

# Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement Programme



## Peer Review Group Report

### National Centre for Plasma Science & Technology (NCPST)

#### Peer Review Group members

Prof. Bill Graham (Chair), Director, Centre for Plasma Physics (CPP) School of Mathematics and Physics, Queen's University

Dr. Pascal Chabert, Vice-Director of the Laboratoire de Physique des Plasmas, France

Mr. Conor Sheehan, Operations Manager TTSI2 & cTTO, Enterprise Ireland

Dr. Francesco Cavatorta, (Rapporteur) DCU School of Law & Government

Dr. Eithne O'Connell, DCU School of Applied Languages & Intercultural Studies

Date: 22 May 2013

## 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 approve publication in a manner that it sees fit.

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

# Peer Review Group Report for National Centre for Plasma Science & Technology (NCPST)

## 1. Introduction and Overview

### Location

The NCPST quality review visit took place in the research and Engineering Building where the NCPST administrative offices are located and also in the Albert College where two meetings were held. The first of these was the introductory meeting with the coordinating committee of the NCPST and the second one was with the management of the University to discuss the preliminary findings and examine what management expected from the visit. The Peer Review Group (PRG) also visited the labs that the NCPST staff and students used. We were given a tour and demonstrations by post-doctoral researchers, PhD students and technical support staff.

### Staff

The Centre currently consists of 67 members: 14 academic, 2 Emeritus Professors, 11 research staff, 31 postgraduate students and 9 support staff.

### Product / Processes

In late 2011 the NCPST got the call from the Quality Promotion Office (QPO) at DCU to ask the Centre to participate in its second Quality Review, the first review having been completed in 2006. The Centre happily agreed having gained significantly from the 2006 review process.

Outlined in the table below is a timeline tracking the NCPST meetings and tasks undertaken over the past 15 months and who was involved in these tasks. Note that the committees established brought together representatives from all groupings within the Centre (i.e. Principal Investigators (PIs), Postdoctoral Researchers, Postgraduates, Core Team) and committee members were strongly recommended to solicit input and feedback from their grouping. It includes the measures taken to communicate and engage with all members across the NCPST as well as with our external stakeholders. There were of course many email and other communications that are not recorded in this table.

## 2. The Self-Assessment Process

### The Co-ordinating Committee

Name	Area	Role
Ms Samantha Fahy	NCPST	Centre Manager
Professor Miles Turner	NCPST	Director
Ms Sheila Boughton	NCPST	Research Administrator
Dr Dermot Brabazon	School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering,	Academic
Dr Lampros Nikolopoulos	School of Physical Sciences	Academic
Dr Niall O'Connor	NCPST	Postdoc
Mr Thomas Kelly	NCPST	Postgrad
Mr Conor Murphy	NCPST	Technical Officer
Mr Sarah Hayes	NCPST	Research Administration
Ms Fiona Farrell	NCPST	Research Administration

Methodology adopted during process

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity/Task</b>	<b>Participants/Owner</b>	<b>Outputs/Actions</b>
<b>Nov 2011</b>	QPO nominate NCPST for Review	QPO/NCPST Senior Management	To agree process and dates
<b>Jan 2012</b>	Quality Review training course organised by QPO	Sheila Boughton	Review and understand the quality review process from a Centre perspective
<b>May 2012</b>	Nomination of Review Coordinator	NCPST MC	Claire McKenna was nominated as the person responsible for the coordination of the QR
<b>May 2012</b>	Identification of Members of Committees	CMcK/NCPST Management	Committees established as per list above
<b>June 2012</b>	Initial Meeting of Steering Committee	CMcK + Steering Committee members	Several meeting to agree process and major tasks to be undertaken
<b>13 Sept 2012</b>	NCPST Management Committee Meeting	MC Committee, Claire McKenna	To update MC on QR process to date
<b>25 Sept 2012</b>	Talk by Dr Sarah Ingle, DCU Quality Promotion Office	Approx 40 NCPST members	To inform all NCPST members about the QR process
<b>17 Oct 2012</b>	Meeting	QR Committee	To plan data gathering activity and other QR process steps
<b>Oct – Dec 2012</b>	Facilitator - planning meetings	Claire McKenna, Samantha Fahy, Anne Louise Holloway	To prepare surveys and away day plan
<b>Nov 2012</b>	Internal Survey	All NCPST members, postgrads, postdoctoral researchers, core team PIs.	41 respondents (61% response rate)
<b>Nov 2012</b>	External Survey	Ex-members, DCU staff, stakeholders in funding bodies, academic and industrial collaborators	28 respondents

Date	Activity/Task	Participants/Owner	Outputs/Actions
<b>18 Dec 2012</b>	NCPST Away Day	NCPST members facilitated by Sam Fahy/ Claire McKenna/ Anne Louise Holloway and Geraldine Lavin from 3dri ( <a href="http://www.3rdi.ie/">http://www.3rdi.ie/</a> ) – External Facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To review survey outcomes</li> <li>To plan future strategy for the Centre</li> </ul> Approx. 30 participants in the day, successful – areas for focus groups identified, suggestions for future activity and operation procedures made
<b>Jan 2013</b>	Review of material gathered and first SAR draft	Steering Group	Incorporation of inputs into SAR
<b>24 Jan 2013</b>	QR Training	Sheila Boughton, Fiona Farrell	With the departure of both Claire and Anne Louise Sheila and Fiona agreed to familiarise themselves with the process to ensure that the Centre could complete the Review.
<b>30 Jan 2013</b>	Info Session: Career development for researchers	NCPST Postdoctoral staff	To inform researchers of funding opportunities, to generate interest in focus group
<b>Feb 2013</b>	Focus Groups: 1. IT infrastructure 2. Career development for researchers	1. Steering Committee, IT related researchers 2. Steering Committee, researchers (mainly Postdoctoral)	1. Understand IT requirement and propose potential solution 2. Inform researcher regard future career options
<b>Jan – Mar 2013</b>	Compilation of information for SAR	Claire McKenna (until end Jan 2013) Sheila Boughton & Sam Fahy after Jan 2013	Take all the existing and inputted data and compile into a self assessment report.
<b>Mar 2013</b>	Submit SAR	Sam Fahy/Sheila Boughton	Submit documentation to PRG and SMG

### 3. The Peer Review Group Process

#### The Review Group

- Prof. Bill Graham (Chair), Director, Centre for Plasma Physics (CPP) School of Mathematics and Physics, Queen's University
- Dr. Pascal Chabert, Vice-Director of the Laboratoire de Physique des Plasmas, France
- Mr. Conor Sheehan, Operations Manager TTSI2 & cTTO, Enterprise Ireland
- Dr. Francesco Cavatorta, (Rapporteur) DCU School of Law & Government
- Dr. Eithne O'Connell, DCU School of Applied Languages & Intercultural Studies

**National Centre for Plasma Science &  
Technology (NCPST)  
10-12 April 2013**

Day	Time	Peer Review Group (PRG) Activity/Meeting	Venue	Meeting No.
<b>Day 1 Wed</b>	14.00-15.00	Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion; Guidelines provided to assist PRG during the visit and in developing the report.	A204	Arranged by QPO
	15.00-15.45	PRG selects Chair. Discussion of main areas of interest and / or concern arising from the Self Assessment Report (SAR).	A204	Arranged by QPO
	15.45-16.00	<i>Coffee</i>	A204	Arranged by QPO
	16.00-17.15	Consideration of SAR with Area Head & members of quality review committee. Short presentation by Area (10 min) followed by discussion of SAR. (Director of Quality Promotion in attendance) From NCPST: Miles Turner, Samantha Fahy, Sue O'Neill, Sheila Boughton, Niall O'Connor, Thomas Kelly, Lampros Nikolopoulos	A204	Arranged by QPO
	17:15-17.55	PRG Private meeting	A204	
	18.00-19.00	Informal Reception – PRG, Area Head, Members of Quality Review Committee, Director of Quality Promotion From NCPST: Miles Turner, Samantha Fahy, Sue O'Neill, Sheila Boughton, Niall O'Connor, Thomas Kelly	1838 DCU	Arranged by QPO
	19.00-20.30	PRG Private dinner	1838 DCU	Arranged by QPO
<b>Day 2 Thurs</b>	08.45– 09.00	PRG Private meeting	S127A	
	09.00-09.25	Area Head	S127A	1
	09.30-09.55	Area Management Team	S127A	2
	10.00-10.25	Area staff – Principal Investigators	S127A	3A
	10.30-11.00	<i>Coffee</i>	S127A	
	11.00-11.25	Area staff – Postdocs	S127A	3B
	11.30-11.55	Area staff - Administration	S127A	3C
	12.00-12.25	Heads or Senior staff in DCU Support / Service Offices working with Area	S127A	4
	12.30-12.55	Administrative Staff representatives from DCU Schools, Faculties or Research Centres and / or administrative staff representatives from varying levels within central administration	S127A	5
	13.00-14:00	<i>Lunch</i>	S127A	
	14.00-14.25	Tour of Facilities Conor Murphy & Thomas Kelly		

Day	Time	Peer Review Group (PRG) Activity/Meeting	Venue	Meeting No.
<b>Day 2</b>	14.30–15.25	Representatives from varying levels of academic staff familiar with Area.	S127A	6
	15.30-16.25	Representatives of students	S127A	7
	16:30-16:50	<i>Coffee</i>	S127A	
	16.50-17.15	Open forum for any member of Area staff	S127A	
	17.15-17.55	Meetings with external stakeholders (alumni, employers, suppliers, Colleges of DCU, members of Governing Authority depending on relevance to area...)	S127A	8
	18.00-18.05	Area Head (update and clarifications if required)	S127A	9
	18.05-18.15	PRG private meeting time	S127A	
	19.30	PRG private dinner	Crowne Plaza Hotel	Arranged by QPO
	<b>Day 3 Fri</b>	08.45– 09.00	PRG Private meeting	
	09.00-09.55	DCU Senior Management Group (SMG) (Director of Quality Promotion in	AG01	10
	10.00–10.25	Area Reporting Head (usually member of SMG)	AG01	11
	10.30-11.00	<i>Coffee</i>	S127A	
	11.00-11.30	PRG private meeting time	S127A	
	11.30 – 12.00	Meeting with Dr. Stephen Daniels, Executive Director	S127A	12
	12.00 – 13.00	PRG private meeting time	S127A	
	13.00-14:00	<i>Working Lunch</i> Clarification of outstanding issues for PRG if required	S127A	
	14.00-16.00	PRG Prepare Exit Presentation <i>(Coffee provided at 15.45)</i>	S127A	
	16.00-16.30	Exit Presentation – by PRG to Area Head and all members of Area staff (Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)	N115	13

## Methodology

The process of self-assessment is a useful exercise in so far as it allows the area under examination to have an intense and in-depth consultative process with all of the stakeholders and then to produce a document which is reflective and self-critical. This constitutes an excellent point of departure for the peer group reviewing the area under review. The visit is extremely important in the process too because it allows the peer group to meet all the stakeholders and probe them on aspects that the self-assessment report might have dealt with only marginally. The timetable is very intense, particularly on the second day of the visit.

The review report is well conceived when examining either academic or service / support areas, but DCU might consider in the future a different format for research centres with greater focus on the quality of the research output.

Overall the process is adequate and fulfils its mission of providing feedback on the quality of the processes within the area under review, but a change in the format and focus for reviewing research centres is highly recommended.

## Schedule of Activity

The visit was well structured and the schedule allowed for meetings with all of the relevant stakeholders, although more time with the crucial ones such as the PIs might have been of benefit. The members of the peer group quickly agreed on a Chair and broadly assigned areas of inquiry to each member, although group discussions on all aspects of the self-assessment report and the visit were frequent. All decisions were made consensually. The staff and students we met were broadly forthcoming with their views, very willing to engage with the peer group and available for further clarifications when needed. When further documentation was asked for, it was quickly provided and the facilities available to the peer group were excellent.

## View of the Self-Assessment Report

The self-assessment report was somewhat disappointing, but it is difficult to identify the exact reasons why this was the case. In terms of presentation and format, many recent changes in administrative personnel may have made it difficult for the centre to present a completely coherent document. The external members of the review group were expecting scientific achievements and research output to feature much more strongly. NCPST could certainly have decided to focus much more emphatically on research and really 'sell' itself, but the format of the report also placed objective constraints on the Centre's input. In addition, the rationale for the quality review, which is not essentially about research output, but rather about processes within NCPST, contributed to the presentation of report in its final form. Thus, from the beginning different members of the panel had different expectations of what the quality review process was going to be about, or to be more precise, some of them expected a different emphasis.

Once this issue was discussed and clarified, the self-assessment report itself became clearer in a number of respects. Its strengths lie in the details provided about the NCPST and the rather frank recognition of the challenges that face it. These were discussed in light of the changes that had been made following the previous quality review. This frank discussion of problems that were identified within the NCPST was very helpful in guiding the peer review group during the visit and much appreciated by it. The main weakness is that the SAR appeared to be 'flat' because it did not manage to make the strengths of the NCPST really stand out. In this respect again, the limited space dedicated to the scientific achievements was quite problematic. In addition, there was a consensus within the peer group that the SAR was at times unclear both in terms of form and content.



## **4. Findings of the Peer Review Group**

### 4.1 Background, Overview, Strategy, Context

The NCPST represents a Centre of excellence for Dublin City University and contributes greatly to the overall research output of the university. The Centre furthermore is an integral part of DCU's research strategy in so far as it has very close connections to the world of enterprise, which is a core aspect of the innovative approach DCU has. The Centre therefore is central to the development of the university and the Faculties involved support it and enhance it.

### 4.2 Organisation and Management

The Centre is a "virtual" rather than a physical reality and it links staff from two faculties and five individual schools. Given the way members are scattered across departments and laboratories, there are potential challenges in relation to organisation and management. In certain cases, this has meant that some decisions were not consistently communicated across the breadth of the Centre. The Centre has itself identified a need to improve communication at all levels and in all directions. Contact and information exchange between the centre management, PIs, postdocs and Ph.D. students could be enhanced not just from the top down, but also from the bottom up and horizontally amongst peers. Furthermore, the Centre could promote itself better within the University, nationally and internationally, although it does already have a fine reputation.

The current management structure involves a Director, Executive-Director and Centre Manager, and the Management Committee which meets bi-monthly. The review panel recommends that Management be slimmed down to a (scientific) Director, on a limited term, working with the assistance of a senior administrator. In addition to the Management Committee meetings, we recommend that the Director organises and chairs regular meetings with the PIs at which strategic, research, budgetary and other issues can be discussed and progressed.

As regards the organisation and distribution of information, there is scope for an improved website to have an important unifying effect, giving visibility to the research work and publications of post-docs and PIs and providing personal pages with photographs which might serve as the starting point for new contacts and collaborations across diverse areas. We also recommend increased use of internal online access to organisational and management documents such as agendas, minutes, budgets etc.

The Centre would benefit from having a physical hub, and/or more centralised space, that would serve as a focus for members, facilitating direct personal contact, relationship-building and information exchange.

More active use of DCU facilities such as DORAS would enhance the Centre's visibility, both nationally and internationally. Furthermore, prominent signage displayed outside the building in which most of the Centre's labs and offices are located would also increase local awareness/visibility.

### 4.3 Staffing and Accommodation

Members of the Centre and support staff appear to be highly motivated, dedicated and collegial. They have a strong sense of mission and identify well as a team. The administration and secretarial staff were very highly praised by those working in support services across University. The excellence of the Centre is made possible by the level of commitment shown and this is all the more remarkable given the number of people in the centre on short term contracts.

The PRG urges the University and those members of the Centre involved in HR issues to ensure that employment decisions support the retention of the key knowledge and expertise on which the reputation of the Centre has been built. The PRG urges implementation of the Research Career Framework guidelines in this regard.

#### 4.4 Management of Financial and other Resources

Meetings with PIs and representatives of two faculty managers and the Finance Office confirmed that the financial management of the Centre was excellent both internally and externally.

A web-based database of the equipment resource available to Centre members is under construction at present.

The equipment resources are managed by a number of technicians from both the Centre and associated Schools. The maintenance of some of the complex, expensive equipment requires very specialist knowledge and highly reliable services. There are some issues with the short-term contract available to one of the specialist technicians and the need for 24-hour access to information about the central support services within buildings that house sensitive equipment.

#### 4.5 External/Internal Relations including Community Engagement

The Centre has an impressive list of industry partners and can detail 25 interactions with companies. However, the list of Licence Agreements presented does not reflect this level of activity and, consequently, the Centre is missing an opportunity to reflect their ongoing Knowledge Transfer (KT) activities with industry.

The Centre should consider capturing a number of the industry interactions in case studies. It was encouraging to learn that, looking to the future, the Centre recognises the need to drive translational research projects in order to address defined market needs.

As the NCPST Strategic Plan is reworked to reflect the DCU Research Plan, the opportunity should be grasped to map the available strong platform technologies from across the Centre onto industry sectors in Ireland. This would be a first step in bringing further focus to and informing the work of the business development manager.

The business development manager should consider how best to message the advantages to industry in working with the NCPST. Many potential industry partners will possibly never have considered the use of plasma in their production processes – “if I had it what could I do with it”?

#### 4.6. Academic Programmes, Teaching and Learning

There are a number of very positive aspects that emerge from the academic programmes that the Centre offers. From the point of view of the PhD and post-doctoral students there is enthusiasm for the way in which supervision occurs and there is a sense of widespread happiness about the mentoring, teaching and support they receive. Students were keen to express satisfaction with the quality of the ‘teaching’ they received and were quick to praise the Centre, including the technical support staff. The one issue that seemed to bother some of them is linked to the fact that they might not necessarily know who is working on what among them due to poor communication within the Centre about the different types of expertise that different students have. Part of the success of the Centre is also reflected in the variety of students that it attracts in so far as there is a very ‘international’ atmosphere, which is certainly positive. Finally, praise should be given to the undergraduate programme that up-skills students already in the workforce. This programme has an excellent reputation and has a high success rate.

#### 4.7 Research, Scholarship and Training

In the period under consideration, 2006-2013, 61 PhDs were completed within the Centre, and 139 papers were published in high-quality journals. According to the estimates presented in the report, this represents between 5-10% of DCU publications while the people in the Centre only represent 3% of DCU; the Centre therefore has a strong impact on the overall DCU research profile.

The format of the review did not allow an in-depth analysis of the research carried out in the centre. However, from the bibliography search and the short discussions during the laboratory tour, world class research was clearly identified. Some applied research with good potential for commercial exploitation, which in some cases has been demonstrated, was also identified.

Some historical and recognized competences within the Centre, for instance the electrical diagnostics in low-temperature plasmas, are slowing down but new subjects are emerging. Among them, the area of atmospheric plasmas for food and health applications is promising with real potential for commercial exploitation. The laser-plasma interaction subject has also moved, from fundamental spectroscopy of matter under extreme conditions, to research with potential applications, for instance, EUV light sources for lithography in microelectronics.

Computational simulation in plasma physics is an area in which the centre has recognized expertise, both in MHD and turbulent hot plasmas and in low-temperature plasmas (from low-pressure to atmospheric pressure). This is a clear transversal research theme that can strengthen the collaborations between the Centre's PIs.

#### 4.8 Student/Staff Perspective

There are currently a total of 31 research students registered through the NCPST. There have been 56 graduates in the period 2006-2012, 47 of whom have graduated with a PhD degree, with the remaining 9 receiving either an M.Sc (5) or M. Eng. (4).

The students are generally satisfied by the environment provided by the Centre. The supervision seems appropriate. Students present their work in international conferences and publish papers in high quality journals.

The Centre has strong industrial links which help the students to get positions in industry. Only a smaller percentage of students seem to be interested in seeking post-doc positions abroad to develop an academic carrier.

The administrative and technical staff are very committed to the Centre and showed excellent sense of mission, commitment and pride in the Centre. The administrative staff was described as outstanding and a pleasure to work with by many of those both outside and inside of the centre.

The PIs are very active and busy carrying out their research projects and supervising students. They spoke of the lack of meetings to define the Centre strategy and develop joint research projects and expressed an interest in developing such meetings on a regular basis. The overall environment is positive and the funding situation has been very favorable to date. Every effort will need to be made to continue to access sufficient appropriate funding into the future.

#### 4.9 Overall Analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Concerns

<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
<p>Excellent access to resources: equipment and people</p> <p>Dedicated &amp; committed team</p> <p>Breath of experience</p> <p>Good range of theoretical &amp; experimental research (&amp; basic/applied)</p> <p>Fundamental &amp; industrially focussed research</p> <p>Excellent research environment</p> <p>Links with academic/industry collaborators</p> <p>Internationally competitive in plasma research</p>	<p>Lack of security/funding</p> <p>Poor communication / promotion strategy</p> <p>Lack of awareness amongst postgrads as to what NCPST is</p> <p>No centralised offices – difficult to function as a Centre</p>
<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Challenges</b>
<p>Stronger links with industry, particularly in fusion research</p> <p>Build on successes in relation to training provided to industry</p> <p>Extend research in plasma healthcare/food</p> <p>Develop synergies with other research groups</p>	<p>Funding reductions</p> <p>Lack of career structure for researchers</p>

## 5. Recommendations for Improvement

### Indication of Priority:

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.

### Level(s) of the University where action is required:

A: Area under review

U: University Senior Management

No.	Priority	Level	Recommendation
1	P1	A	Ensure that there are regular, scheduled, at least 6 monthly, meetings of PIs chaired by the NCPST Director.
2	P2	A	Provide more mentoring and information for postgraduate and postdoctoral students in relation to international and industrial employment opportunities.
3	P1	A	Improve the website to include publications, invited conferences. Also update personal pages, including photos of staff and students to improve visibility and encourage communications and contact between NCPST members.
4	P1	A	Improve internal online access to documents relating to management issues such as agendas, minutes, budgetary decisions etc.
5	P1	A	Exploit the diversity of scientific interests to explore/create new research themes and commercial activities.
6	P3	A	Develop the use of DCU facilities such as DORAS to improve international visibility.
7	P1	A	Identify ongoing knowledge transferred to industry and the value, financial and otherwise, placed on it.
8	P2	U	Implement fully the DCU Research Career Framework across the Centre and include for engagement with industry.
9	P3	A	Provide proposal writing training for researchers.
10	P1	A	Engage with EI to identify opportunities to support the important work of the business development manager.
11	P1	A	Map strong platform technologies from across the Centre onto industry in Ireland in order to inform activities of the business development manager.
12	P2	A	Extend the DCU Business School initiative across the Centre so that all members of NCPST are trained in thinking about how businesses can be developed.
13	P2	U	Appoint a Scientific Director for a defined term along with a Senior Administrator.
14	P2	U	Allocate increased space for labs/machinery.
15	P3	A / U	Improve physical environment to encourage closer informal contacts and communications among staff and students.

**Appendix: Names and roles of those attending meetings with PRG during review visit**

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Name(s)</b>	<b>Position</b>
1	Professor Miles Turner	Director NCPST
2	Professor Miles Turner Ms Samantha Fahy	Director, NCPST Centre Manager, NCPST
3A	Professor Martin Henry Dr Dermot Brabazon Dr Masha Chernyakova Dr Turlough Downes Dr Bert Ellingboe Dr Lampros Nikolopoulos Dr Jean-Paul Mosnier Dr. Joseph Stokes	Prof Emeritus Physics, Member of NCPST Academic, School of Mechanical & Manufacturing Engineering Academic, School of Physical Sciences Academic, School of Mathematical Sciences Academic, School of Physical Sciences Academic, School of Physical Sciences Academic, School of Physical Sciences Academic, School of Physical Sciences Head of School, Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering
3B	Dr Jim Conway Dr Cezar Gaman Dr Muhammad Iqbal Dr Bernard Keville Dr Tamara Matthews Dr Orla Cahill	Postdoc, NCPST Postdoc, NCPST Postdoc, NCPST Postdoc, NCPST Postdoc, NCPST Postdoc, NCPST
3C	Ms Samantha Fahy Ms Sue O'Neill Dr Jim Conway Ms Sheila Boughton Ms Sarah Hayes Ms Fiona Farrell Ms Trish Ainsworth Mr Conor Murphy	Centre Manager, NCPST Business Development Manager, NCPST Education and Outreach, NCPST Research Administration, NCPST Research Administration, NCPST Research Administration, NCPST Research Administration, NCPST Technical Officer, NCPST
4	Ms Pauline Mooney Ms Michele Pringle Mr Richard Stokes	Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science & Health Faculty Manager, Faculty of Engineering & Computing Director of Innovation, INVENT
5	Mr Gareth Yore Dr Anne Louise Holloway Ms Karolina Lis Ms Lisa Peyton Mr Billy Roarty Ms Ger Lardner	Human Resources Department Research Officer, Research & Innovation Support Research Financial Accounts, Finance Office Secretary, School of Physical Sciences Technical Officer, School of Electronic Engineering Research Admin, RINCE
6	Prof. Patrick McNally Dr Teresa Hogan	Head of School, School of Electronic Engineering Academic, DCU Business School
7	NCPST Research Students	NCPST
8	Mr Niall MacGearailt Dr Denis Dowling Prof. Hilary Humphreys	INTEL Director, Surface Engineering Group, UCD Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI)
9	Professor Miles Turner	Director NCPST
10	Professor Brian MacCraith Mr Jim Dowling Professor Eithne Guilfoyle Professor Alan Harvey Dr Declan Raftery Dr John Doyle Professor John Costello Ms Marian Burns Mr Ciarán McGivern Mr Ciarán O'Cuinn	DCU President Deputy President Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) Vice-President Research & Innovation Chief Operations Officer Dean of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Dean of Faculty of Science & Health Director of Human Resources Director of Finance Executive Director External and Strategic Affairs
11	Professor John Costello	Dean of Faculty of Science & Health
12	Dr. Stephen Daniels	Executive Director, NCPST