Peer Review Group Report

Of

Faculty of Engineering & Computing

31.05.2024

Contents

1 Introduction and Context

The broad approach to quality assurance and enhancement at DCU aims to promote and develop a culture of quality throughout all aspects of the University. The framework derives from the spirit of Quality Assurance and Quality Improvement enshrined in the Universities Act (1997), which is the legislative basis for quality throughout the Irish University sector, and the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012.

The DCU processes for quality reviews at DCU are further aligned with the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) and the published guidelines of Qualifications and Quality Ireland (QQI).

This Report presents the findings of a quality review of the Faculty of Engineering & Computing following a visit by the Peer Review Group undertaken on 7 to 10 May 2024.

1.1 Overview of the Area under Review

The Faculty of Engineering and Computing (FEC), located in the Glasnevin campus, is one of five faculties of Dublin City University. It was established in 2004 with the coming together of the School of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering (MME), the School of Electronic Engineering (EE) and the School of Computing (SoC). In addition to these three Schools, the Faculty now includes a Professional Support Unit (PSU), as well as three Science Foundation Ireland (SFI) research centres and a number of smaller research centres and groups. In 2024, the Faculty enrolled 1764 Undergraduate students in its various programmes and 521 students in its Taught Postgraduate programmes. In addition, it has 183 Research Postgraduate students.

The School of Computing offers three undergraduate degrees (BSc in Computer Science, BSc in Computing for Business and BSc in Data Science), additionally, it provides postgraduate programmes with specialisms in areas such as Artificial Intelligence, Data Analytics, Secure Software Engineering, and Data Protection. It accounts for over half of the Faculty's taught postgraduate student population (e.g. 256 out of 521 in 2024). The School employs 43 academic staff (of which 11 are on fixed-term contracts) as well as 11 support staff.

The School of Electronic Engineering (EE) offers three undergraduate programmes including Electronic and Computer Engineering, Mechatronic Engineering (jointly with the School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering) and Global Challenges (jointly with the School of Law & Government). The postgraduate programme offerings of the School are Masters in Electronic and Computer Engineering and Masters in Electronic and Computer Technology programmes. The School employs 26 academic staff (of which eight are on fixed-term contracts) and nine support staff.

The School of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering offers four undergraduate programmes including Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering, Biomedical Engineering and Mechanical and Sustainability Engineering (recently started in 2021). Since 2018, an integrated MEng in Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering pathway has been available for BEng students allowing them the opportunity to receive Chartered Engineer status. The School also provides a standalone Masters in Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering with a selection of specialisms. The School employs 29 academic staff (of which 10 are on fixed-term contracts) and 11 support staff.

The Faculty's Professional Support Unit (PSU) numbers 15 staff members working across teaching and learning, research, and marketing. They support new and ongoing projects by

providing financial management and supporting compliance, process design and systems development. These areas are led by the Faculty Manager while the relatively new (started in 2022), internationalisation and industry engagement position reports directly to the Executive Dean.

The Faculty is a host institution for three SFI research centres, AI-driven Digital Content Technology (ADAPT), Advanced Manufacturing (I-Form) and Data Analytics (Insight). In addition, it is a co-lead or member of eight other national SFI Centres. It is a host and/or active collaborator with six other University designated research centres with two others awaiting confirmation at the time the 2024 Quality Review was conducted.

2 Approach to Self-Assessment

2.1 Quality Review Committee

The self-assessment phase of the Quality Review was led by an internal quality review steering group. Committee membership was as follows,

- Prof. Brian Corcoran [Co-Chair of Steering Group]
- Dr. Jennifer Bruton [Dean of FEC; Co-Chair of Steering Group]
- Prof. Nicholas Dunne [Deputy Dean of FEC]
- Michele Pringle [Faculty Manager]
- Gavin Osborne [Facilities and Technical Services Manager]
- Mary O'Halloran-Proffitt [International and Industry Engagement Manager]
- Prof. Conor Brennan [Associate Dean of Research, FEC]
- Dr. Jennifer McManis [Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning, FEC]
- Dr. Paul Clarke [Deputy Head, School of Computing]

The Faculty Quality Review (FQR) Steering Committee was assembled and agreed on the key principles, terms of reference, timelines for self-assessment and real-time progress and outputs. Members of the Steering Committee had responsibility for leading the self-assessment in their areas of responsibility. Faculty staff were engaged in the process through two Town Hall meetings – the first to present the FQR plan and the second to present the main outcomes of the self-assessment and the identified areas for improvement – and through School and Unit SWOCs and various focus groups. Surveys were conducted and cross-cutting focus groups were held with staff, students, and internal and external stakeholders.

2.2 The Self-Assessment Report

The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) was felt to provide a good reflection of the breadth across and detail within the Faculty. Taking place some time having elapsed since the pandemic and its aftermath, it was a timely assessment of lessons learnt and new opportunities arising.

The SAR took a pragmatic but systematic approach, providing comprehensive details and benefitting from the clear engagement of a wide group of stakeholders and participants in its drafting. One minor weakness was that it was difficult to get an impression of the overall individual inputs beyond the core team, including specifically who, how and when external stakeholders (i.e. those outside the University) had been involved, as this information was dispersed throughout the document.

It was evident that it linked to the overall DCU strategy, and it was noted that the use of a Town Hall approach to disseminate the SAR to staff was a positive and inclusive approach.

The overall impression of the PRG was that the SAR and SWOC were a complete and comprehensive review of the Faculty and provided enough richness and depth of information for a good insight and understanding. Where any gaps or further explanations were identified, these provided the basis of questioning and exploration for the subsequent review.

3 Approach Taken By Peer Review Group

3.1 Peer Review Group Members

Membership of the Peer Review Group for the Quality Review was,

- Prof. Ian Bond, Pro Vice-Chancellor and Executive Dean of Science and Engineering, University of Bristol (Chair)
- Prof. Tiziana Margaria, Department of Computer Science and Information Systems, University of Limerick
- Mr. Denis Kelly, Energy Engineering Capability Specialist & Researcher
- Prof. Christine Loscher, Head of School, School of Biotechnology, DCU
- Mr. Adam Daly, School of Psychology, DCU
- Dr. Saumava Mitra, School of Communications, DCU

3.2 Overview of Approach Taken by Peer Review Group

The Peer Review Group (PRG) convened on the evening of Tuesday 7th May 2024 to receive a briefing followed by Q&A on the review process from Dr Rachel Keegan, Director - Quality and Institutional Insights Office. It was stated that a requirement of the review was to elect a Chair from one of the three external panel members. After some discussion of the responsibilities this role entailed, it was agreed that Prof. Ian Bond would serve in this capacity.

The PRG then went on to discuss their initial thoughts and findings from the self-assessment documents, which were found to be comprehensive and detailed in nature, and which areas of enquiry each PRG member wished to pursue. The PRG agreed to approach the review in a manner of open questioning that allowed participants to engage in the discussion freely and confidently. PRG members agreed areas on which they wished to pursue a line of questioning, based on their areas of interest/expertise as well as their preliminary assessment of the SAR and other related documentation provided as a supplement to the review.

The formal review process began on Wednesday 8th May 2024 and comprised multiple meetings with various stakeholders from across the Schools, Faculty and University, including a wide range of academic (including early career researchers) and professional services staff, undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students.

At the conclusion of the review, the PRG were in unanimous agreement that the visit was an extremely worthwhile exercise, and that face-to-face meetings with a range of stakeholders provided an invaluable and accurate insight into the function, operation and culture of the Faculty. Whilst intense in nature, the meetings with so many stakeholders did provide a comprehensive level of scrutiny with no obvious omissions.

The PRG formed an effective review body from the outset, and were extremely well supported by the QPO, the Faculty and all other stakeholders with whom they engaged, noting the positive, open and honest spirit of ALL stakeholders throughout the review.

4 Approach to Quality Assurance and Enhancement

- *The effectiveness of current quality assurance and enhancement processes*

The FEC are honest in their SAR that their approach to quality assurance has been impacted by leadership changes and the global pandemic, stating;

> *"Since 2016, there have been three Executive Deans (2016-2017, 2017-2020, 2021-present) and an Acting Executive Dean (2020-2021), with the added complication of a global pandemic and its aftereffects. All of this has meant that processes around quality improvement in the Faculty have been less consistent than they would otherwise have been."*

And whilst this is not being used as an excuse, it does provide some mitigations for any shortcomings. That said, the diligence inherent in the SAR, and the impression given to the PRG during the review, it was quite clear that the current management team recognise and accept this challenge and are proactively working to make quality assurance implicit in the FEC's culture and behaviours.

- *Progress made since the last area review*

The previous FEC review was undertaken in April 2016, and it was evident from the SAR, that many of the recommendations forthcoming from that review have now been fully or partially addressed. These recommendations were ranked in terms of priority (1-highest, 3-lowest and responsibility, Faculty/University/Both), and there remain two significant Priority 1 recommendations unaddressed for which the FEC is wholly responsible;

-PRG Recommendation 12 - Establish appropriate, evidence-based entry requirements across the Faculty to match student capability to course demands.
There remain outstanding concerns about the progression rates for undergraduate students in Engineering and Computing. Several efforts have been made to address this issue but there is no evidence to suggest these have been successful.

-PRG Recommendation 17 - Develop a policy on feedback of student continuous assessment, including guidelines on the time between submission of work and feedback, suggested max 15 working days, and the quality of the feedback provided.
The FEC have not yet actioned a specific policy but have been proactive around the use of rubrics as an effective and efficient means to provide high-quality, timely feedback.

- *Progress made since the last area review by other quality assurance bodies*

Whilst comprehensive information was not provided in the SAR with respect to other quality reviews undertaken within the FEC, it was made clear that *Engineers Ireland* have undertaken periodic professional accreditation assessments of the undergraduate engineering programmes since 2016, with continued success. This implies that the FEC has and is meeting its quality assurance obligations with respect to one major aspect of their activities.

The annual QQI reviews, whilst undertaken at an institutional level, generally indicate DCU to be a highly performing University, with strong quality assurance measures in place.

5 Findings of the Peer Review Group

5.1 Planning and Effective Management of Resources

Members of the FEC leadership and management team provided valuable input to the panel via various stakeholder meetings throughout the review. The team came across as well functioning and aware of the FEC strengths and weaknesses and engaged in addressing the known opportunities and challenges.

The FEC is to be commended on the following:

- Notable and evident staff collegiality and mutual support;
- Fortitude and resilience in which strong growth in student and staff numbers has been achieved in recent years;
- Achieving such growth without reduction in quality of student admissions (CAO preference) or taught student experience whilst successfully recruiting and inducting a significant number of new academic and professional services staff;
- Good coordination between staff responsible for technical infrastructure and academic staff.

However, it is unsurprising that growth has placed considerable pressure on the resources available, both staff and spend, which have not grown at the same rate as student numbers, and thus going forward will require careful stewardship.

Support for, maintenance of, and investment in new physical infrastructure was repeatedly raised as a concern by various stakeholder groups and was recognised as an institutional issue by the Senior Management Team. The Faculty leadership team do an effective job with the resource constraints they operate within, but it was suggested that, given their strong industrial ties, they explore how the Industrial Advisory Board members might be able to help identify additional resources, especially for equipment. They should also ensure they keep making a strong case to the Senior Team for investment in a successful and high performing Faculty at every opportunity.

Throughout the review process, several recurring topics were identified from the various stakeholder discussions and will form the basis of several recommendations.

Prioritisation of initiatives

Given the recent and ongoing growth and the strain on existing resources, the Faculty senior team need to be proactive in prioritising which new initiatives and or known challenges will be addressed, decide when these will be addressed and commit appropriate time and resources to ensure their delivery. It is suggested that a Faculty level Steering Group with broad representation is established to coordinate initiatives, set priorities and determine resources. (**Recommendation**)

Scenario/Contingency planning

The upcoming decisions on continuation or cessation of several major research activities e.g. SFI Centres, CDTs, CRTs means that the FEC faces some considerable risks in the

near term. Furthermore, with the reliance on short term contracts for academic staff and the inherent flight risk therein, it is recommended that some scenario/contingency planning be undertaken to explore likely consequences and mitigations. (**Recommendation**)

Workload Management

The challenge of workload volume, work allocation transparency, “burn out” and staff welfare were raised during several panel sessions. There appears to be an imbalance in academic and teaching administration staff resources across the Schools and Faculty, leading to high workloads, staff retention issues and risks to student experience. Programme Chairs and school student administrators were notably vocal in this regard.

An inconsistency between workload distribution and the promotions framework, compounded by high numbers of contract staff, means overwork is commonplace. Workload models of varying complexity were found to exist but were inconsistent across Schools which needs to be addressed. For example, models based on credits did not reflect class size, nor number of programmes versus staff capacity. Currently, no capacity for research leave is available, jeopardising the sustainability of future large scale research initiatives (see 2. above). The creation and implementation of a consistent and transparent FEC-wide workload allocation model is suggested. (**Recommendation)**

The use of research staff to supplement teaching is patchy and (within the constraints of contract limitations, teaching experience/capability, etc.) could be explored further (with appropriate development and support) to provide additional capacity for more informal teaching e.g. project supervision.

Workforce Planning

Several staff stakeholder groups identified the need for proactive succession planning for both key academic roles and professional/technical services. Programme Chairs highlighted the challenges of taking on the role feeling unprepared, and a reliance on the previous incumbent to continue supporting for an extended period. It is recommended that the handover is formalised through a time-bound deputy progamme chair role/overlap period. (**Recommendation**)

Retention of institutional knowledge was at risk, with known forthcoming retirements amongst the technical team not being mitigated by new appointments, ideally with a short overlap to facilitate knowledge transfer. The grading and remuneration of technical services staff was highlighted as a burgeoning problem for recruitment and retention. Consistency of staffing (academic and professional services) across schools in proportion to their student FTE and number of programmes delivered was raised and a review to ensure workload is equitable is suggested. The FEC leadership team are also urged to review their Human Capital Plan and to develop a more detailed forward-looking workforce plan as a priority. (**Recommendation**)

5.2 Teaching and Learning

The PRG met with various groups who provided their thoughts, experiences and information on the FEC’s approach to and delivery of teaching and learning.
The FEC is to be commended on a number of points..

- Engineering and Computing as a single Faculty has distinct advantages and is more reflective of where technology is evolving. This cohabitation is being leveraged to advantage in both teaching (and research) which strengthens the external brand of the Faculty.
- Great collegiality and peer support among programme chairs via regular school meetings
- Genuine care and concern for student welfare
- Practical aspects are effective and popular with students (Projects, INTRA, etc)
- 'Connected classrooms' and information manager role creating efficiencies in student instruction and support
- Student peer mentoring schemes are effective and popular.
- The innovative DCU Global Challenges programme has provided fruitful inter-faculty, inter-school dialogue and cooperation which has stimulated new ideas.
- The growth in Engineering programmes has provided valuable cross- fertilisation and coordination across taught modules in the FEC.

The breadth of discussions with the PRG that related to Teaching and Learning mean that it is easier to provide several sub-sections related to specific areas of interest.

Content, Delivery and Student Voice

The mitigations implemented for the pandemic saw the rapid implementation of on-line teaching resources which has subsequently matured to become an established means of teaching provision, both as a supplement to in-person delivery, but increasingly as a fundamental part of education. The balance between on-line vs. in-person is now a question of attempting to cater to different students' learning demands and preferred styles. Furthermore, the students perceived 'value' of traditional classroom delivery compared to attending just the practical elements and pursuing self-study (on-line) defines whether they choose to engage with classes or not. Indeed, there is evidence of a direct correlation between online resources and student attendance. It was also highlighted that there appears to be an inconsistent approach to providing and the quality of online content across different teaching staff, with no apparent standardisation. This poses real challenges for the efficiency of teaching, and the strains in providing the breadth of resources now expected by some students. FEC-wide guidance on expectations for such provision would prove immensely helpful for both staff and students, for a host of reasons. (**Recommendation**)

Specifically, a lack of engagement from students has seen a drop-off in attendance. Students stated they were making choices based on perception of module difficulty, lecturer enthusiasm/entertainment, and the perceived 'value' of being in the room. Early morning or late afternoon timetabling compounds the issue with pressures of navigating work commitments (cost of living challenges) and/or significant commute times also being factors. A desire was expressed by students for in-person attendance to be clustered on fewer days, with reference made to the previously trialled 'Cyber Mondays' - where a day per week was purposely designed and organised to benefit from an on-line delivery. The FEC is encouraged to explore how such a clustering might be achieved to the benefit of staff and students without compromising workload or pedagogical outcomes. (**Recommendation**)

Student voice is critical in maintaining a good sense of community and as a means of continual improvement. Some students stated they were unaware of how to give feedback on a specific programme, with different systems identified across the Schools. Student representation on and consultation in relevant decision-making bodies (e.g. Assessment Working Group - see below) is recommended as good practice. Furthermore, where feedback is provided, any resulting changes could be relayed to students via a 'you said, we did' communication. (**Recommendation**)

Assessment and Feedback

The emergence of AI as a mainstream technology in academia and industry poses significant challenges to the faculty. There is a significant awareness of these challenges and their impact on Academic Integrity across all programmes. However, decisions on changes to Faculty policies are slow. They need to be accelerated to bring clarity to students and Faculty staff. From an employer's perspective, AI skills are highly valued but there is also an expectation that academic and qualification integrity are assured.

From feedback provided, the PRG were of the opinion that students are being over-assessed, with weightings often not reflecting the work needed to complete. The co-ordination of and effort expended on continual assessments (CA) within and between modules could be improved. Guidance to students on time to complete, avoiding overlapping commitments, and expectations for staff on feedback to students would be beneficial. Furthermore, post CA feedback from students could underpin a process of continual improvement.

An Assessments Working Group (AWG) was mentioned during our discussions which was being planned and should be expedited as a priority, as it will address a variety of issues raised by the various FEC stakeholder groups. Given the complexity of assessments across programmes, this AWG would benefit from a roadmap to identify the numerous interdependencies, and planned roll-out of any changes. (**Recommendation**)

Welfare and Wellbeing

Supporting students with their mental health and wellbeing was identified as an ongoing challenge. It was recognised that this is not a topic that teaching staff are generally comfortable engaging with, although there was notable evidence of some good practice amongst Programme Chairs and staff training on neuro-diversity support for students was a clear strength.

A suggestion was made that a specific staff member might be identified as a mental health advisor, in addition to the services offered by the University. With regard to the latter, it was noted by some staff that where to refer students for welfare support is somewhat unclear post a recent Central Support Services reorganisation. Greater communication with staff on this is needed as a priority.

More generally, continuous efforts to raise awareness amongst the student population about where help can be obtained should be maintained, with suggestions that Heads of Schools and Class Representatives could work more closely together on this. The current student community acts to foster peer-to-peer academic and emotional support for students however some individuals are struggling to join this community, perhaps exacerbated by a lack of

communal space for students within faculty buildings. Student-student and staff-student mentoring systems were noted as good but can always be improved.

With regard to other welfare issues raised, one concerned limited support for the small number of part-time students registered - the PRG were not clear on the scale of this potential need, and the challenge of visa sponsorship for partners of overseas PhD students - an issue that falls outside of the FEC's responsibilities but requires a University response.

Resources

The question of access to/use of resources is a difficult item for the PRG to address, recognising the constraints of the FEC and University. That said, it is recommended that efforts are made to ensure alignment of the scope of assignments (for PGT) and or research project needs (for PGR) with access to the necessary infrastructure, specifically High-Performance Computing (HPC). Also, a perceived lack of collaborative work/project space in FEC buildings was identified by some students who suggested that an 'open' timetabling information capability be considered that allowed easy and quick identification of labs or rooms that were vacant and available for ad-hoc use.

The PRG fully recognised the continual need to and challenges inherent in investing in the replacement of old equipment. This was raised with the Senior Team who accepted the challenge and are making every effort to fully utilise existing budgets. Furthermore, they want to work with the Faculty to consider long-term resourcing needs and investments with a view towards how this might increase future income generation. One suggestion from PRG is for the FEC to explore with the IAB how they might be able to provide additional in-kind support, help with procurement or offer access to off-site facilities.

5.3 Research and Scholarship

The FEC has a strong and growing reputation for high-quality research across a number of key technological areas. To that end, the Faculty should be commended for the following;

- Numerous prestigious SFI research centres as well as CDT and CRTs both as a host or partner. Some like I-Form have been recently re-approved for up to 6 more years, ensuring continuity of the research activity and stability for the involved research groups and researchers. These make a significant positive impact academically, financially, provide a talent pipeline and enhance the overall FEC brand.
- Increasing research competitiveness arising from previous successes and burgeoning expertise and reputation.

The strong national and international competition to win research funding and attracting high-calibre talent to deliver it places an emphasis on some significant challenges currently faced by the Faculty. The teaching workload is high which directly impacts on potential for future research growth. Start-up support or PhD scholarship funding for early-career researchers from either FEC, University or state resources is extremely limited, thus impeding the pipeline of internal development. Short-term contracting of research staff means significant churn and loss of knowledge and capability. Furthermore, beyond the remit of the FEC but important nevertheless, lobbying at sector level for improvements in retention of international talent in Ireland, especially non-EU, and the ability of research staff to apply for funding could prove critical going forward.

Research Centres

The presence of SRI funded research centres presents some managerial and organisational challenges for the Faculty. Some are hosted within the FEC, others with sibling Faculties or external partner Universities, affecting the degree of influence on direction. The staffing of centres varies, as does their degree of integration into the FEC day-to-day business, creating some tensions, although this has been recognised and efforts are underway to improve relations by communicating at school meetings how research centres contribute to schools and the Faculty.

Of the aforementioned SFI funded centres, several of them will terminate in the short to medium term, and the SFI funded CDT/CRTs are going to terminate in 2026 or 2027, with all the recruitment already now completed and the earlier cohorts of PhD students beginning to graduate. These CDT/CRT terminations and the potential loss of one or more research centres in the next funding round are a significant risk with respect to maintaining and growing the research and scholarship capability. Contingency scenarios should be considered in advance of any announcements to ensure the Faculty and University can respond appropriately and seek to mitigate losses or diversify sources of funding away from national agencies e.g. EU. (**Recommendation**)

It is further suggested that the research centres, with their own business development capabilities, seek to engage with the newly established IAB and explore how the INTRA programme might be leveraged to their advantage.

Research Staff and Students

The research staff and students are the lifeblood of the research endeavour. A significant reduction in their numbers, by virtue of the cessation of SFI-funded activities, would have a significant detrimental impact. There would also be a severe consequence for the teaching capacity, as the research staff and PhD students contribute to the UG and PGT programs as teaching assistants and demonstrators. Demonstration is usually paid, and arrangements are flexible which is popular with those who participate. For wellbeing reasons, there is a 144-hour teaching-related duties cap within doctoral contracts. However, there is a different approach between Schools regarding PhD students teaching which should be addressed. A notable positive in this regard was the recent replacement appointment of a PhD coordinator in the PSU, after a hiatus, who will re-establish more equitable support and community building across the Faculty.

Supporting this next generation of research leaders in their development is essential. It is suggested that the FEC explores how to build a stronger sense of community with a dedicated PhD coordinator to provide support to all regardless of funding pathway or research group affiliation. Likewise, facilitating networking activities among post-doctoral researchers of different Research Centres would provide additional benefits of cross-fertilisation of ideas and understanding, as well as making a clear distinction that they are members of Faculty staff and therefore afforded the same status. Access to social/common room/kitchen facilities would also provide a supportive and inclusive environment.
Career support and personal development plans for those on short-term contracts should be mandated and regularly discussed. (**Recommendation**)

Resources and External Engagement

Links with industry, commerce and other end-users are an important part of the research ecosystem and have the potential to benefit the broader FEC well beyond the research centres. The scale of research undertaken at DCU could benefit from much higher visibility if the communications and interactions with industry were further developed and coordinated. The well-established links developed within the INTRA programme offer a further route to build new research relationships. A challenge inherent with many of the current external/industrial relationships is the propensity for them to be an in-kind over direct financial support. The ability to transform the former to the latter will be a key challenge for the FEC.

The FEC possesses a range of specialist research equipment which provides a competitive edge compared to other Universities but without continued investment, there is a risk this advantage might be lost. Furthermore, the Faculty does not benefit from a searchable inventory or an ability to provide access/user support for individuals outside of research centres, meaning wider benefits are not being realised.

Overall, a more systematic approach to building and sustaining industrial relationships as well as exploiting the Faculty resources more widely would most likely have a positive impact on the breadth and scope as well the potential level of investment in research. (**Recommendation**).

5.4 University Service and Engagement

Critical to the successful function of the Faculty is Academic leadership, and the PRG noted the importance of the Programme Chair role in this regard. With responsibility for both programme design and execution, the programme chair role works well in its current configuration. However, this role comes with both a high workload and a level of responsibility. Teaching allocation is not reduced, and capacity for research is severely impacted. As noted in Section 5.1, the handover of such roles should be improved, especially as there is a potential loss of institutional knowledge as a result of newer staff members seeking to take on programme chairpersonships in order to improve promotion prospects.

The academic promotion process was identified by staff as being very competitive, with ‘expectations’ for the individual to over-perform as part of the embedded culture. This manifested itself in the form of some poor personal behaviours, exacerbated by conflicting demands at times from the OVPAA and OVPR. Faculty leadership intervention is needed here to provide clarity, direction and prioritisation, as outlined in Section 5.1. Consideration as to how periods of research leave might be made available, following a significant role i.e programme chair, would be most beneficial. More pragmatically, ensuring notable periods of a cessation in formal activity e.g. two weeks of ‘shutdown’ during the summer, would provide some relief for hard-pressed staff, and an ability to take annual leave. (**Recommendation**)

5.5 Communications and Provision of Information

Communications and information flow was raised as being fundamental to many aspects of the function of the FEC raised throughout the stakeholder meetings. In this respect, the Faculty is to be commended for the following good practice.

- Alumni, education trust and intra-office work collaboratively

- University mental health and well-being support – Care and Connect
- Good coordination among staff responsible for technical infrastructure

From these discussions, several suggestions were forthcoming and opportunities were identified to improve current practice.

- Despite the variety of wellbeing services available for students, and the support of staff when contacted, students are either unaware of the services available or do not feel comfortable reaching out to members of staff.
- Communicating with students could be broadened by acknowledging informal closed group chats etc. along with more formal channels.
- Documentation related to PhD progression was not easily available from a single, up-to-date source across all students in the FEC
- Research Development Officer and the International and Industry Engagement Manager could be more coordinated in their working.
- IAB interaction with the SFI-funded research centres could be formalised.

The international dimension of the FEC means that several issues were raised with respect to communication and support for incoming and outgoing staff and students.

- Consider how working with the Department of Foreign Affairs to bring first IRP visa registration to campus
- Improve HR support for international staff with immigration issues
- Improve outward European mobility for FEC students by exploring how an INTRA abroad scheme might be able to use the Erasmus exchange scheme.

-

5.6 External Perspectives

The Faculty is to be commended on the following.

- The DCU brand in research and teaching particularly in the Engineering and Computing programs has remained strong and attractive to employers, especially in the industrial sectors.
- The applied character of the education has been observed first-hand in the Final Year (Undergraduate and Integrated Masters) projects exhibition on day one of the review and was clearly of a very high standard
- Keeping in touch with industry and adapting to change on an ongoing basis is key to sustaining the relevance, ensuring quality, and maintaining the brand.
- The IAB is an excellent recent initiative aimed at providing consultation and feedback on the educational programs, and the IAB members are clearly very committed, also as individuals, i.e. beyond the specific interest and perspective of their employers.

The recent establishment of the IAB has brought a focused and organised interface with industry, as well as some strengths and benefits to the FEC;

- Integrating industry perspective
- Creating internship opportunities
- Input into syllabus and curriculum
- Kindling Industry relationships, student passion and business acumen

The challenge for the FEC is to exploit the good will and expertise of the IAB more systematically. Computing is well represented on the IAB but the engineering input could be improved by including a broader remit e.g. energy engineering, larger scale mechanical engineering and expertise in the use of embedded IT in larger engineering systems.

Future evolution of the IAB may include scope for structured peer mentoring for early career academic staff, interfacing directly with graduating students, establishing Intra pathways for SMEs, and CRT and CDT secondments. (**Recommendation**)

There are also opportunities for the IAB to collaborate further with central services (Engagement, Alumni Office, INTRA, Careers, Philanthropy) to fully leverage interactions with its members as well as with industry representatives from the research centres.
From an industry perspective, the IAB stated that ownership of the relationships should be faculty and research centre led, and better coordination regarding opportunities to engage i.e. calendar of pre-planned events, would be hugely beneficial.

The new Industry and Internationalisation Manager role is having a very positive effect on the communications and relation building. It has led to numerous outreach initiatives and enhanced communication as well as to several steps towards better highlighting of research outcomes and visibility of collaborations. There is perhaps another opportunity here to further leverage functions provided by the PSU, for example, focused marketing, press releases, and social media postings, while supporting key relationships with industry and other external stakeholders led by the faculty.

6 SWOC Analysis and Plans for Improvement

6.1 SWOC Analysis for the Faculty of Engineering & Computing

The self-assessment report for the Area included a proposed summary SWOC analysis of the Area. As a result of the Peer Review Group's analysis of the self-assessment report and findings from the peer review visit, we propose the following to be a true reflection of the area's capabilities and opportunities and identified weaknesses and threats to future success.

Strengths	Weaknesses
● Staff collegiality ● Positive impact of Deputy HoS role and IAB ● Genuine care and concern about student welfare ● Growth in UG/PGT demand and numbers ● Connected classrooms & investment in education technology/information manager creating efficiencies in pedagogy ● Hands on training and education ● Intra placements ● Staff training re: neuro-diverse students ● Internationalisation and engagement manager drawing upon alumni, education trust, and Intra offices working well	● Inability of contract staff to grow research capacity ● Impending cessation of multiple research centres ● Insufficient capacity and awareness for mental health support for students ● Lack of collaborative space for students in Faculty space footprint. ● PGR experience depends on affiliation ● Inconsistent PGR transfer process ● High workload and imbalance in continuous and examination assessments ● Inconsistent workload allocation models across Faculty

• Significant research funding and centres of high repute • Grant funding guidance and support available from RDO officer based in Faculty • Good coordination between technical and academic staff • PGR contribution to teaching • PGR community building by research administrator	• No recognition of class sizes in workload allocation • Inconsistency between workload distribution and promotion framework • Imbalance in administrative support at the School and Faculty level • Staff workload detrimental to research leave affecting research capacity • Promotion pathways and remuneration for technical staff need review • Better recognition of post-docs as staff and implementation of personal and career development plans
Opportunities	**Challenges**
• Better student communication, consultation and representation in seeking feedback and decision-making • Adapting timetables to foster and enable student engagement • Establish Assessment Working Group with clear roadmap and priorities • Structured peer mentoring for career progression • Managed handover of programme chair responsibilities • Increase Student awareness of ECIU and Erasmus mobilities, possible link to Intra • Creating PhD coordinator role at faculty level • Better signposting for international students to existing services and support • Further leveraging of industry connections via IAB	• Workload for programme chairs • Lack of University or Faculty guidance on online resource provision • Reduced student engagement/attendance stemming from housing crisis, commuting, timetabling and cost of living • Postgraduate research sustainability post CRTS and CDTs through research centres • Loss of research admin staff and limited capacity in RDO support • Pending PGR reduction will negatively impact teaching support and delivery • Postdocs taking on teaching opportunities • Succession - retaining institutional knowledge, Industry networks & partnerships • Ongoing maintenance and replacement of ageing physical infrastructure • Loss of one-stop shop for international students

6.2 Plans for Improvement Identified by the Faculty of Engineering & Computing

Internationalisation & External Engagement

1. Establish a dedicated Faculty-level Internationalisation and Engagement framework by allocating resources to ensure a proactive and coordinated strategy.
2. Establish a centralised system to assess and communicate internationalisation and engagement initiatives.
3. Leverage existing Faculty resources to develop a comprehensive support system that aligns the Engagement function with Marketing initiatives, enabling reassessment and expansion of key Faculty events for broader external reach and industry relevance.

The PRG are supportive of the FEC improvement plans above, which broadly align with the findings and recommendations of the review. The PRG would add that the above should also include improving the overall research narrative for an external audience (as per 5

below), to better engage with current and potential external partners, including those on the IAB. This might also go some way to better further leveraging the existing industrial relationships/partnerships.

Research

4. Leverage the Faculty's operational expertise from existing Doctoral Training Centres and Research Training programmes to establish a support structure to develop large-scale, collaborative, and interdisciplinary funding proposals that focus on strengthening postgraduate and postdoctoral research communities in areas with significant growth potential.
5. Develop and implement an action plan to enhance the quality, impact, and openness of the Faculty's research outputs, ultimately positioning the Faculty's research to have a more reputational power and to generate greater social and economic impacts through its research activities.
6. Implement a structured peer-to-peer mentoring and career development programme for researchers and early career academics within the Faculty to cultivate a collaborative environment to enhance grant application submissions and research impact.

Again, the PRG concur with the improvements already identified by the FEC in the SAR but would add a further action to undertake some scenario planning for a future research portfolio both with (i.e. renewals) and without the current SFI centres and CDT/CRTs.

Teaching & Learning

7. Implement Faculty staff development initiatives, including a structured mentorship programme, upskilling opportunities in emerging pedagogical teaching and learning approaches, and the establishment of an Educational Technology working group.
8. Develop a framework and staff training programme, in collaboration with University units (e.g. Student Support & Development), to support an inclusive learning environment that recognises and supports the diverse cultural and educational needs, health and wellbeing of the Faculty's student body.
9. Implement a centralised information management system to help streamline Faculty-level Teaching & Learning programme management and quality review processes in collaboration with the Professional Support Unit.

The PRG would add to the above the prioritising of an 'Assessment Working Group' with a clear roadmap to address urgent challenges in assessment & feedback (including the impact of generative AI) , staff and student workload, and student engagement (including representation, decision making, timetabling, online resource provision, wellbeing, and access to study spaces).

Strategy, Structures & Resources

10. Deliver the Faculty Strategic Plan for 2023-2028 through a coordinated annual review process.
11. Foster strategic alignment across the Faculty by broadening collaborative planning engagements with Schools and Units, supporting Heads to integrate their strategic priorities, directional focus, resourcing and PRD objectives with overarching University and Faculty strategies.
12. Review the current Faculty organisational structure to identify gaps or areas hindering strategic implementation and enable proactive restructuring and realignment measures as required.
13. Review the current Human Capital Plan in the context of appropriate work-life balance and identify a development pathway for all categories and grades of staff to realise their potential via targeted training/mentorship initiatives, and strategic recruitment.

14. Collaborate with University stakeholders to integrate the Faculty's strategic space, equipment, and infrastructure needs into the new Campus Development Plan.

In addition to the above, the PRG would strongly urge that the FEC first undertakes a prioritisation of initiatives (to address the overwhelming nature of the numerous potential activities to pursue). Ensure 11,12 &13 above also address the current inconsistency in School workload models and the provision of administrative support across the Schools.

7 Summary of Commendations and Recommendations

No	Commendation/ Recommendation	P	Level	
Planning and Effective Management of Resources				
i	Commendation			Notable & evident staff collegiality/mutual support
ii	Commendation			Fortitude and resilience during strong growth in staff and student numbers
iii	Commendation			Maintaining quality admissions and student experience during growth
iv	Commendation			Coordination between academic & technical staff
1	Recommendation	P1	A	Steering Group acts to coordinate initiatives, set priorities and determine resources
2	Recommendation	P1	A	Contingency planning to mitigate loss in research centres/CDT/CRTs and reliance on contract staff
3	Recommendation	P2	A	Implement a consistent and transparent FEC wide workload allocation model
4	Recommendation	P2	A	Implement a deputy programme chair
Teaching and Learning				
v	Commendation			A clear sense of caring and empathy towards students across the faculty
vi	Commendation			Practical elements of the course are effective and well-liked by students
vii	Commendation			Student peer mentoring schemes are effective and popular.
viii	Commendation			Strong collegiality and mutual support from Programme Chairs
ix	Commendation			'Connected classrooms' and information manager gives rise to efficiencies in pedagogy
x	Commendation			Growth in programmes has stimulated valuable cross-fertilisation and coordination
5	Recommendation	P1	A/U	Clear guidance on expectations for on-line resource provision
6	Recommendation	P2	A	Further embed student representation and/or student voice on existing committees and projects
7	Recommendation	P1	A	Expedite mission of A&F working group to address urgent challenges, workload, and engagement and student feedback
8	Recommendation	P2	A	Review current timetabling, with goal of consolidating content on specific days rather than spreading classes throughout the week

Research and Scholarship				
xi	Commendation			Hosting of/partnering in numerous prestigious SFI research centres, CDT and CRTs which have a significant positive impact academically, financially, on talent and enhance overall brand.
xii	Commendation			Increasing research competitiveness arising from previous successes and burgeoning expertise and reputation.
9	Recommendation	P1	A/U	Scenario planning to ensure the faculty and university can respond to new funding opportunities
10	Recommendation	P2	A	Diversify sources of funding away from national agencies e.g. towards EU.
11	Recommendation	P1	A	Deploy a more systematic approach to building and sustaining research with and investment from the newly established IAB. Explore how Intra might be leveraged to research advantage.
12	Recommendation	P2	A	Career support and personal development plans for those on short-term contracts should be mandated and regularly discussed
University Service and Engagement				
13	Recommendation	P1	A	Award structured accommodation dedicated to research activities following a significant leadership role i.e. programme chair
14	Recommendation	P2	A/U	Ensure notable periods of cessation in formal activity during summer, to allow leave/recovery
Communications and Provision of Information				
xiii	Commendation			Alumni, education trust and Intra offices work collaboratively
xiv	Commendation			University mental health and well-being support – Care and Connect is well regarded
xv	Commendation			Good coordination among staff responsible for technical infrastructure
13	Recommendation	P1	A	Deploy better communications in local spaces to inform students of wellbeing services
14	Recommendation	P1	A/U	Update, rationalise and make readily available PhD progression process information
15	Recommendation	P2	A	Utilise student communication channels such as class reps or student group chats
16	Recommendation	P1	A	Connect research centres with IAB
17	Recommendation	P2	A/U	Improve HR support for international staff with immigration issues
18	Recommendation	P2	A/U	Explore how Intra abroad might use Erasmus exchange to improve outgoing European mobility
Stakeholder Relationships				
xvi	Commendation			FEC brand in research and teaching is strong and attractive to employers, especially in the industrial sectors

xvii	Commendation			IAB an excellent recent initiative and members are clearly very committed
19	Recommendation	P2	A	Evolve IAB to include structured peer mentoring for early career academic staff, interface directly with graduating students, establish Intra pathways for SMEs and CRT/CDT secondments

Appendices

Peer Review Group Visit Schedule

Time	Peer Review Group (PRG) Activity/Meeting	Venue	Meeting No
Tuesday evening 7th May			
5 pm	**Briefing by the Director of Quality and Institutional Research** *guidelines provided to assist the PRG during the visit and in developing its report (Tea and Coffee)*	Crowne Plaza Hotel Meeting Room	**Rachel - QIO**
6 pm	**PRG Private Meeting Time** *Selection of Chairperson* *Review of initial impressions of the document* *Identification of key areas of interest* *Assignment of tasks and responsibilities*	Crowne Plaza Hotel	
7 pm	**Peer Review Group Dinner** with Quality Director	Crowne Plaza Hotel	**Review Team**

Day 1 : Wednesday 8th May, 2024 Glasnevin Campus, Stokes Building, Room S206/S209 & S208			
9.00-9.45	Consideration of the SAR with the Executive Dean and members of the Quality Review Steering group, commencing with a short presentation by the Dean, followed by discussion (Director, QIO to attend)	S206/ S209	Professor Brian Corcoran [Co-Chair]: Steering Group Lead Dr. Jennifer Bruton [Co-Chair]: Steering Group, Executive Dean Professor Nicholas Dunne: Deputy Dean Michele Pringle: Faculty Manager Gavin Osborne: Facilities and Technical Services Manager Mary O Halloran-Proffitt: International and Industry Engagement Manager Professor Conor Brennan: Associate Dean: Research Dr. Jennifer McManis: Associate Dean: Teaching and Learning Dr. Paul Clarke: Deputy Head School of Computing

9.45 - 10.45	Final year Expo 2024 - tour	McNulty Building	Prof Brian Corcoran, Chair of Steering Group Prof Nicholas Dunne, Deputy Dean
10.45-11.15	Conversation with Final Year Student Representatives	S206/S209	Conor McCarthy, Final Year Student, BEng Electronic & Computer Engineering Raj Dhanush Yendamuri, Final Year Student, BEng Electronic & Computer Engineering Jack Brosnan, Final Year Student, BEng Biomedical Engineering Emma Moriarty, Final Year Student, BEng Biomedical Engineering Liam Cowley, Final Year Student, BEng Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Jack Butler, Final Year Student, BEng Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Tony Tankoy-Bonki, Final Year Student, BSc Enterprise Computing Bartlomiej Pakula, Final Year Student, BSc Enterprise Computing
11.15-12.00	Industry Engagement	S208	Elaine Hanley: Partner, IBM Cybersecurity Services Ireland and UK, IBM PJ Hough: Investor and Advisor, Citrix/Microsoft, Citrix Michael Langan: Intel Movidius VPU IP Lead at Intel Corporation, INTEL John Malone: CEO at Provident CRM Marc Mullan: VP Data & Analytics, DAA Niall O'Connell: Executive Director of Engineering, Openet Dr. Alessandra Sala: Sr. Director of Artificial Intelligence and Data Science, Shutterstock Fergus Whelan: COO at MALONE Group
12.00-12.40	Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee	S206/ S209	Dr. Jennifer McManis:Associate Dean of Teaching and Learning Dr. Shirley Coyle: Programme Chair, Global Challenges Dr. Graham Healy: Programme Chair, Computing for Business Dr. Tamas Szecsi: Programme Chair, Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Owen Clarkin: Teaching Convenor, Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Brendan Hayes: Teaching Convenor, Electronic Engineering Dr. Brian Davis: Teaching Convenor, Computing Clare Gormley: Teaching Enhancement unit

			Tony Bonki - Student Rep Ewelina Wasiak: Senior Administrative officer Teaching and Learning
12.40-13.20	Programme Chairs	S206/ S209	Dr. Ali Intizar, Assistant Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Dr. Shirley Coyle, Assistant Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Mr Richard Bolger, Business Development Manager, School of Electronic Engineering Dr. Alan Kennedy, Assistant Professor, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Tanya Levingstone, Assistant Professor, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Greg McNamara, Assistant Professor, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Graham Healy, Assistant Professor, School of Computing Dr. Jennifer Foster, Assistant Professor, School of Computing Dr. Alessandra Mileo, Assistant Professor, School of Computing Dr. Conor McArdle, Assistant Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Professor Derek Molloy, Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Dr. Leah Ridgway, Assistant Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Dr. Renaat Verbruggen, Assistant Professor, School of Computing
13.20 - 14.00	Lunch/ PRG Private Meeting Time	S208 The POD	

14.00-14.30	Meeting with Heads and Deputy Heads of School	S206/ S209	Dr. Paul Young, Head of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Noel Murphy, Head of Electronic Engineering Dr. Andrew McCarren, Head of Computing Dr. Paul Clarke, Deputy Head of Computing Professor Derek Molloy, Deputy Head of Electronic Engineering Dr. Nigel Kent, Deputy Head of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering
14.30-15.15	Undergraduate Students - cross-Faculty	S206/ S209	Bhartendu Sharma: BEng Mechatronic Engineering (Year 4) Niamh Burke: BEng Biomedical Eng (Year 3) Hannah Adediwura: BEng Mech & Manuf Eng (Year 3) Cian Foy: BEng Mechatronic Engineering (Year 4) Sol Lee: BEng Mechanical & Sustainability Engineering (Year 4) Evan Rooney: BEng Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering (Year 4) Krzysztof Baran: BSc Data Science (Year 4) Adam Johnson: BSc Computing for Business (Year 3) Stephanie Ulogwara: BSc Enterprise Computing (Year 4) Josh Casey: BSc Computer Science (Year 3) Kirsten Lee: BEng Electronic and Computing Engineering (Year 4) Oisin Thurlow: BEng Electronic and Computing Engineering (Year 4) Patrick Vitols Jegurs: BEng/MEng Electronic and Computing Engineering (Year 4) Muhammad Roshdy: BEng Electronic and Computing Engineering (Year 1) Anthony McNally: BEng Electronic and Computing Engineering (Year 2)
15.15 - 15.45	Research Centre Directors, Managers and CDT and CRT Administrators	S206/ S209	Professor Cathal Gurrin: AI-driven Digital Content Technology (ADAPT) Professors Stephen Daniels: Advanced Materials and BioEngineering Research (AMBER) Dr. Prince Anandajarah: Future Networks and Communications (CONNECT) Dr Inam Ul Ahmad: Funded Investigator, Advanced Manufacturing (I-Form) Professor Tomas Ward: Data Analytics (Insight)

			Professor Liam Barry: Irish Photonic Integration Centre (IPIC) Professor Gabriel Muntean, DCU Head, Software (Lero) Dr. Paul Clarke: Member, Software (Lero) Dr. Ali Intizar: Agri-Food & Dairy Production (VistaMilk) Professor Suzanne Little: Artificial Intelligence (CRT AI) Dr. Naadiya Carrim: INSIGHT (SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics) Professor Nicholas Dunne; Biodesign Europe (BDE) Dr. Tanya Levingstone: Biodesign Europe (BDE) Professor Andy Way: DCU Institute for Future Media Democracy and Society (Fujo) Dr. Owen Clarkin, DCU Life Sciences Institute (LSI) Dr. Martin Collier: DCU Entwine Centre for Resilient IoT (RIoT) *awaiting confirmation University Designated Research Centres - Affiliated Dr. James Carton, DESI (DCU Centre for Decarbonisation, Sustainability and Innovation) Vicky Flanagan, Co-ordinator, Centre for Research Training.
15.45 - 16.30	Postgraduate taught and research - cross-faculty	S206/ S209	Arash Babamiri Nammrudi, PhD-track, Year 1, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Tara McMullan, PhD, Year 3, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Niamh Kilgallen, BEng/MEng Mechanical & Manufacturing Eng. (Year 5), MEng) School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Gavin Chapman, BEng/MEng Mechanical & Manufacturing Eng. (Year 5), MEng) School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Jacob Baneham, PhD-track, Year 2, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Colm Parnell, BEng/MEng Biomedical Engineering (Year 5, MEng), School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Venkatraman Palani, MSc Computing (Year 1), School of Computing

			Pranshu Mangal, MSc Computing (Year 1), School of Computing Artur Martins, MSc Computing (Year 2), School of Computing Adam Stapleton, PhD track, Year 4, School of Computing Marco Troncoso Costas, PhD, Year 4, School of Electronic Engineering Oluwabukola (Grace) Adegboro, PhD-track, Year 1, School of Electronic Engineering Anam Hashmi PhD-track, Year 2, School of Electronic Engineering Sanjaya Gunawardhana, PhD-track, Year 3, School of Electronic Engineering Sarraj Alsersawi, MSc Electronic & Computer Technology, School of Electronic Engineering Zhou Fang, MEng Electronic & Computer Engineering, School of Electronic Engineering Vitor Gaboardi Dos Santos, PhD-track, Year 2, School of Computing Chinmaya Kaundanya, PhD-track, Year 2, School of Computing Mayur Ganesh Sonawale, MSc Computing (Year 1), School of Computing
16.30 - 17.00	PGR - coffee and break	S208 The POD	
17.00- 18.00	PRG Private Meeting Time	S208 The POD	
19.00	PRG Private Dinner and Discussion	Crowne Plaza Hotel	Arranged with QPO

Day 2 : Thursday 9th May, 2024 Glasnevin Campus, Stokes Building, Room S206/S209 & S208 and SG101			
9.15 - 9.45	PRG Private Meeting Time	S208 The POD	
9.45 - 10.30	Faculty Academic Staff	S206 - S209	Prof. Dermot Brabazon, Full Professor, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Harry Esmonde: Associate Professor, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Anne Morrissey, Associate Professor, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering

			Dr. Lorna Fitzsimons, Assistant Professor, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Mohammad Saffari, Assistant Professor, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Prof. Andy Way, Full Professor, School of Computing Dr. Alessandra Mileo, Associate Professor, School of Computing Dr. Claudio Mazo, Assistant Professor, School of Computing Dr. Pascal Landais, Associate Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Dr. Mingming Liu, Assistant Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Prof. Noel O'Connor, Full Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Dr. Robert Sadleir, Assistant Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Dr. Rajani Vijayaraghavan, Assistant Professor, School of Electronic Engineering Prof. Paul Whelan, Full Professor, School of Electronic Engineering
10.30-11.15	Faculty Professional Support Staff/Technical Staff Session	S206 - S209	Michele Pringle: Faculty Manager Mary O Halloran-Proffitt: International and Industry Engagement Manager Aine Nolan: Senior Administrative Officer: Marketing Ewelina Wasiak: Senior Administrative Officer: Teaching and Learning Gintare Lubeck: Administrative Assistant: Teaching and Learning Vicky Flanagan: Centre for Research Training: Administrative officer Irene McEvoy: Senior Administrative Officer: Electronic Engineering Caoimhe O Broin: PA to Head of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Gavin Osborne: Facilities and Technical Services Manager Keith Hickey: Information & Education Technology Manager Eugene Curran: Senior Systems Administrator Paul Wogan: Chief Technical Officer

			Cian Merne: Technical Officer Sean Haran: Systems Administrator Robert Clare: Senior Technical officer
11.15-11.30	PRG Private Meeting Time (Tea and Coffee)	S208 The POD	
11.30-12.15	Faculty Research Committee	S206/ S209	Prof. Conor Brennan: Chair: Associate Dean Research Joan Kelly: Centre Doctoral Training-Administrator Professor Suzanne Little: Academic Lead Centre for Research Training Dr. David Kinahan: Research Convenor Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering Dr. Faisal Zahoor: Research Development Officer Dr. Martin Collier: Director Entwine Dr. Prince Anandarajah: Research Convenor Electronic Engineering Dr. Silvana MacMahon: Research Convenor Computing Thomas Keogh: Student Rep Anesu Nyabadza: Postdoctoral representative Treasa Fagan: Senior Administrative Officer - Research
12.15 - 13.00	Postdoctoral Researchers and Research Assistants	S206 - S209	Ly Duyen Tran: Research Assistant (ADAPT, SFI Research Centre for AI-Driven Digital Content Technology) Dr. Tu Ninh Van: Postdoctoral Researcher (ADAPT, SFI Research Centre for AI-Driven Digital Content Technology) Josiah Chekotu: Postgraduate Researcher (i-Form, SFI Research Centre for Advanced Manufacturing) Dr. Mehran Bahramyan: Postdoctoral Researcher (i-Form, SFI Research Centre for Advanced Manufacturing) Dr. Suman Chatterjee: Postdoctoral Researcher (i-Form, SFI Research Centre for Advanced Manufacturing) Dr. Gopinath Perumal: Postdoctoral Researcher (i-Form, SFI Research Centre for Advanced Manufacturing) Dr. Julia Dietlmeier: Postdoctoral Researcher (INSIGHT, SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics)

			Dr. Jaime Fernandez: Postdoctoral Researcher (INSIGHT, SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics) Dr. Anderson Simiscuka: Postdoctoral Researcher (INSIGHT, SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics) Dr. Abid Yaqoob: Postdoctoral Researcher (INSIGHT, SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics) Dr. Asma Slaimi: Postdoctoral Researcher (INSIGHT, SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics) Dr. Zohreh Mousavi Nejad: Postdoctoral Researcher (Biodesign Europe) Dr. Srishti Agrawal: Postdoctoral Researcher (Biodesign Europe) Dr. John Redmond: Postdoctoral Researcher (Biodesign Europe) Dr. Satish Jaiswal: Postdoctoral Researcher (Biodesign Europe)
13.00-13.45	Lunch/ PRG Private Meeting Time	S208 The POD	
13.45 - 14.30	Central Support Units (ISS, Library, SS&D, Estates, Finance, HR, OCOO, H&S, President's Office, OVPAA, Placement, INTRA, Alumni, DCUET, OEDE.)	S206-S209	Claire Whelehan, Director of Philanthropy, DCU Educational Trust Mary Larkin Griffin, Alumni Relations Operations Manager, DCU Alumni Office Brendan Tighe, Senior International Mobility Manager, DCU Placement Jean Hughes, Associate Director of University Initiatives, DCU President's Office Maeve Long, Head of INTRA, DCU Placement Gary Conway, Operations Manager, DCU Information Systems Services Annabelle Stover, Deputy Dean of Students, DCU Student Support & Development Sandra Gibney, Careers Consultant - FEC, DCU Careers Service Caroline Groarty, Student Enrolment Fees, Registry Lisa Callaghan, Information & Digital Literacy Coordinator/ Engineering & Computing Librarian, DCU Library Siobhan Fitzgerald DCU Management & Financial Planning Janice Knight, HR Service Delivery Manager, DCU Human Resources Gerard McEvoy, Head of Estates, DCU Estates Office

			Laura Mahoney, Executive Director of Engagement, DCU Office of the Executive Director of Engagement
14.30 - 15.00	Staff Open Forum for any member of staff	S206 - S209	An opportunity for any colleague to meet panel who hasn't been included in any of the sessions
15.00– 15.30	PRG Private Meeting Time/ Coffee	S208 The POD	
15.30 - 16.30	Executive Dean, Deputy Dean, Associate Deans, Faculty Manager, International & Industry Engagement Manager and Facilities and Technical Services Manager	S206/ S209	Dr. Jennifer Bruton: Executive Dean Professor Nicholas Dunne: Deputy Dean Professor Conor Brennan: Associate Dean: Research Dr. Jennifer McManis: Associate Dean: Teaching and Michele Pringle: Faculty Manager Gavin Osborne: Facilities and Technical Services Ma Mary O Halloran-Proffitt: International and Industry Engagement Manager
16.30 - 17.30	Private Panel Meeting	S208 The POD	
19.00	PRG Private Dinner and Meeting	Crowne Plaza Hotel	Arranged with QPO

Day 3: Friday 10th May 2024 Glasnevin Campus, Stokes Building, Room S206/S209 & S208 and SG101			
9.00 - 10.00	PRG Meeting with Senior Management Group	AG01 Albert College	Already in SMG Diary
10.00- 10.30	Meeting with Area Reporting Head	AG01	Already in Anne Sinnott's Diary
10:30- 12.30	PRG Private Meeting Time- final discussion on recommendations	S208 The POD	Peer review group
12.30- 14.00	PRG working lunch and finalisation of exit presentation	S208 The POD	Peer review group
14.00- 15.00	Briefing with Executive Dean and Director of QPO on key recommendations	S208 The POD	Dr. Jennifer Bruton, Executive Dean of Faculty Dr. Rachel Keegan, Director of Quality Promotion
15.00	PRG Exit Presentation - All Staff	SA301	All Faculty Staff