooth University. Inevitably the sector's response is to reduce reliance on Exchequer funding.
- National Research Prioritisation limits national funding streams available and pertinent to the Department
  - This is a substantial problem, but there is research breadth and a willingness to collaborate beyond disciplinary and institutional boundaries. It would have been interesting to hear which of the Department's research goals are more likely to be challenged by these national priorities, and perhaps to have more explicit engagement/rehearsal of these in relation to the research undertaken and planned.
- Lack of promotion opportunities within the University inhibits staff development and retention
  - This problem is widely recognised across the institution. We understand that another promotions round is imminent, and were reassured by a number of senior University staff that during the last round, none who met the criteria for promotion failed in their promotion bid.

In addition to the above, PRG also has the following SWOT-related observations. Psychology at Maynooth University is a strong, growing, successful and highly collegial body of staff and students at all levels. The spirit and positivity is quite remarkable, and a tribute to

all those in the Department and wider University who, despite severe economic challenges, have continually supported Psychology. In some senses, what PRG has reviewed is a Department in transition. About half of the academic staff are new to the University, and the Department's original, and very specific identity – as specialists in Applied Behaviour Analysis – has undergone a sea-change. Our view of the weaknesses and potential threats may thus seem somewhat unfair. We believe that despite a very strong set of characteristics and personality, the Department currently lacks identity. The Department's admirable commitment to a broad curriculum and desire to support individual staff interests, given its relatively small staff complement, may undermine attempts to develop and sustain a strong sense of identity, and it certainly undermines the potential for developing 'critical mass'. It may be that the proposed MSc programmes will help to concretise its developing identity. However, again, the commitment to working with other disciplines (again commendable), on the frontiers these disciplines share, may itself threaten the development of a strong core academic/research identity. In addition, the excitement around and commitment to further growth will not, in itself, secure future success. It may be that staff, both administrative and academic, will merely be stretched more thinly, to a point which ultimately becomes unsustainable.

## **5.2 Self-Assessment Report**

PRG found the document both accessible and comprehensive, and a compelling blend of commentary and robust statistical analysis. We understand a working group was convened following an open call to all staff, and that the initial preparation of the SAR was the responsibility of this, largely senior staff, group. This draft was circulated to all staff and was discussed at an 'away day' for all staff, and finalised by the drafting group.

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

## **6.1 Overview**

Further to our comments above, PRG wishes to stress the positive engagement both with the QR process, and their own roles, across all of those we met. Our view is that the Strengths, even with our qualifications, far outweigh the Weaknesses, and that the Threats are largely sector-wide, and are tempered by the Opportunities which are largely under local/institutional control.

The Department is well organised, and dynamic, but perhaps this is achieved with a higher burden on particular staff than is appropriate. The University appears very largely enabling and permissive, rather than the source of further challenges. Very positive values are strongly endorsed with regard to teaching, learning and student engagement, but we feel these may be being achieved by, and in some cases are compromised by, the lack of a more



systematic approach, both to the delivery, and the development of those engaged in delivery. Specifically, (1) we feel it is unlikely, even with a more acceptable completion rate, that SELE provides the granularity and quality of feedback to individual lecturers that would enable them to monitor and enhance their teaching; (2) Teaching Assistantships provide a great opportunity for post-graduate students to acquire teaching skills, and for the lecturing staff to share some of the load imposed by seminars and marking. However, we do not feel there is a clear distinction between lectures and the engagement available during seminars, and while TAs are encouraged to take a 5-credit training module provided by the University's Centre for Teaching and Learning, there is no requirement for this to be completed before TAs are required to teach, nor is there any formal monitoring of the quality of their actual teaching as it develops. This poses clear risks to teaching quality, and provides fewer career development opportunities than it might; (3) We understand that seminars are delivered to classes which combine both denominated degree students and Psychological Studies. This seems to us an opportunity missed to address the seminar needs of both sets of students. We also understand, from comments made during our visit, that attendance at seminars is sometimes quite low. It is unclear whether these remarks have substance, and it may be worth more formal monitoring of, and addressing, attendance and student engagement.

More generally, we feel that career development is not as systematically developed as would benefit both the individuals and institution. Specifically, transferrable skills training and opportunities to present their research should be provided for post-graduate students. A sterling attempt is being made to mentor staff, by a single member of academic staff, but it is unclear how structured, or individualised this mentoring is. Opportunities for sabbatical and research breaks are limited, not because there is no University provision (although we note the financial costs to individuals of doing so, and that these may affect individuals and groups of staff very differently), but because it is felt by staff that it would be uncollegial to take up this opportunity. The Department needs to address this and we note the University's flexibility with regard to how informal/local arrangements might be made (consistent with practice elsewhere in the University).

Research interests and achievements of staff are impressively broad. Members of staff have published in leading journals, and the citation rates averaged across papers is consistent with a successful research effort. While the publication record does appear sustained, it is unclear what the relative aggregated contributions are from recently appointed staff and those who have been in post longer. This is an important issue as it may be that staff research carried out elsewhere temporarily inflates the research output and associated citations, and may mask a more challenging internal research environment. Current and secured research income is also somewhat unclear in the SAR: we understand this to be due to the difficulties in accessing such information at institutional level. Even if better quality information was available, the aggregation across recent and long standing staff, is again worthy of close scrutiny. It may be, for example, that the highly impressive recent increases in numbers of research bids may again reflect the activity of recently appointed staff, and is in essence, unsustainable. Finally, the potential value of these bids would also be worth considering as an activity measure.

## 6.2 Commendations

There is no way PRG could adequately convey the positivity we encountered throughout our visit. Maynooth came across as a thriving, exciting and highly collegial institution. We thank those outside Psychology for their time, engagement and forbearance.

The same spirit of joint endeavour and commitment to succeeding was still more evident in Psychology, and the staff as a whole, and particularly the Department's leadership, deserve our most sincere commendation to the effort that goes into developing and maintaining this. Long may it continue.

The Department is well led, by the HOD, and the senior staff team. It is evident that these individuals are fully appreciated, but it would be remiss than to do otherwise than note our sense of this here.

We also note the strong reputation the staff group has built for Psychology across the University, and the evident collegiality across the institution as a whole. This seems to have been enhanced by the establishment of various Research Institutes (e.g. ALL, etc).

It is clear from the students we spoke to that they are very grateful for the educational opportunities Maynooth University affords them, and particularly the openness with which staff engage with them. We note also the respectful way in which the students we met referred to those more academically advanced than they themselves are currently.

## 6.3 Recommendations for Improvement

### Institutional/Strategic Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
S.1	Staffing, especially administration	There was a clear commitment to improving the amount of administrative support available in the previous QR ten years ago. This issue remains unaddressed, despite burgeoning growth since then in all respects. Strengthening administrative support should not be at the cost of academic hiring.
S.2	Staffing: HoD succession	The current Head of Department finishes his term in the next few months. We feel that succession planning, and perhaps a more focused set of HoD expectations, are urgent priorities.
S.3	Students: Student facilities	Facilities for undergraduate students within Psychology are very limited; morale and engagement would benefit greatly from discipline-dedicated facilities.
S.4	Students: Student Feedback/SELE	The Department noted the limitations of SELE as the University's formal mechanism for measuring the student learning experience. The Department's plans to devise and introduce its own annual review are noted, but these may need

		to take cognisance of institutional moves to develop a new scheme.
<b>S.5</b>	Infrastructure: Consolidation (space)	The Department understandably wishes to accommodate its whole staff, postgraduates etc within the same building. We support this request fully- and suggest that a clear plan and timescale for doing so is discussed with Psychology by the University's VP for Estates or equivalent responsible officer.
<b>S.5</b>	Infrastructure: Refurbishment	Various areas, e.g. replacement of Windows 7 PCs in the computer laboratory, seem overdue. Other areas (PG room) would benefit from refurbishment and addressing of smell and noise issues.
<b>S.7</b>	Infrastructure: Resource Allocation Methodology	We note the absence of a formal Research Allocation Methodology. Inevitably such RAMs are less than perfect, but we would urge the University to proceed with haste with the most adequate methodology available.
<b>S.8</b>	Staff well-being: Disincentivising sabbaticals	The external members of PRG were shocked to realise that staff are effectively financially disadvantaged by taking a sabbatical. This exacerbates the challenges for staff with family/caring responsibilities, and we would encourage the University to examine the discriminatory potential of the current scheme and address its shortcomings, not least in

		the context of the University's Athena Swan award and the Department's ambition to apply for Bronze.
<b>S.9</b>	Staff well-being: Promotions delay	We recognise that delays in promotions rounds have complex origins, many outside the institution's control. However, Psychology as a university discipline /profession is thriving in Ireland and staff recruitment and retention is highly competitive. Delays in promotion rounds make these challenges still harder to address.
<b>S.10</b>	Staff well-being: Staff development opportunities	We would encourage the institution to provide more staff development opportunities for staff at all levels. This will not only enhance staff capability, but boost staff retention, and well-being.

### Recommendations to the Department

<b>Number</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Additional PRG Comments</b>
<b>U.1</b>	PhD students	We feel there is substantial opportunity to enhance the experience and future employability of post-graduate research students. This would involve extending the group-based support available to some PhD students to all, increasing the opportunities for PGR students to present their research in the Department, providing effective training in transferrable skills,

<b>U.2</b>	Teaching Assistants, support and training	<p>The Department needs to address issues around the intended purpose, expertise, training and monitoring of Teaching Assistants (see above)</p> <p>It should also address what we see as questionable practice with regard to TA marking assessments which contribute directly to Degree grades, and the support provided for the psychological studies students e.g. mixed tutorial groups.</p>
<b>U.3</b>	Monitoring of teaching quality and student engagement	<p>There appears to be little opportunity for students to feed back individually on the content, quality etc of what they are taught in Lectures and Seminars. There are real benefits both to morale and staff capability to doing this well. We recommend that the Department explores the potential for using systems which work well elsewhere. We believe it would enhance the Department to have more opportunities than twice yearly meetings to ‘hear’ more of the student voice, and perhaps work towards the more ‘partnership’ approach adopted in other HE institutions.</p>
<b>U.4</b>	Coursework submission procedures	<p>We were surprised to learn that course work is submitted in hard copy, having been electronically submitted to Turnitin. Electronic submission, marking and feedback would reward the efforts involved of students and staff- and reduce an unnecessary administrative load.</p>
<b>U.5</b>	Research breath, critical mass and strategic direction	<p>The panel were very impressed by Psychology at Maynooth University, across the breadth of its involvements. However, we</p>

		feel that the Department lacks a clear, coherent psychological identity (see above).
<b>U.6</b>	Departmental identity and Masters opportunities	We commend the Department's desire to engage with the University priority to extend its PGT provision, and note the plans to develop three Masters in collaboration with other disciplines across the University. We would encourage caution in pursuing this ambition, because of its potential to support or dilute the Department's developing identity, and encourage Psychology to develop and introduce these in stages, so that resources are not spread still more thinly, and the development and delivery of subsequent courses may gain from the experiences of those that went before.
<b>U.7</b>	Collegial support for 'sabbatical' relief	We encourage the Department to actively plan how it might make sabbatical research leave both more attractive, and feasible, for all members of academic staff. We note the University's flexibility with regard to consolidating teaching, temporary covering of responsibilities by colleagues for each other, etc.
<b>U.8</b>	Management of workload model/explicitness and flexibility	We note the staff's satisfaction with workload allocation, but remain unsure as to how it operates, its explicitness, and ability to cope with increasing demand, other than by relying on the goodwill of staff. Workload management would also, ideally, consider opportunities for Departmental responsibilities to change, facilitate brief research leave/ sabbatical cover, etc.

**APPENDIX 1: PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT: PEER REVIEW GROUP SITE VISIT TIMETABLE**

<b>Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> March 2019</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Venue</b>
19:00	<p>Convening of the Peer Review Group.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Dinner for members of the Peer Review Group and Director for Strategy &amp; Quality &amp; University Executive Member</p>	<p>Booked Carton House Hotel at 7pm for 6 people under the name Mulkeen</p> <p>Aidan Mulkeen Ronan Farrell John Groeger Melanie Giles Claire Hamilton Stephen O'Neill</p>
<b>Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> March 2019</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Venue</b>
8:30- 9.00	Convening of Peer Review Group	Council Room
9.00-9.45	Professor Andrew Coogan, Head of Department	Council Room
9.45 -10.30	Group meeting with all Department staff (Head of Department recused)	Council Room
10.30-11.30	Tour of facilities of Department & Refreshments escorted by HOD	Department
11:30 -12.00	<p><b>Staff Group 1 Lecturers</b></p> <p>Dr Laura Coffey, Lecturer Dr Seán Commins, Senior Lecturer Dr Michael Cooke, Lecturer Dr Michael Daly, Senior Lecturer Dr Deirdre Desmond, Senior Lecturer Dr Philip Hyland, Senior, Lecturer Dr Rebecca Maguire, Lecturer Professor Sinéad McGilloway, Professor, Founder Director of CMHCR Professor Malcolm "Mac" MacLachlan, Professor, Director ALL Institute. Dr Carol Murphy, Lecturer</p>	Council Room



	Dr Brenda O'Connell, Lecturer Dr Unai Diaz-Orueta, Lecturer Dr Bryan Roche, Senior Lecturer	
12:00-12.30	<b>Staff Group 2 Administration &amp; Technical</b>  Mrs Anne Dooley, Senior Executive Assistant Mrs Caroline Edwards, Executive Assistant Ms Hilary Hooks, Administrative Officer ( ALL Institute) Mrs Victoria Thompson, Senior Executive Assistant Mr Derek Walsh, Senior Technician	Council Room
12.30-13.00	<b>Staff Group 3 Post-docs and Research Staff</b>  Ms Yvonne Leckey Ms Joanne McVeigh	Council Room
13.00 -14:00	Working Lunch	Reserved Pugin Hall/ Table with service for Quality/4 people
14:00 -14:45  14.45.-15.30	<b>Meet with Students:</b>  Undergraduate Students (7)  Postgraduate Students (6)	Council Room
15.30-16.00	<b>Staff Group 4 Academic Programme Directors and Year Managers</b>  Dr Deirdre Desmond, BA Psychology Programme Manager / Post-graduate Co-ordinator Dr Seán Commins, BSc Psychology Programme Manager & Final Year Manager Dr Bryan Roche, BA Double Major Psychological Studies Manager Dr Brenda O'Connell, Year 1 Manager Dr Rebecca Maguire,, Work Placement Manager Dr Unai Diaz-Orueta, International Co-ordinator	Council Room
16.00-16:30	Break	Council Room

16.30-17.00	<b>Meeting with University Executive Members</b> Professor Aidan Mulkeen, VP Academic & Registrar Professor Ray O’Neill, VP Research	Council Room
17.10-17.20	<b>External Stakeholder Phonecall</b> Ms. Terri Morrissey, CEO Psychological Society of Ireland	Council Room
17:20-18.00	PRG meeting – identification of any areas for clarification and finalisation of tasks for following day	Council Room
19.00	PRG private working dinner	<b>Booked Carton House Hotel at 7.00pm for 4 people under the name O’Neill</b>

Thursday 28 <sup>th</sup> March 2019		
Time	Description	Venue
9:00-9:30	Convening of Peer Review Group	Council Room
9.30-10.00	Professor Ronan Farrell, Faculty Dean	Council Room
10.00-10.30	<b>Meeting with other Administrative Staff</b>  Mr Peter Miller, Senior HR Manager Dr John McGinnity, Assistant Registrar Ms Catherine O'Brien, Examinations & Timetabling	Council Room
10.30-11.00	<b>Staff Group 5 Academic Staff appointed in last 3 years</b> Dr Laura Coffey, Lecturer Dr Michael Cooke, Lecturer Dr Michael Daly, Senior Lecturer Dr Philip Hyland, Senior Lecturer Dr Rebecca Maguire, Lecturer Professor Malcolm "Mac" MacLachlan, Director ALL Institute Dr Brenda O'Connell, Lecturer Dr Unai Diaz-Orueta, Lecturer	Council Room
11.00-11.30	Refreshments	Council Room
11.30-12.00	<b>Staff Group 6 Teaching Assistants</b> Mr Leo Carroll Mr Michael Cleary-Gaffney Mr Keith O'Donnell Ms Sudha Raman Ms Chiara Seery Ms Rachel Kelly	Council Room
12.00-12.30	<b>Staff Group 7 Strategic Leaders and Future Directions</b>  Professor Andrew Coogan (HoD) Professor Mac MacLachlan (Director ALL Institute, Chair Dept. Research Committee) Professor Sinead McGilloway (Director CMHCR) Dr Deirdre Desmond (Chair T&L Committee)	Council Room
12.30-13.00	<b>Meeting with other Heads of Department</b> Professor David Prendergast, HoD Design Innovation  Professor Stephen Buckley, HOD Maths & Stats	Council Room

13:00-14:00	Working Lunch	Pugin Hall/Reserved Table with service for Quality, 4 people
14.10-14.20	<b>External Stakeholder Phonecall</b>  Professor John McDermott, Connolly Hospital, Blanchardstown	
14:20-16:30	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