

Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement Programme



QUALITY REVIEW

RESEARCH & INNOVATION SUPPORT

Peer Review Group Report

Prof. James McElroy Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and Postgraduates Queen's University Belfast
Prof. Geoff Rodgers Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) Brunel University London
Dr. Keith O'Neill Director of Life Science and Food Research Commercialisation Enterprise Ireland
Dr. Catherine Maunsell Director of Quality Promotion and Assurance St Patrick's College, Drumcondra Dublin City University
Prof. Enda McGlynn Deputy Head School of Physical Sciences Dublin City University

Date: 18th-20th February, 2015

Introduction

This Quality review has been conducted in accordance with a framework model developed and agreed through the Irish Universities Association Quality Committee and complies with the provisions of Section 35 of the Universities Act (1997) and the 2012 Qualifications and Quality Assurance Act. The model consists of a number of basic steps.

1. An internal team in the School/Faculty/Office/Centre being reviewed completes a detailed self-assessment report (SAR). It should be noted that this document is confidential to the School/Faculty/Office/Centre as well as the Review Panel and senior officers of the University.
2. This report is sent to a team of peer assessors, the Peer Review Group (PRG) – composed of members from outside DCU and from other areas of DCU – who then visit DCU and conduct discussions with a range of relevant staff, students and other stakeholders.
3. The PRG then writes its own report. The School/Faculty/Office/Centre is given the chance to correct possible factual errors before the PRG report is finalised.
4. The School/Faculty/Office/Centre produces a draft Quality Improvement Plan (QuIP) in response to the various issues and findings of the SAR and PRG reports.
5. The PRG report and the draft QuIP are considered by the Quality Promotion Committee (QPC) and University Executive.
6. The draft QuIP is discussed in a meeting between the School/Faculty/Office/Centre, members of the PRG, the Director of Quality Promotion and members of Senior Management. The University's responses are written into the draft document and the result is the finalised QuIP.
7. The PRG Report and the QuIP including the University's response is sent to the Governing Authority of the University, who approves publication in a manner that it sees fit.

This document is the report referred to in Step 3 above.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and Overview.....	3
2. The Self-Assessment Process	4
3. The Peer Review Group Process	5
4. Findings of the Peer Review Group.....	8
5. Commendations.....	13
6. Recommendations for Improvement	14
7. Appendix 1.....	16

Peer Review Group Report for Research and Innovation Support

1. Introduction and Overview

Location

Research and Innovation Support (RIS) is the administrative department within DCU that provides support to academics and researchers relating to research funding and commercialisation. It has two units: Research Support (RS) and Invent, the Technology Transfer Office. The two units are based on the main DCU campus in the Invent building.

Staff

The following table outlines RIS staff along with their current roles and responsibilities.

Name	Responsibilities	Unit
Prof Alan Harvey	Vice-President for Research and Innovation VPRI	Research and Innovation Support
Dr Ana Terres	Director of Research Support	Research Support
Ms Marguerite Aherne	Unit Secretary and PA to VPRI	Research Support
Ms Fiona Brennan	Senior Research Officer	Research Support
Mr Kieran O'Dwyer	Senior Research Officer	Research Support
Dr Helen Burke*	Senior Research Officer	Research Support
Dr Yuliya Shakalisava	Research Officer	Research Support
Dr Anne Louise Holloway	Research Officer	Research Support
Dr Domingo Sanchez Zarza	Research Officer^	Research Support
Ms Catriona NiShe	Coordinator of SFI International Cooperation Brazil consortium.	Research Support
Ms Isabel Hidalgo	Information Management Officer	Research Support
Mr Richard Stokes	Director Invent and Director of Innovation	Invent
Ms. Hilary Coates	PA to Director of Innovation (new appointment replacing Marie Rooney)	Invent
Ms. Emma O'Neill	Business development	Invent
Mr. Paddy O'Boyle	Business development	Invent
Dr. Carolyn Hughes	Business development	Invent
Dr. Peter Olwell	Management of IP patenting process and reporting	Invent
Dr Georgina Murphy	IP Management BDI	Invent
Ms. Maria Johnston	Management of Incubation centre and programmes	Invent
Mr. Tommy Ruane	Running Vital project with DkIT and Queens University Belfast	Invent
Ms. Maeve Freeman	Invent reception, admin and client support	Invent
Ms. Janetta Meszarosova	Support for social enterprise (Dr. Emer Ni Bhraidaigh) and U-Start	Invent

*On maternity leave

^ Cover for maternity leave

Functions / Activities / Processes

The Research and Innovation Support unit has two distinct, albeit closely linked, aspects, Research Support (RS) and Invent.

Research Support provides academics with support relating to research activities (identifying sources of funding, mentoring and training relevant to developing research activities, advice on preparing proposals and budgets, and assistance in management of awards, including liaison with Finance and HR). Research Support also administers internal schemes for supporting research (and also manages the overall processes around management and distribution of overhead income) and coordinates liaison with external funding bodies.

Invent primarily deals with intellectual property (IP) management and knowledge transfer activities (collaboration with industry through collaborative and contract research, and licensing). It also provides training courses on topics relevant to IP, research commercialisation and technology transfer, and support for innovation through advanced courses on company creation (e.g. the Invent Tech Venture commercialisation programme for emerging academic entrepreneurs is now adopted nationally by Science Foundation Ireland).

2. The Self-Assessment Process

RIS Quality Review Co-ordination Committee

Prof. Alan Harvey	Research & Innovation	Vice President for Research and Innovation VPRI
Dr Ana Terres	Research Support	Director
Mr. Richard Stokes	Invent Innovation	Director Director
Ms Maria Johnson	Invent	Operations Manager
Mr. Kieran O'Dwyer	Research & Innovation Support	Research Officer
Dr Anne-Louise Holloway	Research & Innovation Support	Research Officer
Dr Yuliya Shakalisava	Research & Innovation Support	Research Officer
Ms Fiona Brennan	Research & Innovation Support	Research Officer
Dr Domingo Sanchez-Zarza	Research & Innovation Support	Research Officer
Ms Isabel Hidalgo	Research & Innovation Support	Research Administrator
Ms Caitriona NiShe	Research & Innovation Support	ISCA Co-Ordinator
Ms Marguerite Aherne	Research & Innovation Support	Secretary

Methodology for Preparation of the Self-Assessment Report

The overall self-assessment process was a combined effort of the RS and Invent teams and the self-assessment report (SAR) was prepared jointly. The self-assessment process started with an externally facilitated joint brainstorming session focussing on discussion of the current functions of the two units in the context of DCU's research and innovation strategy and exploring team views on strengths and weaknesses, existing processes, stakeholders interactions, and current challenges and opportunities. An action plan was developed in order to gather relevant information from stakeholders.

Data gathering was by: survey of internal stakeholders (separate surveys by each unit), focus groups with relevant internal stakeholders (jointly), and survey of external stakeholders (separate surveys by each unit).

Surveys of internal stakeholders: The surveys of DCU staff were designed with the input and advice of the Research and Institutional Analysis Officer.

Focus Groups: The focus groups were held on one day, and organised by the same external facilitator who led the brainstorming session. The composition of the groups was agreed by both RS and Invent and the facilitator was briefed beforehand about relevant context. The following groups were interviewed: Principal Investigators; Postdoctoral Researchers; Central Administration Units that deal with RIS (Finance, HR, Information Systems and Services, ISS and the Library); and Academic Directors of the Research and Enterprise Hubs, Deans and Associate Deans for Research of the four Faculties.

Survey of external stakeholders: RS and Invent approached the external survey differently as their stakeholders are mainly funding agencies for RS, and external companies and incubation centre clients for Invent. RS gathered the information using an email survey, while Invent used a combination of focus groups, and email survey.

The Coordination team ensured the compilation of the SAR occurred in a timely fashion, and also organised meetings between the subgroups. Discussions about process within each of the teams were incorporated as part of regular team meetings in order to ensure progress. The SAR was finalised by the Director of Research Support and the Director of Invent (also Director of Innovation) with input from the Vice-President for Research and Innovation (VPRI). An advanced draft was provided to team members in RIS for final comments. The completed SAR was approved by the VPRI.

3. The Peer Review Group Process

Peer Review Group

Prof. James McElroy Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and Postgraduates, Queen's University Belfast
Prof. Geoff Rodgers Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research), Brunel University London
Dr. Keith O'Neill Director of Life Science and Food Research Commercialisation, Enterprise Ireland
Dr. Catherine Maunsell Director of Quality Promotion and Assurance, St Patrick's College, Drumcondra Dublin City University
Prof. Enda McGlynn Deputy Head, School of Physical Sciences, Dublin City University

Self-Assessment Report

It is the view of the Peer Review Group that the SAR was clear, employed concise language and was an easy to read report. It was evident from the SAR that a broad range of RIS staff were engaged in the preparation of the document from both Research Support and Invent.

Even with the inclusion of a comprehensive appendix of information, the PRG felt there were a number of gaps in relation to the information provided, these were addressed during the peer review group visit. It was also felt by the PRG that further, and more self-critical, reflection would have enhanced the document.

The previous quality review was addressed at the end of the SAR report, however, it was the view of the PRG that, given the timeframe since the previous quality reviews and the significantly changed structures in the intervening time, it was entirely appropriate that this and other aspects of the SAR concentrated primarily on the current (and more recent) activities of RIS.

Review Visit Programme:

Day	Time	Peer Review Group (PRG) Activity/Meeting	Venue	Meeting No.
Day 1 Wed	12.30-14.00	Lunch with Director of Quality Promotion and available PRG members	1838 DCU	
	14.00-15.00	Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion; Guidelines provided to assist PRG during the visit and in developing its report.	A204	
	15.00-15.45	PRG selects Chair. Discussion of main areas of interest and questioning arising from the Self-Assessment Report (SAR).	A204	
	15.45-16.00	<i>Coffee</i>	A204	
	16.00-17.15	Consideration of SAR with Area Head, Professor Alan Harvey & members of quality review committee. Short presentation by R&I followed by discussion of SAR. Ana Terres; Richard Stokes; Domingo Sanchez Zarza; Fiona Brennan; Emma O'Neill, Carolyn Hughes. <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>	A204	
	17:15-17.55	PRG Private meeting	A204	
	18.00-19.00	Informal Reception – PRG, Professor Alan Harvey, Members of R&I Staff: Ana Terres; Richard Stokes; Kieran O'Dwyer; Anne Louise Holloway; Paddy O'Boyle; Maria Johnston. <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>	1838 DCU	
	19.00-20.30	PRG Private dinner	1838 DCU	
Day 2 Thurs	08.45– 09.00	PRG Private meeting	BG15	
	09.00-09.25	Professor Alan Harvey, Vice President Research and Innovation	BG15	1

	09.30-09.55	Research and Innovation Management Team		BG15	2
	10.00-10.25	Research Support staff		BG15	3A
	10.30-11.00	<i>Coffee</i>		BG15	
	11.00-11.25	Innovation Support staff		BG15	3B
	11.30-11.55	Directors of Research and Enterprise Hubs and Platforms		BG15	3C
	12.00-12.25	DCU Heads or Senior staff in Support / Service Offices working with Research and Innovation		BG15	4
	12.30-12.55	DCU administrative Staff representatives from varying levels within Faculties / Centres / central administration		BG15	5
	13.00-14:00	<i>Lunch</i>		BG15	
	14.00-14.25	Tour of Facilities		BG15	
	14.30-15.25	Representatives from varying levels of academic staff familiar with Research and Innovation		BG15	6
	15.30-16.25	Post-doctoral Researchers representatives		BG15	7
	16:30-16:50	<i>Coffee</i>		BG15	
	16.50-17.15	Open forum for any member of RIS staff		BG15	
	17.15-17.55	Meetings with external stakeholders relevant to R&I		BG15	8
	18.00-18.15	PRG private meeting time		BG15	
	19.30	PRG private dinner		Crowne Plaza Hotel	
Day 3 Friday	08.45– 09.00	PRG Private meeting		BG15	Meeting No.
	09.00-09.55	DCU Senior Management Group (SMG) including President, Professor Brian MacCraith. <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>		AG01	9
	10.00–10.25	Professor Brian MacCraith as reporting Head		AG01	10
	10.30-11.00	<i>Coffee</i>		BG15	
	11.00-12.00	PRG private meeting (JMce, GR, CM)	Supplementary meeting of KO'N and EMcG with two support staff associated with the new Research and Enterprise Hubs	BG15/BG14	Not numbered
	12.00-13.00	PRG private meeting		BG15	
	13.00-14:00	<i>Working Lunch</i> Clarification of outstanding issues for PRG if required		BG15	
	14.00-15.55	PRG Prepare Exit Presentation		BG15	
	16.00–16.30	Exit Presentation – by PRG to Professor Alan Harvey and all available members of R&I staff <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>		Invent Seminar Room 4 th Floor	11

Methodology of Review Visit:

The Peer Review Group (PRG) initially met the Director of Quality Promotion who outlined the conduct and timetable of the visit, and provided a general overview of aims and goals. The PRG then conducted a private meeting where Professor James McElroy (QUB) was chosen as Chairperson of the PRG. A number of aspects of the SAR were identified as requiring further discussion during the visit, an overall plan was devised for the visit and each PRG member took on particular aspects or themes to address during meetings and interviews. Some gaps in information provided in the SAR were also identified at various stages and these were communicated to the area as they arose. Up until Friday morning, the members of the PRG attended all of the meetings jointly. At 11.00 am on Friday, two members of the PRG attended a supplementary meeting with two support staff associated with the new Research and Enterprise Hubs. The additional information acquired during that meeting was reported to the entire PRG thereafter.

See Appendix 1 for a list of attendees at all meetings during the PRG visit.

All of the groups met by the PRG responded enthusiastically, engaged in open and frank discussion and provided useful feedback. This was much appreciated by the PRG and commended to DCU Senior Management.

Communication with both RIS staff and with the Quality Promotion Office was very positive throughout the exercise and RIS staff members were particularly helpful in providing additional data requested by the PRG at different stages throughout the process. Again, this was much appreciated by the PRG.

The PRG were of the view that, in the main, the process was appropriate, though they also felt that it would have possibly been better to have slightly fewer but longer meetings, enabling slightly deeper and more searching discussions. Given DCU's stated objective to be Ireland's University of Enterprise, the PRG also would have liked to have met more industry stakeholders.

The PRG also note that it was aware of the new DCU research and innovation strategy, and of the Research and Enterprise Hubs and Platforms structures which are of particular relevance in terms of the RIS unit under review. During the visit the PRG enquired in more detail as to these structures and their interactions with RIS. However, the PRG stresses that all such enquiries were solely to supply the PRG with the appropriate information and context to enable the most useful forward-looking recommendations to be made in this PRG report. Clearly the Hubs and Platforms structures are at far too early a stage of development to be a part of this review of processes and operations, and furthermore, the details of their interactions with and relationship to RIS are still evolving.

4. Findings of the Peer Review Group

4.1 Overview

The PRG were impressed with the ambition of DCU to place research and innovation at the centre of their strategic objectives and the mission statement of the University. Furthermore, the PRG acknowledge and commend the ambition of RIS, and the leadership demonstrated by Prof. Harvey in the relatively short timeframe since his appointment, in the development of the new strategy for the area and the significant progress made in implementing the structural

changes required to enable its delivery. The area is performing well as evidenced by the outputs and metrics presented to the PRG. For example, DCU had the highest number of licenses, options and assignments of any Irish Institution cumulatively over the last 6 year period and the number of industrial research contracts over €25k in value is on a par with the largest universities in Ireland. Senior researchers, post-docs and external stakeholders reported very positive interactions with RIS staff, citing them as ‘excellent’, highly interactive, supportive and proactive. RS, Invent and the hubs and platforms matrix seem to have good working relationships– with appropriate focus on developing areas of strength and expertise in research and innovation– rather than short-term financial goals.

Further detail is provided in the sections which follow, including the articulation of areas which form the basis of recommendations collated in Section 5 below.

4.2 Organisation and Management

It was the view of the PRG that the organisation and management of both Research Support and Invent were effective. Staff members were positively engaged in their work and with a clear understanding of their own roles and responsibilities. The PRG was pleased to hear that RIS had regular communication/meetings with the Hub and Platform Directors, with clear pro-formas used to inform discussion. However, the PRG suggests that the degree of integration of work between RIS and the new matrix structures will require ongoing monitoring as the matrix model becomes further embedded (**Recommendation 3**).

4.3 Functions, Activities and Processes

The PRG note the significant achievements to date of RIS, namely in the contribution to the development and initial roll-out of the matrix model. In relation to performance levels in respect of licencing and other Intellectual Property (IP) metrics, Invent’s achievements appear impressive both in an absolute sense and when viewed relative to other higher education institutions in the State and abroad.

During meetings with RIS staff, the PRG were made aware that the University is developing policies on research integrity including the areas of research ethics, research misconduct and other related policies such as publication, dissemination and authorship. RIS is supporting this initiative. It is recommended that the University, working closely with RIS, establish clear lines of responsibility and ownership for the policies falling under the research integrity umbrella (**Recommendation 6**).

The view was expressed by a range of stakeholders that communication and interaction at the interface between RIS and some other central administrative units in the University has been problematic in the past. Clearly issues of this nature can ultimately have a negative consequence in terms of the support provided to academics. It is recommended that RIS and central administrative units develop stronger collaborative working models. For example, in the case of Finance, this should build on the initial work on their joint forum to progress this area, in particular, to introduce a single system to manage pre- and post- award finance that fully supports the needs of all the stakeholders (**Recommendation 2**).

Senior academics noted concerns about the time taken to prepare costings for research grant applications. To improve this aspect of research support and to realise strategic objectives in relation to the doubling of research income, it is recommended that serious consideration be

given by the University to introduce a software-based costing tool for research proposal generation (**Recommendation 4**).

While plans are at an advanced stage to reconfigure the publications' database and related systems at University level, these processes need to be underpinned by collaborative structures and processes between relevant functional areas, with RIS as lead (**Recommendations 2 and 4**).

4.4 RIS Staffing and Accommodation

Following their tour of the RIS work places, the PRG saw, at first hand, the excellent standard of accommodation available, all of which was deemed fit for purpose. The PRG noted and welcomed the increased financial and human resourcing of research and innovation with the introduction of the matrix model of hubs and platforms but highlighted the need for close and collaborative working structures and processes as the new structures become embedded (**Recommendations 2 and 3**).

4.5 Management of Financial and other Resources

RIS manage and disburse a range of resources, including managing the Research Support staff pay and non-pay budgets, the Invent operational budgets for the technology transfer office and the incubator centre and managing the disbursement of funds under a range of schemes across the University.

The PRG felt that one very positive aspect of this element of resource management was that all staff across RIS indicated that financial support was available for them to avail of continuing professional development, and that the managers were supportive of staff requests in this regard. However it was also clear that operational demands on RIS staff time meant that opportunities for advance planning and availability of time for such development opportunities were constrained. It also seemed to be the case that, in the main, continuing professional development opportunities were developed in a one-to-one, bottom-up, fashion, and it might be useful to consider whether some team discussion of needs might also feed into this process.

The management of internal funding schemes seems to be effective, particularly when clear financial information is available to the team, but given the team size and the varied demands on time, it is important to keep this aspect of the work under review in order to ensure maximum efficiency (**Recommendation 1**).

4.6 Staff Perspective

The Panel had the opportunity to meet academic / research staff at various levels ranging from senior Principal Investigators (PIs) to postdoctoral researchers. The understanding of these stakeholders of the new Research and Innovation matrix model, in particular, the different roles of the Hubs and Platforms, was varied. The PRG recommends that a further communication campaign be organised to incorporate user case studies, FAQs and templates to assist in the navigation and utilisation of these new structures internally within the University. A parallel approach, but with an external focus, could also assist in the external communication and marketing of research and innovation activities of the University (**Recommendation 5**).

Post-doctoral researchers were enthusiastic about the research and innovation trajectory of DCU, however, it became clear in discussion that they had varied, and generally limited, exposure to the benefits of the University's Researcher Career Enhancement framework. The PRG recommend that RIS and HR work together with PIs, Executive Deans and Research and Enterprise Hub Directors to improve take-up of this important initiative in building research capacity and more general employability skills (**Recommendation 7**).

Much of the day-to-day work in the research support section was by necessity operational in nature, but there was a growing understanding that a more strategic focus was required to help DCU reach the stretched targets outlined in the Research and Innovation Strategy, as well as dealing with the opportunities and challenges which will arise in the context of the incorporation process. Close collaborative working of all RIS staff with the newly appointed support staff in the Research and Enterprise Hubs and Platforms, in addition to colleagues in the incorporating bodies and those involved in the incorporation process, will be key to success in this regard (**Recommendations 1, 2 and 8**).

4.7 Non-DCU Stakeholder Perspective

The PRG met with a number of non-DCU stakeholders, including a CEO of a DCU spin-out company, a Health Research Board funding agency representative (who is also a H2020 national contact point) and the director of Knowledge Transfer Ireland. The first and third of these stakeholders interacted mainly with Invent and the second mainly with Research Support. This meeting was a very positive one, and all three stakeholders commented on the excellent support they received from RIS and on the strength of the relationships that had been established.

From the meeting, a clear sense emerged of the trust that had developed between one of the non-DCU stakeholders in respect of interactions with Invent. Reference was further made to the positivity of comments about Invent expressed by other similar non-DCU stakeholders. There was an overall confirmation of the general view which the PRG had formed previously in terms of the focus of Invent on building relationships for the medium- and long-term, rather than seeking shorter term outcomes.

A second representative of a non-DCU stakeholder also spoke in a very positive manner about interactions with Invent and, in particular, mentioned the very positive contributions of the Director of Innovation to national discourse.

The third non-DCU stakeholder representative spoke in a very complimentary way about interactions with Research Support and the good proactivity experienced in terms of close interactions, Research Support alerting this stakeholder to the new DCU strategy, good organisation of meetings.

In summary, the general tenor of this meeting was very positive and the participants were appreciative of the efforts of RIS.

4.8 Overall Analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Challenges

The PRG felt that the analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Challenges (SWOC) (in tabular form below) undertaken by RIS was, in general, a fair and realistic one.

However, to echo a point made earlier in this document, it was also felt by the PRG that further, and more self-critical reflection, would have enhanced this aspect of the SAR in particular.

Research and Innovation Support SWOC Analysis:

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to do business with – accessible and approachable; few barriers and simplified processes for researchers and industry • Solution-finders/problem-solvers • Broad oversight due to interactions with other units and broad range of experience in team • Cooperative processes between team members • Independent budget • Co-location of RS and Invent • Speedy decision-making – non –hierarchical • Always meet or exceed metrics from EI/KTI (Invent) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too focused on problem-solving • High workload, forcing reactive rather than proactive activity • Metrics drive behaviour- issues of quality vs. quantity (Invent) • Obsolete electronic support systems • Pressure to say 'yes' to all and any grant applications • Dumping ground for problems are picked up from other central units • Internal workload limits time allocated to external business development (e.g. commercial and European)
Opportunities	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National drive for 'impact' suits DCU agenda and profile with translational research • International alliances, e.g. Mayo Clinic, ASU • Research Professional database • New Research Management System • Next H2020 work programme • Engagement with key influencers, leverage with existing contacts, alumni • Review of Research Prioritisation • Marketing of infrastructure and expertise, nationally and internationally • New matrix structure (defined roles/targets) – and use of CRM • Increased collaboration with industry • NRF/STEP Platform – better facilities access • DCU consulting services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term recruitment of PIs/recruitment cap, lack of strategic hires in research • Integration of new hub/platform matrix • Funding agency criteria – international experience needed by applicants • Expectation of national funders for local impact • Incentives and motivation to engage in consultancy and contract research • International competition for research funding • Influence with national bodies at decision making level – raising DCU's profile • Time to build the next generation of engaged researchers • Need for an innovation fund/seed fund to support projects between end of EI funding and angel/VC support • Tech Transfer/Business Development roles are funded by EI grants and changing policies for EI funding create uncertainty

5. Commendations

- The PRG commend the ambition of DCU to place research and innovation at the centre of their strategic objectives and the mission statement of the University.
- The PRG commend the ambition of RIS, and the leadership demonstrated by Prof. Harvey in the relatively short timeframe since his appointment, in the development of the new strategy for the area and the significant progress made in implementing the structural changes required to enable its delivery.
- The PRG note and commend that the area is performing well as evidenced by the outputs and metrics presented to the PRG.
- The PRG note and commend that senior researchers, post-doctoral researchers and external stakeholders reported very positive interactions with RIS staff, citing them as ‘excellent’, highly interactive, supportive and proactive.
- The PRG note and commend that RS, Invent and the hubs and platforms matrix seem to have good working relationships – with appropriate focus on developing areas of strength and expertise in research and innovation – rather than short-term financial goals.

6. Recommendations for Improvement

Recommendations made within this section have used the classification system provided by the University.

Priority levels of the recommendations have been noted, using the following University classification system:

P1: A recommendation that is important and requires urgent action.

P2: A recommendation that is important, but can, or perhaps must, be addressed on a more extended time scale.

P3: A recommendation which merits serious consideration but which is not considered to be critical to the quality of the ongoing activities of the Area.

Additionally, the PRG have used the University rubric to indicate the level(s) of the University where action is required, as follows:

A: Area under review and **U:** University Senior Management

Actions at multiple levels have been recommended, as appropriate. For instance: P1-A/U indicates a recommendation that is important and requires urgent action at Area level as well as by the university’s senior management.

No.	Priority	Level	Recommendation
1	P1	A	Reconsider, within RIS, methods for allocation of available resources to best address strategic and operational demands. For example, during periods of high demand for support from RIS, such as closure of major research calls, some kind of triage or demand management should be introduced. The workload in managing the internal funding schemes should also be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure its efficiency. These efficiency gains will enable RIS staff to allocate time to higher level strategic priorities and to participate in professional development programmes.
2	P1	A/U	Develop enhanced collaborative working relationships between RIS and other key research support areas of DCU (e.g. joint forums with Finance, new matrix structures, Marketing, Human Resources).
3	P2	A	Introduce a process of on-going monitoring and develop an evolving portfolio of key performance indicators (KPIs). This refers to the entire process of integration of work between RIS and the new matrix structures of Research and Enterprise hubs and platforms in order to maximise the benefits of this new model to DCU.
4	P2	U/A	Strengthen the information systems that support research activities so that strategic objectives are achieved. In particular, the PRG is supportive of the ongoing initiative to introduce a single information system to manage pre- and post-award functions that fully supports the needs of all the stakeholders. It is further recommend that consideration be given by the University to the introduction of a grant costing tool. This would reduce the time that academics spend preparing proposals and help reduce the number of proposals submitted without University approval. A University wide current research information system (CRIS) type system would support DCU's aspirations to raise its level of citations and monitor and benchmark academic performance.
5	P1	A/U	Develop and execute a further communication campaign to enhance the dissemination and utilisation of the newly developed research and innovation matrix. This could include user case studies and FAQs within the University. These may also assist in the external communication and marketing of the capabilities of the University.
6	P2	U/A	Establish clear lines of responsibility and ownership in the University for the policies falling under the research integrity umbrella.
7	P2	U/A	Further develop the role of RIS in supporting the DCU researcher career development programme. RIS and HR to work together with Principal Investigators, Executive Deans, and Research and Enterprise Hub Directors to improve take-up of the researcher career development programme.
8	P1	A	Maintain and support, within RIS, an active and engaged participation in the DCU Incorporation process. This is to ensure that the aspirations for research and innovation for DCU post-Incorporation can be fully realised.

Appendix 1

Meetings with Peer Review Group Quality Review Visit - Research and Innovation Support

Meeting No:	Name(s)	Position
1	Prof. Alan Harvey	Vice President Research and Innovation (VPRI)
2	Prof. Alan Harvey Mr. Richard Stokes Dr. Ana Terres	VPRI Director of Innovation and CEO of Invent Director of Research Support
3A	Ms. Fiona Brennan Dr. Anne Louise Holloway Dr. Yuliya Shakalisava Dr. Domingo Sanchez Zarza Mr. Kieran O'Dwyer Ms. Marguerite Aherne Ms. Caitriona Ní She	Senior Research Support Officer Research Support Officer Research Support Officer Research Support Officer Senior Research Support Officer RS Secretary and PA to Alan Harvey ISCA Brazil Coordinator
3B	Dr. Carolyn Hughes Ms. Emma O'Neill Mr. Paddy O'Boyle Ms. Maria Johnston Dr. Peter Olwell Ms. Maeve Freeman Ms. Hilary Coates	Business Development Manager Business Development Manager Business Development Manager Operations and Enterprise Development Manager IP Operations Manager Invent Receptionist PA to Richard Stokes
3C	Prof. Noel O'Connor Prof. Dermot Diamond Dr. Theo Lynn	Director, Research and Enterprise Hub (Information Technology) Director, Science and Technology Enhancement Platform (STEP) Director, Business Innovation Platform (BIP)
4	Mr. Anthony Feighan Prof. Lisa Looney Ms. Teresa Murray Mr. Gareth Yore Mr. Martin Leavy Mr. John Kilcoyne Mr. Eamonn Cuggy	Acting Head of Financial Planning Dean of Graduate Studies Director of Marketing and Communications HR Manager Training and Development Manager Finance Systems Manager Senior Project Manager – DCU Incorporation (Formerly Finance Officer)
5	Mr. Alan Floyd Mr. Fran Callaghan Mr. Justin Doyle Mr. Robbie Sinnott Ms. Jennifer Egan Ms. Louise McCabe	Research Accountant DORAS & IReL Librarian T&L and Research Services Manager ISS STEP Research Facilities Manager STEP Research Administration Manager HR Recruitment Officer (Invent)
6	Prof. Martin Clynes Prof. Oliver Dolly Prof. Rory O'Connor Prof. Liam Barry Dr. Teresa Hogan Prof. Richard O'Kennedy	Director of the National Centre for Cellular Biotechnology Director of the International Centre for Neurotherapeutics Head of School of Computing, Lecturer and Member of Research Committee (RC) Associate Dean for Research, Faculty of Engineering and Computing; Member RC Senior Lecturer in Entrepreneurship; Member of RC. Lecturer Biotechnology and Academic Director of BDI

7	Dr. Dorota Wencel Dr. Fiachra Collins Dr. Elaine Spain Dr. Mercedes Vazquez Dr David Collins	Postdoctoral Researcher at BDI Recent ex-Postdoctoral Researcher (CTO at <i>Ambisense</i> –DCU Spinout) Post – Doctoral researcher at BDI Lecturer in Chemistry (ex-research fellow at DCU) Research Fellow, School of Physics, NSCR
8	Ms. Kay Duggan-Walls Dr. Alison Campbell Mr. Stephen McNulty	Health Research Board, EU Project Officer & National Contact Point for Health Director of Knowledge Transfer Ireland (KTI) CEO and Co-Founder <i>Ambisense</i> - DCU Spin-out
9	Professor Brian MacCraith Mr. Jim Dowling Professor Eithne Guilfoyle Dr. Declan Raftery Professor John Costello Professor Barry McMullin Ms. Marian Burns Mr. Ciarán McGivern Mr. Trevor Holmes	DCU President Deputy President Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) Chief Operations Officer Dean of Faculty of Science & Health Dean of Faculty of Engineering & Computing Director of Human Resources Director of Finance Vice-President External Affairs
10	Professor Brian MacCraith	R&I Reporting Head
11	Exit Presentation	All R&I staff invited
N/A	Supplementary meeting of KO’N and EMcG with Ms. Sue O’Neill and Ms. Laura Clifford	Support staff associated with the new Research and Enterprise Hubs.