



**Maynooth  
University**  
National University  
of Ireland Maynooth

Ollscoil Mhá Nuad

**Maynooth University**

## **QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND ASSURANCE**

### **PEER REVIEW GROUP – FINAL REPORT**

***HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT***

**ACADEMIC YEAR 2016**

Confidential

Date: 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2017

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Peer Review Group Members .....	3
3. Timetable of the Site Visit .....	3
4. Peer Review Methodology .....	4
4.1 Site Visit.....	4
4.2 Peer Review Group Report.....	4
5. Overall Assessment .....	4
5.1 Summary Assessment of the Present State of the Unit.....	4
5.2 Self-Assessment Report.....	4
6. Findings of the Peer Review Group: Commendations and Recommendations .....	5
6.1 Overview.....	5
6.2 Commendations .....	5
6.3 Recommendations for Improvement.....	7
<b>Strategic Recommendations</b> .....	7
Whole of Unit Recommendations.....	11
Sub Unit Recommendations.....	18
Appendix 1.....	20

## 1. Introduction

The Peer Review of the Human Resources Department took place on 15 and 16 September 2016. The Human Resources (HR) function at Maynooth University (MU) is responsible for the provision of recruitment and the resourcing of contract management support, employee relations, employee development, employee wellbeing, equality & diversity, workforce planning and general human resources advice, support and associated administrative services.

In addition, the HR department fulfils a governance and legislative compliance role on behalf of MU in accordance with national obligations and is expected to maintain effective working relationships with a range of other external stakeholders. The HR team has gone through a period of transformation and significant restructuring aligned with the rapid growth of MU. The institution has seen a substantial rise in student numbers and, in anticipation of further growth and development in the region of some 25% over the course of the next five years, is engaged in an ambitious infrastructure development programme. This has taken place against a backdrop of a challenging economic landscape with consequential austerity measures in the form of a series of budgetary and demographic interventions in the context of a regulatory framework within which institutions are required to operate. The impact of this background on the HR function, in terms of associated demands and implications, is significant.

## 2. Peer Review Group Members

Name	Affiliation	Role
<b>Ms Christine Barr</b>	University of Glasgow	Director of Human Resources
<b>Mr Tony McMahon</b>	Trinity College Dublin	Director of Diversity and Inclusion
<b>Mr Cathal McCauley</b>	Maynooth University	University Librarian
<b>Professor Fiona M. Palmer</b>	Maynooth University	Music Department

## 3. Timetable of the Site Visit

The timetable for the visit is attached as Appendix 1. While the timetable generally proved to be comprehensive and effective in providing an overview of the various interfaces and relationships within and outside the service, some amendment was required to ensure that additional time with the Director of HR was included to explore a range of issues of interest

to the review panel (PRG). We are grateful to the Director and the staff within the Quality Assurance Office for making this adjustment possible.

## **4. Peer Review Methodology**

### **4.1 Site Visit**

The majority of the consultations took place in one of two meeting rooms, the PRG also visited the HR offices in the course of the review. Although the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) was informative and thorough, the discussions made possible by the site visit were an invaluable part of the process. The PRG is grateful to all of the stakeholders, internal and external, that contributed to the site visit.

### **4.2 Peer Review Group Report**

The PRG report was jointly written by all members of the PRG. Following the recording of the many insights, observations and comments of all of the PRG members, the external members commenced the process and the internal members contributed to the first draft. The final draft was sent to the Director of HR for factual corrections prior to the submission of this report.

## **5. Overall Assessment**

### **5.1 Summary Assessment of the Present State of the Unit**

We have sought in our recommendations to reflect the significant progress made by the University and the HR team in a very challenging environment in recent years, while also making a range of practical suggestions for both the University and the HR Department itself that will help it to deliver and perform at the required level. Where relevant, we have pointed towards possible new opportunities and/or approaches.

In making suggestions for change, we do so from a position that recognises the current trajectory of the University and the HR Department, and which seeks to support that critical journey. Our report details our findings in general terms in section 6.3, which form the basis of a set of specific recommendations under the relevant headings.

### **5.2 Self-Assessment Report**

The SAR prepared for the quality review process provided an extremely comprehensive and competent analysis of the current capability and capacity of the function and involved all members of the HR team in its compilation. In addition, where in the course of discussion during the site visit we felt that we would like further information e.g. the extent of internal HR Department senior management oversight, Core Upgrade project plans, etc.) appropriate and informative documentation was provided promptly.

Credit is due to all concerned for the progressive improvements made across the service in the recent past in a professionally challenging environment, invigorated by the strength of the strategic support and endorsement by the University Executive.

The Director of Human Resources is a key member of the University Executive and therefore instrumental to institutional decision making and the subsequent shaping of the institution's strategic plan, thereby strengthening the position and ability of the HR function to develop the People & Development Strategy aligned with the strategic ambitions of the University.

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

### **6.1 Overview**

Our overall assessment is that the MU HR function comprises a committed and dedicated team, operating in a complex and challenging environment who, with the active sponsorship of the University Executive, have embarked on a transformational journey in support of the strategic objectives of MU, and who are making significant progress in that regard.

In summary, based on our analysis of the SAR, our site visit (which provided the opportunity for our direct engagement with all stakeholders), and our own reflections and discussion, we are satisfied in relation to the quality of service provided by the MU HR function. We deal with this in further detail in the later sections of the report.

In forming our views in relation to HR service quality and best practice, we are acutely aware of the importance of context. In this regard, the PRG have identified a number of factors, both internal and external, which provide very relevant context within which the MU HR function operates:

1. The University is undergoing a rapid expansion and development phase, with the objective of 25% growth over 5 years.
2. The HR Department is evolving (as evidenced by recent growth) and scaling up on the journey in the effective provision of a broader range of people management services and supports to the MU community. We are therefore reviewing a relatively new team undertaking new roles.
3. Rapid cultural and technological change is impacting on how MU engages with key stakeholders, and how HR in turn serves the MU community.
4. The sector generally, and the downturn in public finances in particular, presents a very challenging operating environment and regulatory framework.
5. The team experiences increasing user expectations and in that context must embrace a service culture.

### **6.2 Commendations**

Our assessment of the team and that of the service they provide is very positive as referenced in Section 5 above. It is noteworthy that the MU Quality Assurance process provides the opportunity to comment on that which is working well, and that which is considered to be exemplary. In this context the issues which we wish to highlight in our Commendations are:

- Engagement with the Quality Assurance process, as evidenced by :-
  - Comprehensive SAR and SWOT - our thanks to all staff who contributed.
  - Strong evidence of self-reflection and commitment while balancing service continuity and the development of new objectives and implementation of the broader strategic agenda.
- Consistent with the findings of the internal stakeholder Focus Groups, we were impressed by the enthusiasm, energy, professionalism and dedication of staff.
- There were many positives in terms of progress in operational effectiveness and efficiency, with demonstrable evidence of the streamlining of processes.
- We saw evidence of increasingly user-centric service provision, which is vital for the future mission of the Department.
- We were particularly impressed with the level of HR leadership and the way that it has fully embraced considerable challenges and driven change whilst maintaining and taking due cognisance of the interests of the team and its development.
- We found there to be a good mix, balance and cohesion in the team, and the strategy of establishing and growing the team is working well. Everyone's contribution appears to be valued.

Further, there was substantial evidence of mutually supportive working relationships across the Department. For example, progress on the gender equality agenda in relation to the gender composition of Selection Committees in recruitment required different 'units' within the Department to work together.

- In relation to stakeholder engagement, we noted an acknowledgement across the University of tangible progress, as well as broad support and discernible evidence of effective relationships having been established with stakeholders
- The level of trust and confidence in the function by the UE was palpable and clearly apparent to the PRG, and perhaps most significantly, this was judged on the basis of senior management commitment to the achievement of medium term goals rather than instant gains.
- Overall, we felt that there was clear alignment with and to operational priorities, and considered the Department to be very much on the right track on their journey towards a fully functioning and highly effective HR outfit.
- There was demonstrable evidence of sound strategic thinking in centres of expertise e.g. Employee Relations and Equality strategies, draft Employee Development strategy, etc.

## 6.3 Recommendations for Improvement

### Strategic Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
S.1	<p>HR Strategy Development</p> <p>The PRG is clear that the strategic positioning of the HR function has not featured or figured prominently over more pressing operational requirements in the recent past. This must now take precedence through the development and implementation of a HR strategy and associated deliverables aligned with MU's Strategic Plan. This will enable the senior HR strategic team to truly 'add value' and capitalise on their position of strength and sphere of influence with UE in contributing to shaping and delivering the 'people' driven goals and ambitions of the University. There is already a stated commitment to developing such a strategy with a series of key strategic themes. It is imperative that these are taken forward forthwith. The PRG recommend: -</p> <p>Development of an HR Strategy which sets out and strategically positions and prioritises a number of key people themes aligned with and to the delivery and ambitions of MU Strategic Plan and organisational goals is an essential requirement for MU at this point.</p> <p>This should include: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Attracting &amp; retaining high-quality talent</li><li>b. Driving high performance &amp; talent management culture enabling workforce &amp; succession planning</li></ul>	<p>The PRG acknowledges, both from the SAR and stakeholder feedback, that the HR Department has necessarily until now had to prioritise operational requirements and service provision over the strategic positioning of the function. Significant progress has been made in the recent past to enhance the service delivery of the function in a flexible, sustainable and responsive fashion. It is key that the focus shifts to the strategic development and delivery of the function in support of University plans.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Building leadership capacity &amp; career &amp; capability development.</li> <li>d. Rewarding excellence through transparent &amp; equitable recognition and reward structures.</li> <li>e. Enhancing equality &amp; inclusion agenda through achievement of institutional performance metrics/KPIs as measured through appropriate benchmarking.</li> <li>f. Maximising staff engagement &amp; empowerment in facilitating change to deliver creative, efficient and flexible service solutions through collaborative working.</li> </ul>	<p>Comprehensive induction &amp; effective training and development were recurring themes and featured most strongly from focus group discussions.</p>
<p><b>S.2</b></p>	<p><b>HR Operating Model and Resourcing</b></p> <p>Delivering essential ‘business as usual’ operational requirements and service delivery as outlined in 6.1, has involved the full HR team operating in a holistic and multi-faceted way in which flexibility, versatility and extensive application of transferrable skills has proven to be key, largely resulting in highly positive feedback. However, as the function has grown organically, specialists have begun to evolve or be recruited into roles. There can be a lack of clarity for some stakeholders with whom the service interfaces in such an operating model. While it is recognised that the introduction of a more effective operating model is required, it may also bring additional resource implications. The PRG recommends that the business operating model is reviewed with a view to implementing a revised approach that is most suited to the needs of MU. The PRG considers the following issues to be central to such a review:</p>	<p>There is window of opportunity for the function given the evident level of confidence, and the continuing investment and support of the University Executive (and Governing Authority) in the context of its alignment and contribution to the University’s strategic direction and delivery of its goals. The Department can play an instrumental role in so doing and it should capitalise upon this at this juncture. This could be a key and critical measure of success in any cost/benefit analysis of the function in the fullness of time. There may however be resource implications in so doing.</p>



	<p>Determine and introduce an appropriate relationship management model in consultation with UE and other key stakeholders i.e. strategic business partnering, territory related responsibility or alternative variation on this theme, to stabilise and manage client expectations in relation to minimal ‘business as usual’ or service level standards.</p> <p>There is a balance to be struck between delivering the strategic ‘transformational’ remit and the operational ‘transactional’ role of the HR function. Demonstrating that the function can effectively deliver and ‘add value’ through the pragmatic application of a theoretical model (e.g. Ulrich) and implementing such a hybrid approach, thereby displaying ‘best practice’ in the provision of a streamlined and efficient transactional service in addition to an embedded ‘strategic business partner’ and transformational approach will be critical to its ongoing and future success.</p> <p>Pre-determined SLAs or alternative service delivery measures and associated metrics/benchmarking with other HEIs/organisations can be applied to measure and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of this service delivery model.</p>	
<p><b>S.3</b></p>	<p><b>People Management</b></p> <p>The effective management of that most critical resource of a University, its people, is a responsibility that rests, not solely with the HR function, but is shared with senior and mid-level leadership, and other stakeholders throughout the institution. The effective UE support for HR, which we alluded to in section 5.2 is very important in this regard, however, developing and implementing the policies and processes that support line managers in their</p>	

people management functions is a key strategic function and responsibility of the HR Department.

In this context, the following specific actions should be addressed

- a. In response to a certain frustration expressed by Heads of academic departments in relation to a number of critical HR functions and processes across the University (e.g. Staff promotions and post requisitions) the HR Department should ensure that (1) the relevant processes are clearly communicated to key stakeholders, and (2) that they are proactive in reporting on status to key stakeholders. The issue of HR policies, processes and administration is considered in more specific detail in section U.4 below.
- b. To ensure that the cadre of academic talent throughout the University achieves its optimal potential, HR needs to develop a clear vision and model for Academic leadership, addressing, for example, structures, roles and effective supports mechanisms, ideally prior to assuming such responsibility as well as throughout its duration and beyond e.g. headship. At a minimum, provision of clear job/role descriptions and an induction programme for new Heads, as well as administrative & associated budgetary support to deliver an ambitious leadership development programme.
- c. Noting the planned review of administrative posts following the current promotional round, we recommend that this process be seen through, and the outcomes used to inform the talent management and retention strategy.

The PRG is aware that MU has participated in a national sectoral project in relation to academic leadership and development, and the outputs and findings from this project can be leveraged to fulfil this recommendation.

	<p>d. Further to (a.) above, in relation to academic promotions, while noting that execution of the process is not the sole preserve of HR, we recommend that HR must ensure certain process standards, e.g. ensure the adoption and communication of clear criteria as well as a realistic and clearly communicated timeline, including timely communication of amendments and the causes for delays if and when they may arise. HR should also ensure gender proofing of promotions processes and monitor gender outcomes.</p> <p>e. Employee relations – Heads would benefit from an introduction to the HR function, and ‘where to’ and ‘how to’ guides re: the services/support available from HR with appropriate showcasing or storytelling to ensure full socialisation of these procedures/practices. Support to line management in dealing with interpersonal disputes and complaints can be addressed through the relationship management model proposed at S.2 above. A formal presentation to key stakeholders (including Trade Union representatives) on the HR Strategy, including HR Structures would be beneficial once the strategy is finalised.</p>	
--	---	--

### Whole of Unit Recommendations

Number	Recommendation	Additional PRG Comments
U.1	<p><b>HRIS Project</b></p> <p>The investment in the CoreHR Upgrade project has transformative potential for service efficiency and strategic HR management information and reporting. To</p>	

maximise MU's return on investment in HRIS, the following measures are recommended as critical enablers of successful project implementation.

- a. Change Management - to ensure continued stakeholder engagement and buy in, a communications and engagement strategy for the project is recommended.
- b. Ownership and expertise - a dedicated HRIS owner should be appointed. The core purpose of the role will be to ensure that the focus on data quality and efficient business processes is maintained, and the full functional capacity of the system is fully exploited on an ongoing basis.
- c. Benefits Realisation – we recommend a clear programme to realise the benefits from the University's investment in the project should be developed and implemented as a priority.
- d. Consistent with Recommendations S.1 and S.2 above, HR should take a strategic approach to the consideration of what value-added services and supports HR can provide following the successful automaton of existing time-intensive administrative tasks.

For example, Recruitment is seen as a key strategic priority for MU, yet the current recruitment operation is described in administrative terms, and the core process is manual and labour intensive. Exploitation of HRIS capability will provide the basis to transform the administrative processes and free up HR resources to provide strategic input to recruitment and resourcing.

Stakeholders were in general supportive of the Core Project but some voiced concerns that the good elements of the existing approach to some areas might be lost following the launch of the system e.g. a number of departments are dependent on occasional pay models for tutoring, teaching practice, research assistance etc. HR should work with these stakeholders to demonstrate how their needs can be accommodated within the new systems

	<p>e. Maximising functionality of CoreHR to increase process efficiency to deliver benefits &amp; enhance system effectiveness &amp; coherent reporting mechanisms at enterprise and unitary levels</p>	
<p><b>U.2</b></p>	<p><b>Performance Management</b></p> <p>MU is clearly on an upwards trajectory in which strategic performance management will be fundamental to the next stage of its journey in the achievement of its strategic goals. The PRG noted that there is not currently a comprehensive or consistent approach to performance management through which strategic HR management, working together with academic and professional service heads, can enable and maximise performance whereby all employees understand their job and the contribution of their roles in delivery of the ‘big picture’. The following measures are recommended:</p> <p>a. Design &amp; introduction of a ‘fit for purpose’ Performance &amp; Development Review or Performance Management mechanism for all staff in which individual development and career aspirations are supported and aligned with MU strategic goals and KPIs.</p> <p>b. Inclusion of objective setting aligned with individual, unit and institutional objectives with regular interim reviews on progress. The nature of these will necessarily be different dependent upon the nature of job roles i.e. academic &amp; professional services - research, teaching, KE or alternatively effective service delivery facilitating academic endeavour</p>	<p>The desire for a revised &amp; strategically aligned approach to performance management was strongly advocated by UE and supported by the trade unions in which opportunities for personal development &amp; career progression for both academic and professional (support) services staff are maximised.</p> <p>Employee &amp; leadership development will require financial investment and sufficient resourcing from the outset, coupled with recurring budgetary provision to deliver the requisite learning &amp; development and associated career development of desired outcomes on an annual basis.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Implementation of an associated development infra-structure to enable and facilitate employee and line manager learning and development, and to support the longer term development of career paths for diverse groups of staff. This should encompass the creation of a range of staff development opportunities to enhance staff mobility within and outside employing department/university for development purposes i.e. secondments, job shadowing, 'a day in the life of' type scenarios, showcasing good practice and organisational wide dissemination of 'how to guides', etc.</li> <li>d. Outputs from the regular, ideally annual, performance management process should inform future decision making as it relates to recognising exceptional contribution and performance of staff via the relevant recognition and reward policies and schemes highlighted in recommendation S.1 d. above.</li> <li>e. Mechanisms to be put in place to manage those situations where there is a lack of evidence of performance or strength of delivery for particular individuals within their remits/areas of responsibility, in order for steps to be taken to appropriately manage the level of performance accordingly or to pursue alternative courses of action.</li> </ul>	
<b>U.3</b>	<p><b>Organisational Development</b></p> <p>Implementation of an OD model in due course as part of the longer term evolution (over revolution) of the function will be instrumental to delivering the</p>	<p>Organisational Development is a planned, systematic approach to improving organisational</p>

requisite cultural transformation at MU. Improving business efficiency and facilitating organisational change will be essential to MU realising its ambitions and will necessarily include meaningfully engaging and empowering staff as expectations are effectively managed & internal communication mechanisms enhanced.

The focus of any such activity will be driven by strategic imperatives assisted by the implementation of multiple initiatives:

- Establishment of a regular Service Head forum consistent with academic head equivalent.
- Regular staff engagement or employee opinion surveys i.e. biennially as an effective temperature check
- Short or longer life working groups to lead key projects with associated support team(s) and resource planning e.g. HRS4R & Athena SWAN accreditation.
- Utilising multimedia approaches to enhance 'bottom-up' & regular two-way communication
- Regular 'face –to- face' topical engagement events to enhance leadership visibility
- Nudge campaigns on mutually beneficial topics i.e. minimising e-mail, etc.
- Raising awareness of topical issues e.g. Promoting Healthy Working Lives; Management of Stress in the Workplace; Dignity at Work, etc.
- Focus on health & wellbeing, work life balance, etc.
- Learning & development opportunities

effectiveness – one that aligns strategy, people and processes to achieve desired goals of high performance and competitive advantage.

This may be a longer term objective influenced by the ongoing evolution, future direction and maturity of MU whereby its organisational, people and processes are fully aligned and integrated.

<p><b>U.4</b></p>	<p><b>HR Policies, Processes and Administration</b></p> <p>a. Streamlining of processes. Continue this process, and move on to focus on the added value. As recommended in U.1.d in relation to recruitment, HR in consultation with hiring managers need to consider where HR can bring added value to recruitment plans and processes, in addition to process efficiency &amp; consistency of service provision.</p> <p>b. Induction – the annual programme is impressive, but had not yet been run for the new recruits whom we met. In addition, the HR support for a seamless on boarding process (from initial induction through probation management) is not currently offered, and this would be an essential aspect of the talent management strategy. This is particularly important in supporting early career academics, through the new/proposed tenure track process. Interim and immediate options could be to produce induction checklists, and new recruit information packs, which would include appropriate guides from other support service areas, in particular from IT, and Facilities (thereby streamlining the bureaucracy surrounding access to IT account/Access Card, etc.) The induction of temporary staff should also be mandatory and standardized, drawing on systems and information packs supplied for new recruits on permanent contracts. The approach to probation would also benefit from being similarly standardised and codified.</p> <p>c. Post requisitions – the overarching approach and process for post requisitions/approvals needs to be considered in the context of the</p>	



	<p>ongoing development of workforce and financial planning. Delegation of authority from the UE should be considered to streamline the process. Transparency of decision making should be an underlying principle, HR should explore options to ensure that they can manage a consistent university wide approach to determining job size (building on the proposed job evaluation work may provide methodologies to facilitate this). A more developed MU approach to work force planning would be helpful in this regard.</p> <p>d. Policy Base and HR Governance – the governance structures for HR as represented through the GA Committee structure have been changed recently, and HR should meet with/work with the GA Committee to agree a modus operandi and work programme, which clarifies the respective executive and governance roles of the HR Department and the GA Committee.</p>	<p>The key objective of this recommendation is to ensure that the programme of HR policy development and implementation continues in a planned and structured way, enabling full and effective consultation and communication with relevant stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>U.5</b></p>	<p><b>Employee Engagement</b></p> <p>Consistent with the recommendations outlined in U.3. above in relation to engaging, involving and empowering staff:-</p> <p>a. Partnership – the PRG were impressed with the Partnership Committee structure as a potentially valuable communications forum. The University should consider options to further promote its activities and outputs.</p> <p>b. In relation to employee engagement and benchmarking/comparative analysis with other HEIs, MU should consider a form of staff survey.</p>	

	<b>Sub Unit Recommendations</b>	
<b>U.6</b>	<p><b>a. Pensions</b></p> <p>Whilst recognising that the Pension function does not have a reporting relationship to the Human Resource Office, we noted from our discussion with the Pension Officer that the current arrangements for provision of pensions administration and pensions expertise are somewhat tenuous. On that basis, we recommend that the University must proactively consider and determine where the service should be housed within the MU Organisational structure (or otherwise), and associated resourcing. This is essential to ensure compliance with obligatory legislative parameters, and broader engagement with staff/service recipients as appropriate.</p> <p><b>b. Research</b></p> <p>Noting the positive stakeholder commentary on the current relationship arrangements with the Research community, a strategy that specifically sets out how HR can work with other partners (Research Office, Research Administration, Bursars’ Office and Library) would be helpful in addressing MU’s objectives in this key area.</p> <p><b>c. Mediation</b></p> <p>The PRG notes that MU has a dedicated in-house mediation service, that operates independent of Human Resources, but which provides a complementary service.</p>	

The PRG did not hear a strong case for examination of the positioning of this service put forward by any party, however, the availability of this service should be communicated clearly to the MU community, as well as where use of mediation is positioned with the standard set of agreed Employee Relations policies and procedures.

**d. Physical Infrastructure**

The PRG noted that the current space allocation to Human Resources has certain limitations, principally around waiting room and/or private consultation space for staff visitors, as well as sound proofing/confidentiality issues surrounding the logistics of the interview location. While we are reluctant to embark on suggesting piecemeal solutions outside of our areas of expertise, we recommend that the HR team investigate the feasibility of implementing a Document Management System (DMS) for HR records. This may free up additional consultation/work space in the current filing room, as well as making records access and management more efficient.

## Appendix 1

### Quality Review Human Resources Department

#### Schedule 14<sup>th</sup> September 2016

TIME		PURPOSE	VENUE	PRESENT
8.45 – 9.45	Welcome and briefing	Discuss quality review process, timetable, logistical issues, paperwork and other relevant matters.	Council Room	Review Panel Jim Walsh/VP for Strategy & Quality
9.45 -10.15	Private meeting of peer review group		Council Room	Review Panel
10.15- 11.00	Peer Review Group meeting with Director of HR and Coordinator of SAR	Discuss the strategic role of HR in relation to the University's Strategic Plan Overview of SAR .	Council Room	Review Panel Rosaleen McCarthy/HR Director Peter Miller/Senior HR Manager
11.00 -11.15	Tea/ coffee			
11.15 – 11.45	Peer Review Group meeting with all staff in HR Department	Introduction to all staff, discussion of expectations from the review.	Council Room	Review Panel Rosaleen McCarthy/HR Director Peter Miller/Senior HR Manager Amanda Manley/Employee Relations Manager Anne Marie Parkes/Admin Deirdre Boyle/Admin Eimear Wilkinson/Admin Emmet O'Conaill/CoreHR Project Manager Frances Kiely/Admin Mark Leonard/Admin Mary Corcoran/Admin Rachel Masterson/Admin Sue Crofton/Admin

				Triona Shovlin/Admin
11.45 – 12.15	Meeting on the general HR Service	Explore the day-to-day HR service delivery. Interaction with staff in general.	Council Room	Review Panel Peter Miller/Senior HR Manager Frances Kiely/Admin Ann Marie Parkes/Admin Triona Shovlin/Admin
12.15-12.45	Meeting on the Core Upgrade	Review the Core Upgrade project - key implementation and service delivery enhancements.	Council Room	Review Panel Emmet O’Conaill/CoreHR Project Manager Sue Crofton/Admin Deirdre Boyle/Admin
12.45-13.15	Meeting on Employee Development and Training delivery	Discuss the development and training interventions that are in place for staff.	Council Room	Review Panel Rosaleen McCarthy/HR Director Amanda Manley/Employee Relations Manager Ann Marie Parkes/Admin Frances Kiely/Admin Eimear Wilkinson/Admin
13.15 -14.30	Lunch		Pugin/Reserved table for 5	Review Panel Jim Walsh (if required)
14.30 - 15.00	Meeting Employee Relations and Equality issues	Review the Employee Relations and Equality Strategy and Services to the University.	Council Room	Review Panel Rosaleen McCarthy/HR Director Amanda Manley/Employee Relations Manager Eimear Wilkinson/Admin
15.00 – 15.30	Meeting on Recruitment and Selection and Contract Management	Review the recruitment and selection processes and contract management.	Council Room	Review Panel Peter Miller/Senior HR Manager Sue Crofton/Admin Mary Corcoran/Admin Frances Kiely/Admin Deirdre Boyle/Admin Mark Leonard/Admin

				Rachel Masterson/Admin
15.30 – 16.00	Meeting on Statutory Reporting and Data requirements	Review the range of Reporting and Data Metrics provided internally and externally.	Council Room	Review Panel Rosaleen McCarthy/HR Director Eimear Wilkinson/Admin Sue Crofton/Admin
16.00 – 16.15	Tea / Coffee			
16.15 -16.45	Meeting with Faculty Heads of Department/nominees	Review the staff planning and approval processes, and other operational matters relevant to Heads of Depts .	Council Room	Review Panel Colin Graham/English Dept Arnd Witte/German Dept Michael Doherty/Law Dept Joseph Coughlan/School of Business Gerry Kearns/Geography Dept John Stephens/Chemistry Dept
16.45 - 17.15	Meeting with members of former HRSDE committee	Consider effectiveness of University governance arrangements re HR functions	Council Room	Bernard Mahon/VP Research Mike O'Malley/Bursar Aidan Mulkeen, Deputy President & VP Academic Affairs Fiona Lyddy/Dean Science & Engineering Mark Boyle/NIRSA Paula Murray/Placement Office James Cotter/Computer Science
17.15 -17.45	Meeting with members of the University Executive	Consider how effectively HR Office enables the University to achieve its strategic goals	Council Room	Review Panel Aidan Mulkeen, Deputy President & VP Academic Affairs Ray O'Neill/VP Innovation Mike O'Malley/Bursar Bernard Mahon/VP Research Fiona Lyddy/Dean Science & Engineering

**Quality Review Human Resources Department  
15<sup>th</sup> September 2016**

9.00 - 9.15	Meeting with VP Strategy and Quality	Review progress, identify any operational matters requiring attention	Council Room	Review team and Jim Walsh
9.15 – 9.45	Meeting with recently recruited staff in both academic and other areas	Consider user perspectives on Recruitment, Contracts and induction	Council Room	Review Team Sabrina Barrett/Student Services Gary Grant/Bursars Office Iain McCurdy/Music Dept John Coll/Geography David Conlon/Spanish Mary Larkin/Alumni
9.45 – 10.15	Meeting with staff in Finance Office, IT Services, Pensions	Consider effectiveness of procedures for information sharing and collaboration	Council Room	Review Team Willie Cannon/Finance Cheryl Forde/Research Admin Jane Corcoran/Finance Mark Martin/IT Services Mary Kelly/Pensions
10.15-10.40 (a)	Meeting with HR service users in Library, Student Services and Institutional Research	Consider effectiveness of processes for sharing data	Council Room	1 Internal Reviewer 1 External Reviewer Laura McElwain/Institutional Research Niamh Lynch/Student Services Helen Fallon/Library
10.15-10.40 (b)	Meeting with Partnership Committee	Consider role and effectiveness of the Partnership Committee	Presidents Boardroom	1 Internal Reviewer 1 External Reviewer Ann Donoghue/History Michael Rafter/Campus Services Mick Bolger/Geography Saranne Magennis/Higher Education Policy Unit
10.40 – 11.00	Meeting with HR Director		Council Room	Review Team

				HR Director
11.05 -11.30 (a)	Meeting with Third Party representatives	Consider effectiveness of relationships with third party representatives	Council Room	1 Internal Reviewer 1 External Reviewer James Cotter/Comp Science Paula Murray/Placement Office Peter Hodson/Campus Services Peter Murray/Sociology
11.05 - 11.30 (b)	Meeting with Research Development Office Research Leaders		Presidents Boardroom	1 Internal Reviewer 1 External Reviewer Carol Barrett/Research Development Office Jane Gray/Sociology Sinead McGilloway/Psychology Sharon Todd/Education Valerie Heffernan/German Fiona Walsh/Biology
11.30 - 12.00 (a)	Phone calls separately with Barry Walsh (Solicitors) 15 mins Ray Corbett (Dept Education & Science) 15 mins	Ph: 8280608 Ph: 8892410	Council Room	1 External Reviewer 1 Internal Reviewer
11.30 - 12.00 (b)	Phone calls separately with Niall O'Reilly (IT Consultant)	Ph: 0861791228	Presidents Boardroom	1 External Reviewer 1 Internal Reviewer
12.00-12.30	Meeting with Director HR	To outline emerging issues	Council Room	Review team Rosaleen McCarthy
12.30 -13.00	Meeting with Vice-President for Strategy and Quality	Outline of preliminary conclusions and preparation for exit presentation		Review team Jim Walsh
13.00 – 14.00	Working lunch – initial reflections and conclusions (may roll this into previous session)		Pugin/Reserved table for 5	Review Team
14.00 – 14.15	Visit HR Office		HR Office	Review Team



14.15 – 15.30	Preparation of Exit Presentation		Council Room	Review team
15.30 – 16.00	Exit Presentation and wrap up		Council Room	Review Team Jim Walsh All HR staff
16.00	Post review refreshments		Council Room	Review Team Jim Walsh All HR staff