



Peer Review Group Report

School of Health & Human Performance

1. Prof. Mark Yeckel, Associate Dean for Admissions, Prof of Medical Sciences, Quinnipiac University (Chair)
2. Dr. Fiona Chambers, Director of Sports Studies and Physical Education, University College Cork
3. Mr. James Galvin, Chief Executive, Federation of Irish Sport
4. Ms. Karen Johnston, Institutional Research & Analysis Officer , Dublin City University
5. Prof. James Kelly, Head of School, History & Geography, Dublin City University

Date: 9 June 2017

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 (QulP) in response to the various issues and findings of the SAR and PRG reports.
5. The PRG report and the draft QulP are considered by the Quality Promotion Committee (QPC) and University Executive.
6. The draft QulP 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 QulP.
7. The PRG Report and the QulP 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 the School of Health & Human Performance

1. Introduction and Overview

Location

The facilities of the School of Health and Human Performance (SHHP) occupy 2976 sq.m and are spread across four buildings: Albert College, The Science Building, House 19, and The Nursing and Human Sciences Building (see Appendix A). The SHHP has shown significant physical growth since the last Quality Review in 2007, when it occupied 1353 sq. m.

Staff

At present, there are 18 full-time academic staff, 3 technical staff, 5 research staff, and 1 administrative staff member (see Appendix B). There are also 14 contract staff. Of the 18 academic teaching staff, 14 are Lecturers, 3 are Senior Lecturers, and 1 is a professor. The full-time academic staff represent various disciplines: physiology (5), sports medicine and exercise (2), pedagogy (2), athletic training and therapy (2), physiotherapy (1), psychology (1), motor skills (1), biomechanics (1), cell and molecular biology (1), adapted physical activity (1), and coaching (1).

The academic staff teach, run research programs, fulfill administrative duties, and participate in community engagement. The technical staff primarily provide operational support of equipment and facilities. The research staff provide support for research endeavours. The one administrative staff member provides administrative support to the entire School.

Product / Processes

The SHHP is one of six academic units within the Faculty of Science and Health, along with Chemical Sciences, Physical Sciences, Biotechnology, Nursing and Human Sciences and Mathematical Sciences,. The SHHP was established in 1999 as the Centre for Sport Science and Health, and gained School status in 2005. Since its inception as a Centre, then advancement to a School, the SHHP has been a leader in developing programmes related to human-based research and education as it relates to sports, exercise, a healthy lifestyle, and most recently chronic illness rehabilitation. The SHHP also plays an important role in working with various community groups and entrepreneurial organisations to promote a healthy lifestyle and advance the mission and values of DCU.

The Mission, Aim, and Objectives of SHHP as stated in the SAR are:

Our Mission

Through education, innovative research and outreach programs, the School of Health and Human Performance endeavours to prepare graduates to enhance health and human performance and advocate for and champion a healthy, educated and active society.

Our Aim

Through the provision of high quality education and innovative and integrative research, provide students with an understanding of the principles that underlie their discipline of study and the practical skills to implement them. The School also aims to lead and foster excellence in research to the highest international standards, and cultivate external links that facilitate teaching and research while benefiting the wider community.

Key Objectives

- 1. To provide an effective, efficient, sustainable and agreed management structure for the School*

2. *To enhance the learning experience of students, through the delivery of unique and varied teaching styles based on best practice*
3. *To encourage and facilitate quality research activity and output that reflects the interests of staff in the School*
4. *To continue to foster existing external links and community relations as well as to actively pursue engagement with the community*

The School offers four level 8 undergraduate BSc degree programs that were progressively implemented, starting in 1999:

1. Sport Science and Health (SSH; 1999);
2. Athletic Therapy and Training (ATT; 2005/6);
3. Physical Education with Biology (PEB; 2006/7);
4. Physical Education with Mathematics (PEM; 2012/13).

Each undergraduate programme is administered by a Chairperson who is a full-time Faculty member in the SHHP. The same Chairperson is currently assigned to PEB and PEM. Faculty members are also assigned to coordinate the INTeGrated TRAIning (INTRA) internship program for SSH students and clinical placement (mostly in North America) for final year ATT students. The School currently offers graduate level MSc and PhD programs, by research only.

2. The Self-Assessment Process

The Coordinating Committee

A School co-ordinating committee was established in September 2016 comprising the following representative membership:

	Name	Role in School	Role in QR Committee
1	Prof. Niall Moyna	Head, Professor	Chair
2	Dr. Bróna Furlong	MedEx Research Officer	Co-ordinator of self-assessment report
3	Dr. Ronan Murphy	Deputy Head of School	Co-ordinator of self-assessment report

Methodology adopted during process

As noted in the SAR, the School Quality Review Committee was formed in September 2016 and members were allocated their various positions of responsibility and tasks. Early meetings were devoted to identifying the scope and processes of the review and to develop a draft self-assessment plan. The Committee met with the Quality Promotion Office on a number of occasions to confirm the objectives and activities involved in the review process. The Committee participated in a training workshop delivered by the Quality Promotion Office. A meeting was organised with the entire HHP Staff to outline the objectives and benefits of the Quality Review process and obtain input from the staff on the draft self-assessment plan and to finalise the plan.

The first self-assessment activity was an online staff survey circulated in November 2016. A survey was generated for academic staff, technical/administrative staff, and research staff. The surveys included common core items in addition to role specific questions. Topic areas included workload, professional development, communications, supports and resources, research, and collaborations. The surveys were anonymous. The response rate to the survey was 70%. In December 2016, staff focus groups were conducted focusing on i) Teaching & Learning, ii) Research and Scholarship, and iii) Community Relations and Services. There was an open call to all staff to attend the focus

groups. A postgraduate representative was also invited. The focus groups were chaired by a Quality Review Committee member, who followed a semi-structured script. Minutes were taken by another committee member. Attendance at the Teaching and Learning, Research and Scholarship, and Community Relations and Services focus groups were 9, 6 and 3 staff members, respectively.

In January 2017, a review day was organised and took place at a location external to the campus. The findings of the staff surveys and focus groups were circulated to all staff in advance of the review day. The review day was chaired by an external facilitator. The agenda included:

- i. Where are we now? A SWOC analysis under the themes of Teaching and Learning, Research and Scholarship, and Community Relations and Services
- ii. Where are we going? The development of strategic aims
- iii. How will we get there? The development of an action plan

The review day was attended by 19 out of the 21 School staff members. A follow-on meeting was organised with all HHP staff to finalize the School's Strategic plan.

In parallel with this process, the DCU Quality Review Committee compiled data on the School, the staff, and the students. Annual and periodic program reviews were analyzed and used to assist with the Quality Review Process.”

3. The Peer Review Group Process

Peer Review Group (PRG)

Dr. Fiona Chambers, Director of Sports Studies and Physical Education/Senior Lecturer, University College Cork

Mr. James Galvin, Chief Executive, Federation of Irish Sport

Ms. Karen Johnston, Institutional Research & Analysis Officer, Dublin City University

Prof. James Kelly, Head of School, History & Geography, Dublin City University

Prof. Mark Yeckel, Associate Dean and Chair for Admissions, Prof of Medical Sciences, Quinnipiac University

Site Visit Programme

The Peer Review Group (PRG) met with School management and staff, students, Heads of other Schools in the Faculty, representatives of University Support and Service Units, external stakeholders, and University Senior Management. The full programme of the visit is shown in Appendix C. A list of participants in meetings is shown in Appendix D.

Methodology

The PRG met with the Director of Quality Promotions who outlined the format of the visit, along with an overview of the aims and objectives of the review process. Following this briefing the PRG met in private and chose Professor Mark Yeckel as the chairperson of the PRG. Following a general discussion of the SAR and appendices, several themes emerged that required further exploration. It was decided to not assign tasks at this stage and to engage in frank and open discussions with each of the group with all members of the PRG open to explore not only the areas highlighted from the SAR but also any subsequent issues or concerns that arose in light of the meetings. The PRG worked as a single group in all meetings with the sole exception of meetings with the students.

There was a high level of engagement with the PRG by all the participants. Both the School and the Quality Promotion office were very helpful in providing additional data and information requested by the PRG at several stages during the PRG visit.

The format of the site visit programme enabled the PRG to meet with all of the academic staff of the School, support staff and a representative group of other users/stakeholders including undergraduate and postgraduate students, postdoctoral researchers, employers, Alumni, MedEx users and staff in key support roles within the University. In addition, the opportunity to meet the University Senior Management team was welcomed and appreciated.

Schedule of Activity

The review visit was conducted according to the timetable provided by the Quality Promotion Office (Appendix C) with all members of the PRG present for all meetings. The site visit consisted of 12 meetings which were extremely well attended. The timetable for meetings was adhered to apart from splitting the meeting with UG and PG students into two separate meetings as the PRG felt that meeting UGs separately to PG students would be more beneficial. The PRG would have welcomed the opportunity to talk to individuals from the Institute of Education, however, a representative was unavailable at short notice. The PRG commend the thorough and intensive nature of the quality review process. Also, commendable is the genuine and in-depth engagement with the process by all the HHP staff, as well as by other DCU Staff and external stakeholders.

View of the Self-Assessment Report

The PRG concludes that the School's Self-Assessment Report (SAR) provides a comprehensive overview of the work carried-out by members of the School and a thoughtful analysis of its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges.

This conclusion is based on candid discussions with the principle stakeholders in the School's operation: the SHHP faculty members, SHHP staff, Heads of other Schools, students, postdoctoral fellows, and community members. The SAR also adequately reviewed progress that has been made since the 2007 Quality Review. There are, however, several aspects of the SAR that would have assisted the PRG in its deliberations. These include: (1) Providing biographies and CVs of the academic staff listing their publication achievements over the past decade, their teaching complement and administrative functions; (2) A comprehensive list of internal and external links with academic and community collaborators; (3) More specific information on funding endeavors and strategies; (4) A summary table of research output based on the study topic and the participants involved; (5) In some cases, providing quantitative data on statements related to success.

Finally, the Quality Review Committee is encouraged to include more extensive reflection on strategies for facilitating communication with DCU administration in the Quality Improvement Plan (QuIP). In summary, PRG is optimistic that the SAR, and consequent QuIP, will provide a roadmap for continued success and growth as a School.

4. Findings of the Peer Review Group

4.1 Background, Overview, Strategy, Context

The School of Health and Human Performance was established in 2005, after outgrowing its precursor, the Centre for Sport Science and Health, which was established in 1999. An important goal of the School continues to be the development of innovative research programs aimed at understanding health and human performance from “cells to society.” Another important goal is to provide a high-quality education that trains students to be critical and creative thinkers, and allows them to gain practical skills that will lead to a more educated and healthier society. Lastly, the School’s strong and varied community and entrepreneurial links reinforce these goals, as well as, promote the University’s Strategic Plan of “Transforming Lives and Societies.” As a result of their consistently forward-thinking approach to health and human performance, the SHHP has become a leader in the growing field of “lifestyle medicine.”

Since its last Quality Review in 2007, the SHHP has shown considerable growth, despite the challenging economic conditions:

1. Fulltime faculty have doubled from 9 to 18
2. Space has increased from 1353 sq. m. to 2976 sq.m.
3. The School added another BSc. degree program ie
4. The School established more external links and community relations
5. Research funding and productivity has increased

With this history of success in mind, the PRG has attempted to perform a comprehensive and constructive review of the School, with the hope that it can help facilitate the next phase of the School’s growth and maturation. The PRG also hopes that the Quality Review process will help spur the renewed energy and commitment necessary for the School to fully realise its role as a national and international leader in sensible approaches to human health.

4.2 Organisation and Management

The School is structured similar to standard Schools structures in DCU. However it is not clear that this current structure serves the varying needs of the constituent parts of the School. From the initial meeting with the Head of School and the Quality Review Committee it was clear that there were issues in terms of the current management of the School. The School has experienced difficulties in appointing a new Head of School following the departure of the previous post holder. The absence of financial incentives for staff to take up the role and the extra administrative burden it adds to already increased workloads was cited as some of the reasons for this reluctance. In response to the 2007 Quality Review, the School appointed a Deputy Head of School. The PRG consider that this role is an important one in sharing management and administrative responsibilities for the School, and considers that in this instance, this role would benefit from a more clearly defined range of responsibilities and duties.

The PRG found that the dispersed nature of the School in terms of locations of staff has impacted on the School. The School’s sense of identity as a unit is diminished as a result with programmes providing the primary focus of identity rather than the School unit.

During the PRG visit, staff raised a perception that the School was strategically under-valued within the broader University .The School recently lost two senior members of staff, which has contributed to a the feeling of frustration that the PRG detected. In addition, the PRG feel that succession planning is a serious issue within the School, both with respect to School leadership, and in preserving and developing teaching and research competence. The PRG also recognise the potential for growth in the School given its unique position in the market from both a research perspective and from the School’s ability to fund itself.

The PRG recommends that the School reviews its current operational and management structures with a view to identifying how it might address issues of efficiency, sharing of administrative responsibilities, community, identity and with ensuring the School achieves a higher profile in the University and beyond.

4.3 Staffing and Accommodation

Staffing

When the SAR was submitted there were 18 academic staff, 3 technical staff, 5 research staff, 1 administrative staff and 14 part-time staff. The PRG acknowledges the constraints of the budgetary environment under which the University operates. This notwithstanding, promotion and succession planning is an important issue that needs to be addressed at University and faculty level if the School is to retain faculty and maintain the high level of enthusiasm amongst the junior faculty.

The extremely successful MedEx programme is reliant on one key member of staff. In this light, it is vital that the School develop a clear staffing strategy in conjunction with HR that aligns with the school's future strategic objectives.

Technical staff and administrative staff are crucial to the development of the School. In the PRG meeting, they expressed frustration at the lack of promotion opportunities. It was clear to the PRG that there are a number of highly skilled, high performing staff in this category that have limited career progression opportunities under the current structures. However, this is a University-wide issue that University Senior Management should consider.

Good communication is a keystone to the success of any organisation. The PRG found that communication within the School and between School and other University structures was not optimal, which lead to lack of awareness or engagement with University policies. However, the PRG acknowledge the difficulty that the dispersed nature of the staff causes for communication and have recommended that the School develops a communications strategy that embraces all staff in the School.

Accommodation

The issue of the dispersed nature of the School was highlighted in the PRG's first meeting with the Quality Review Committee and Head of School. The School is currently spread across four locations across the campus (see Appendix A]. This has limited communication and collaboration within the School. The PRG feels that providing a "home" for the School will facilitate and foster accelerated growth and success, through increased collaboration and collegiality. The PRG further believes that housing the SHHP in a single building will also help create a more obvious "identity" that will raise the stature of the School both nationally and internationally. The PRG notes the commitment of Senior Management with regards to the new building for the School due to commence in 2019. The PRG strongly recommends that the building site be finalized and that the School be included as soon as is possible in the final design of the building to ensure that the building will meet the future needs of the School.

In the interim the School should work with the Estates Office and the Science and Health Faculty on an interim plan for the School to address space issues until the new building is completed.

4.4 Management of Financial and other Resources

The PRG recognises the overall potential for revenue generation within the School from a number of areas including MedEx and the School's interactions with industry. However, the School lacks the relevant business expertise to develop this potential. The PRG recommends that the School work with a business consultant to assist the School in building a development plan for the School

which shall include the identification of growth opportunities, with a particular emphasis on increasing non-exchequer revenues.

Equipment

The PRG recognised a need for equipment upgrades in the School and the impact that this can have on the work of the School. On discussions with both Senior Management and the Dean of Health and Science the PRG were made aware of an allocation of funding to the School for upgrading of equipment. The PRG recommends that the School undergo a full review of its current equipment in order to maximise the benefits to the School. The PRG acknowledges that this funding will not fully solve the issues with all the equipment.

4.5 External/Internal Relations (Including Community Engagement)

Collaboration is deeply embedded in the ethos of the SHHP – it is integral to the success of the School. There are substantive research and teaching collaborations between colleagues within the School and across various DCU Schools, which serves to create a vibrant and productive academic environment. Research collaborations with other Irish universities and universities abroad help to increase research possibilities and raise the stature of the school. Consistent with the ethos of DCU, there is also significant collaboration with entrepreneurs and biotech. Lastly, and very importantly, collaboration with the community spans many demographics and societal needs. Taken together, these collaborations help to expand the boundaries of knowledge, promote a healthier society, and drive the development of innovative products. The PRG strongly recommends that these external and internal relations continue to be promoted and enhanced.

Internal Relations

The multidimensional and integrative nature of human-based research performed at the SHHP makes it amendable, if not required, for collaboration. Personnel within the School appear to embrace collaboration and the shared effort in trying better to understand exercise/physical activity, nutrition, vascular and metabolic health and musculoskeletal medicine across the lifespan. This is beneficial for faculty-faculty interactions, faculty-student interactions, and student-student interactions. The PRG believes that sharing a built-for-purpose building will help to amplify these internal relations and the success of the School. The PRG also believes that an SHHP graduate program will increase interaction in the School by virtue of the thread created by students crossing every aspect of School life.

At odds with the mission of the School and its collaborative nature was the dissolution of the Centre for Preventive Medicine (CPM). The rationale for this policy change was not shared with the PRG. The PRG are in agreement with the assessment made by the School in their SAR, which noted the importance of a University Designated Research Centre to consolidate research activity, might provide an ideal platform for promoting internal relations and further advancing the School's research initiatives.

It should also be noted that the School makes important contributions to sports excellence at DCU by providing medical support, and through management and coaching of teams.

External Relations

Research:

External research relations, both nationally and internationally, appear to be robust, based on documentation in the SAR (there were no scheduled meetings with external research partners). This reinforces the PRG's perception that research performed by the School is significant and cutting-edge, and respected by external colleagues and peers. Given the exploding interest in examining human health in an integrated/holistic manner as the SHHP does, we expect the School to continue gaining international recognition, and consequently, more opportunities for external collaborations.

Industry/Business:

The SHHP also has numerous partnerships with industry and entrepreneurs who are interested in the School's expertise in human-based health research. For example, members of the School are involved in clinical trials examining "nutraceuticals." Members of the School also have external links with software development. Another example of a promising partnership involves a licensing agreement for software that was developed, in part, through Enterprise Ireland Commercialization Fund Project at DCU. Based on meeting with some of the business partners, the PRG is impressed by the level of enthusiasm expressed by these external relations. It's the PRG's view that the School would benefit from guidance from those familiar with business-academic relationships.

Community Engagement:

Despite lacking a formal structure for developing and managing community engagement activities, the School has an impressive array of relationships. As documented in the SAR, these include:

- support to local and national sport and health organisations
- serving on local and national committees
- involvement in community based programmes
- participation in local and national lectures
- participation in national and international conferences
- teaching of and examining of external courses
- contribution to local and national radio and television

School staff, particularly Prof. Moyna, have developed a national reputation for sharing their expertise on a healthy lifestyle in the media. Related to this is the annual national fitness challenge among post-primary pupils.

In agreement with the SAR, the PRG believes that the School would benefit from a fulltime community engagement coordinator who will help develop a coherent community strategy, coordinate community activities, and develop an assessment strategy for determining the impact of the individual programs.

As discussed elsewhere in this document, the MedEx Wellness program is the most substantial community engagement activity associated with the School. In addition to providing a sensible program for helping community members manage chronic illness, such as heart disease, lung disease, diabetes, and cancer, it provides a platform for teaching practical skills to students and provides data for research purposes. The PGR agrees with the SAR and community members involved in the program that it is a significant asset to the community and the University. Capitalizing on this program has the potential to raise revenue, advance the School's and DCU's reputation for being highly engaged with the community, and enhance DCU's reputation nationally, and potentially, internationally. Continued development of MedEx will require business expertise and additional management-level support.

An important issue raised in the SAR, and during meetings with both the Quality Review Committee and junior faculty, is how to recognize the contribution that School staff make to community engagement efforts. The PRG recommends that staff be encouraged to participate in community engagement by formally recognizing their efforts when being considered for promotion. This will increase the likelihood that these impactful community projects will be sustained, and is also likely to increase morale.

4.6 Academic Programmes, Teaching & Learning

The PRG note that the university is currently developing a series of initiatives which positions DCU as a 'Healthy Campus'. The PRG believe that the School of Health and Human Performance can play a key role in leading the implementation of this initiative across the campus. This is because the School is held in high esteem locally, nationally and internationally in relation to its research and teaching in the area of human health. Their current tagline is that they conduct research *from cell to society* recognising that '*Lifestyle medicine is the future*'. In our opinion, this may be extrapolated as follows with three core prongs:

Cell: Genetic engineering; mitochondrial RNA etc.

Human: Chronic illness/disability/elite athlete

Social: School/community

The School of Health and Human performance has a number of key strengths. These lie in the variety of programmes provided by expert staff. In addition, students are very able and because programmes are designed to be student centred and applied, there is a low level of attrition.

Notwithstanding this, there are seven key areas which impact on the future growth of the School:

1. Augment and Sustain the Quality of Teaching and Research
2. School Identity
3. Communication
4. Space
5. Progression and Succession Planning
6. Graduate programme
7. Incorporation

For these to be addressed, it is clear that a school strategy is needed which aligns with the new DCU strategy. School staff need to co-create this so that there is clear buy in and a desire to implement it. The school strategy needs to augment and sustain existing offerings. To begin, it will be helpful to audit current teaching and research practices. Therefore, we suggest that there are two key pieces of work which can help define the direction of the School i.e. *teaching quality review* in tandem with a *research quality review*.

There is an obvious School identity issue which can be addressed during the process of school strategy development. This will ensure that the highly innovative approach is maintained by that teaching and learning and research energy is harnessed a number of key strategic directions only. To do this, it would be helpful to engage in benchmarking the School against others like it in the world e.g. University of Basel? This process will also allow the School to see how it can exploit Brexit and move toward developing an evidence based business plan. This can help identify partners and competitors? The process may also lead to a change in the School name which aligns with the new focus. The Business Plan can also help to identify funding plans for growth of the teaching and research agendas and help to address succession and progression issues with staff.

In tandem with this, the School could become even more outward facing by harvesting student testimonials; using a dissemination plan to share research outputs with all community partners.

The PRG spent considerable time reviewing the School's reflections on teaching and learning within the SAR document, and in discussions with staff and students during the Peer Review Visit. It is clear that the academic teaching staff are passionate about their programme offerings and in maintaining the strong national reputation of these programmes. In discussing the content and delivery of the programmes with students, the strong relationships between staff and students were noted, as was the importance for graduates of having a breadth of career and further study opportunities available at the completion of their programmes. The PRG suggest the following areas for exploration and attention to maintain and build the reputation of taught programmes within SHHP.

Graduate Profile

Yogi Berra once asserted the need to '*plan backwards to implement forwards*'. With this in mind, the School might consider identifying the optimum characteristics and competences of a graduate of the School, aligning with those of the University's graduate attributes, as well as key programme specific competences. The PRG consider that this would improve alignment of Learning Outcomes, transferrable skills and assessments of modules. The School might also consider exit interviews with graduates to ensure that it continues to amend programmes such that they are fit for purpose. In addition, it would be helpful if the School developed a digital learning strategy for students as part of the transferrable skills programme. Finally, graduates need to have clear postgraduate pathways. To this end, the PRG consider that the development of postgraduate taught programmes, specific to graduate employment needs, and reflective of SHHP national and international disciplines strengths should be considered.

Communication

It is the view of the PRG, that School teaching meeting, which will involve all programme chairs, and other teaching staff where appropriate, should meet on a regular basis. An objective of this committee should be the sharing of pedagogy and assessment practices, and where appropriate, reflect on structure and curriculum of all taught programmes delivered by SHHP. In addition, the PRG consider that a School specific mentorship scheme should be developed for new academic staff in the School to support early career stage academics, who are balancing heavy teaching and research loads, but who may be unfamiliar with School and University processes and administrative systems.

Processes

The PRG recognise that there is considerable scope within SHHP to review administrative process and approaches to ensure efficiency- both in administrative, and broader approaches to teaching and assessment. The PRG consider that collaborating with University colleagues in other departments, including the Teaching Enhancement Unit and perhaps the DCU Business School may provide improved alignment in processes across all domains of academic activity.

Capacity issue

The School has a young and ambitious staff who want to engage in research and deliver quality teaching at the same time. The PRG consider that the School should reflect on the current workload model, and implement improvements which will seek to create better visibility of activity taking place in each of the domains- research, teaching and community engagement.

Comments on Specific Programmes

BSc. in Physical Education with Biology/Mathematics (PEB/M)

These programmes are unique and have a strong school and community centred approach. The inclusion of opportunities for students of PEM/B students to engage activity with the community provides a symbiotic relationship as the students gain applied knowledge and the community gains expertise and the most up to date knowledge. Students can measure impact on community physical activity levels inside and outside Schools.

Both in the SAR, and during the PRG visit, the University Incorporation programme, completed in 2016, was identified as a key issue for the two concurrent teacher education programmes, Physical Education with Biology (PEB), and Physical Education with Mathematics (PEM) was raised as being an important issue for the School. To ensure high quality management and delivery of the programme, the PRG consider that the Programme Chairs of these programmes should develop in a more formal relationship with the Institute of Education (IOE), who co-deliver this programme. In DCU, PEB/M is a hybrid teaching degrees and as such exists in two locations – the School and the IOE. By formalising the relationship, best practice can be shared to the benefits of students and staff. In tandem with this, there is a need for the PEM/B to conduct an audit of the programme to ensure that it meets the new National Council for Curriculum and Assessment Junior Cycle Wellbeing programme and the mooted Leaving Certificate Examination Physical Education programme. To ensure a high quality experience for students and staff, the PEB/M programmes are applied programmes and need access to sports facilities and to up to date equipment.

BSc. in Sport Science & Health (SSH)

This is a long running programme, delivered by the School. The PRG consider that in order to maintain its relevance and quality, the School should consider a root and branch review of this programme, to include an audit of module content, programme structure and the quality of the INTRA placement. From their review of the curriculum, and in discussions with staff teaching on this programme, there appear to be modules which are 'dated', e.g. Step Aerobics; and others which are not tailored to the student's needs and abilities, e.g. modules delivered in Physics. Graduates from the programme considered that defining a career path post graduation can be challenging. In addition to this, it is evident that equipment is ageing – it is used across all programmes and in research.

BSc. in Athletic Therapy & Training (AT&T)

This is a professionally accredited programme which is rising in popularity. There is evidence of a strong collegial rapport amongst the course team. There are opportunities to attract additional international students to this programme. It would be important to evaluate progression and succession issues for this programme.

4.7 Research, Scholarship & Training

The PRG applauds the major strides made by the School in developing and promoting a research culture in the interval since it was last reviewed in 2007. There are a number of measures of this in the SAR. We note specifically the number of 'publications by SHHP staff from 2012-17' tabulated on Table 8.1 (SAR, p. 28). One hundred and forty (140) 'articles in refereed journals' is a striking testament to success of 'the strong ethos of supporting scholarship and research' in the School, and the merit and value of the routine discussion of 'research and research interests' at School meetings. It is notable also that the trend is upwards, and that 2016 (with more than 40) was the most productive year to date and approximately double the level achieved in 2012 and 2013 (Appendix L). The increase in Research Income is another indicative measure; the 2012 and 2015 figures stand out and attest to the School's achievement in the present and potential into the future. We can therefore but echo the Schools assertion that it currently possesses 'an excellent national and is developing its international reputation' in the areas of Sport and Exercise Physiology, Clinical Exercise Medicine, Preventative Medicine across the life span and Physical activity research, particularly in children and youth' (SAR, p. 26).

This summation is affirmed by the profile of the School's publication performance. In a report generated by bibliometric reporting tool Scival, reviewed by the PRG of the 182 publications produced between 2011 and 2016 indicates that two-thirds of the Schools research output belongs to three categories (Medicine (37.6 %); Health (16.5%) and Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology (12.7%); seven other categories (including 'other' at 7.5%) account for the remainder. The inescapable conclusion is that the research activity (as measured by output) is

uneven, and that this offers considerable scope for further growth in certain areas. It is, however, not immediately clear to the PRG where this might come from as the SAR did not come equipped with individual profiles and efforts to glean this information from the School's website were frustrated by the number of personal pages that are unpopulated (this is a matter that ought to be addressed). Is it notable at the same time that the School has put arrangements in place 'to assist new junior staff develop their research careers', which is to be commended, and should be continued. Budgetary restrictions pose an obvious constraint on what can be achieved, however, and it may be that the School should give further time and thought to the development of strategies to minimise the effects of these. Some members of the School 'have extensive collaborations, both nationally and internationally'; the implication is that others do not, and it may be – consistent with the admirable desire to facilitate individual initiative – that still further collaborations can be identified and fostered as a means of minimising the impact of the current, and ongoing, challenging budgetary environment. It may be also that it is necessary that the School commissions a research audit in order to best identify its potential in this respect, and to establish which areas possess the most potential and which areas and individuals have most to accomplish. The development of strategic partnerships with industry and the health sector, examples of which are already underway, attest to the revenue generating potential that exists and that might be leveraged to fiscal as well as reputational advantage.

What is apparent, given the strategic significance of the research that the School pursues in the areas of preventative healthcare and well-being, is that the School is exceptionally well nationally and locally (in the University). This presents its own challenges, but these are challenges the School should plan for and anticipate pursuing successfully. It should certainly plan and prepare for growth, and maximising the potential of the University's commitment to provide it with a new space/building. There are many possibilities, but the development of a graduate programme must feature prominently among its priorities. It is heartening to observe that the School possesses an outline plan in this respect, and that it is ready to put behind it the disappointments of a previous unsuccessful initiative. It is in its interest to engage actively and constructively with the University to develop and to progress towards this goal. It will require imagination and energy in the School and support from the University, but the shared aspiration and commitment of all parties should facilitate rapid progress towards that end, with a resulting increase in graduate activity, research and scholarship.

4.8. Staff /Student Perspective

DCU should take great pride from the outputs of the School of Health and Human Performance. The School has developed a significant teaching and research profile both at the national and international level. The School has even more potential to be a dynamic, positive force in the University. The School of Health and Human Performance is well positioned vis-à-vis national priorities.

The professionalism and commitment of School staff, individually and collectively, is apparent to the PRG. The School staff makes a vital contribution to the enhancement of provision, through their attention to their students' experience as learners, to the development of their core disciplines and research responsibilities, and their engagement with their teaching practice.

Staff Perspective

Issues pertaining the lack of a single, purpose built space, with provision for both the teaching and research needs of the School was most often cited by staff as having a major impact on quality of teaching and research within the School. The PRG considers that the provision of such a space provides a significant opportunity for enhanced collaboration between staff on teaching

and learning, eliminates current difficulties in timetabling of classes across 3 teaching spaces, and will be key to developing a more cohesive school identity.

As referenced earlier in this report, staff noted that there was no formal, School specific mentoring scheme for academic and research staff in the School. The PRG consider that the development of a such a scheme would have benefits for improving the quality of teaching and learning, and has the potential of being a positive experience for all staff in the School.

During the visit, a number of staff noted a feeling of being in some way 'cut off' from the constituent parts of the School and indeed the University. The PRG consider that the development of a strategic communications plan would in the short-term help to address this issue. This measure should enable the School "connect" with the wider University community. A communications plan would also serve to create greater awareness of the School across the University and help build its brand and its identity. For the staff and student morale and experience the "identity deficit" should be addressed as a priority.

The PRG note the potential strategic threat to the School in terms of recruitment and retention of staff, given that there is currently no formal succession planning structure for positions of strategic importance within the School. During the PRG visit, a number of staff suggested that the School is vulnerable to staff being headhunted by other institutions.

The PRG notes the strategic value and importance of the MedEx programme to the School from both a research and community engagement perspective. The PRG note that Medex may have considerable scope for national and international growth, and has the potential to position SHHP having leadership in the development of, and research on, such community-based rehabilitation and preventative medicine programmes. In order to exploit these opportunities, the PRG suggests that consideration be given the appointment of a suitably qualified business development manager to develop a business plan, and seek growth opportunities for the Programme.

Student Perspective

The PRG observed the student cohort in the School of Health and Human Performance as an engaged, ambitious and enthusiastic group of students, who are immensely proud of the School which they are part. The PRG notes that the School currently attracts high calibre students achieving high pass rates and experiences low non-progression among students.

In discussions with students of the School, they considered that the School takes a great interest in shaping graduates into "well-rounded" individuals who can make a positive impact on society. Indeed the students are actively involved in the provision of services as part of the Schools Community Engagement activities.

Similar to feedback received from staff, the students highlighted that the lack of a single physical location for the School was a key issue that arose, with the consequence of limited opportunities for students from different but related programmes in the School to meet either formally or informally for knowledge transfer and collaboration on areas of mutual interest. This they felt, has a significant impact on the overall student experience.

A key concern for the students of the BSc in Sports Science and Health was uncertainty about their future career path. Therefore, it is recommended that structured career (academic/professional) pathways be identified with particular reference to the BSc in Sports

Science. This was an important element of the feedback as it goes to the heart of the University/student relationship with regard to student expectations for employability.

The PRG recommends the provision of a dedicated building to house the School of Health and Human Performance. A dedicated “home” would create a sense of identity for the School and contribute in a most significant way to enhancing the staff/student experience. We have no doubt it would also position the School to make a significant contribution to the realization of the strategic goals of DCU.

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

External/Internal Relations (including Community Engagement)

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong ethos of research collaboration within the School, with other DCU Schools, and with outside research institutions • Growing reputation for innovative perspective on human health research • Innovative partnerships with industry • Varied community activities • MedEx • Enthusiastic staff and community members 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersal of School staff across campus • No formal structure/strategy/assessment of community activities • Staff participation not formally recognized • Lacking personnel to coordinate activities and develop new community programs
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fit-for-purpose building will amplify collaboration and facilitate sharing of resources • Innovative partnerships with industry • Growth of community engagement will enhance reputation of school and promote mission and values of school • Expansion of MedEx; potential revenue stream 	<p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time; many research active staff possess heavy teaching and administrative commitments • Multilocation of school inhibits efficiency and promotes fragmentation • Sustainability of programs without incentives/recognition • Developing a coherent strategic direction for community engagement

Teaching and Learning

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variety of programmes • Enthusiastic, Student-centred faculty • AT&T as a benchmark • Strong students • Low drop out • High demand • Staff expertise • Applied/Praxis • Appropriate philosophy • Adaptability • Community links 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New modes of teaching/flipped classroom considered • Benchmarking best practice • Unresolved relationship with Institute of Education • No clear picture of teaching responsibilities – workload model • Fragmented location • Teaching spaces • Teaching supports <p><u>SSH</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSH: Out of date curriculum - fit for purposes; e.g., step aerobics, physics • SSH graduate pathways unclear <p><u>PEB/M</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure programme fit for purpose? • Communication • Reliance on Teaching Assistants
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit review • Reenergised curriculum • Graduate programme • Formalised Assessment of teaching • Formalised mentoring system • Engaging with whole institution • NCCA Junior curriculum/Senior curriculum reimagining their programme. • Collaborate with IoE 	<p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Council regulations • NCCA curriculum • Supply and demand • Fit for purpose • Balancing teaching, research, community engagement

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum mapping 	
--	--

Research and Scholarship

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possesses an establish profile on which it can build • Has made significant progress since its QA review (2007) • Possesses identifiable strengths in the area of Preventative Health and Wellbeing • Takes a broad and ambitious approach to health and wellbeing spanning the human life cycle • Engages in cutting-edge research in the epigenetic realm that is integrative and translational • MedEx provides the School with access to excellent subject populations • Encourages student engagement 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersal of School staff across campus • The breadth and range of its engagement • Absence of a sufficiently broad graduate programme • Diversity; not sufficiently focused/specialise • Insufficient emphasise on dissemination and promotion • Want of certain key areas of expertise (eg. statisticians)
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellently positioned to undertake transformational research into Preventative health care and Well-being • Additional capacity within the School • Environment is particularly opportune to capitalise and build on MedEx • Proximity to key sectors and key policy makers • Opportunity to build on and to develop further co-operation with medical stakeholders • Development of collaborations nationally and internationally 	<p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time; many research active staff possess heavy teaching and administrative commitments • Multilocation of School inhibits efficiency and promotes fragmentation • Insufficient funding • Ageing equipment/ equipment sharing • Accessing relevant expertise (eg statistician for data analysis etc) • Data Protection legislation/Open Access data requirement • General compliance and regulatory environment

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 in the Unit.

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

A: Administrative Unit

U: University Executive/Senior Management

No.	Priority	Level	Recommendation
Organisation and Management			
1	P1	U/A	Restructure the organisation, leadership and strategy of the activities of the School, including the enhanced definition of the Deputy Head role, and appropriate committee and consultation structures
2	P1	U/A	Develop a comprehensive communication strategy that engages stakeholders within and outside the University with the teaching, research and community engagement activities of the School.
3	P2	U/A	Develop a strategic recruitment strategy in line with HR and overall University Strategy to ensure succession plan and to achieve the strategy of the School.
4	P1	U	Consider the introduction of additional incentives and supports for senior staff to assume the role of Head of School.
Staffing and Accommodation			
5	P1	U	Staff should be engaged as early as possible in the consultation around the design of the new building to ensure that the building will meet the future needs of the School.
6	P2	U/A	Develop a workload allocation model to encompass all aspects of teaching, research and engagement.
7	P2	U/A	Appoint a community engagement coordinator to help develop a coherent strategy for community programs and to also to manage and assess the myriad of current community programs.
Management of Financial and other Resources			
8	P2	U/A	The School should engage a business expert to assist with the development of a business plan for both MedEx and any future endeavours including costings for programmes to ensure they are financially viable as well as achievable.

9	P1	U	Review all current equipment in the School. Develop and embark on a rolling renewal programme so as to best utilise current and future funding.
Teaching & Learning			
10	P1	U/A	Conduct a Teaching Quality Review, a programmatic review and a Research Quality Review to inform current programming and the development of a graduate programme.
11	P1	U/A	Engage in internationalisation in order share best practice and secure future teaching and research opportunities.
Research & Scholarship			
12	P1	A	The School should prioritise the expansion of its postgraduate teaching to embrace taught Masters and (structured) Ph.D components.
13	P2	A	Plan for and anticipate the research dividend that will be realised when it is provided with a new School space/building.
14	P2	A/U	Capitalise on the research potential of MedEx.
15	P1	A	Conduct an audit and evaluation of its current research output and capacity with a view to identifying new and expanding current research capacities, developing synergies, establishing targets and priorities both for the School as a whole and all its members, and identifying and locating needed areas of expertise. The terms of reference of the audit should address the issue of the re-designation of the Centre for Preventative Medicine.
16	P2	A	Identify and pursues research collaborations with pertinent medical facilities in the city and other Schools and centres in the University.

APPENDIX A: SHHP Physical Facilities

Type	Location and Area (M ²)				Total
	Albert College	Science Building	House 19	Nursing Building	
Lab	614M ²	593M ²	251M ²		1458M ²
Office Space	150M ²	210M ²		9M ²	369M ²
Meeting Space	15M ²				15M ²
Store	47M ²	68M ²	98M ²		213M ²
Examination/ Procedure room		19M ²			19M ²
Computer Lab		76M ²			76M ²
Vascular research units		91M ²			91M ²
Tutorial room		39M ²			39M ²
Observation Room		9M ²			9M ²
Subtotal	826M ²	1105M ²	349M ²	9M ²	2289M ²
Balance space (calculated as 30%)					687M ²
Overall					2976M²

APPENDIX B: SHHP Staff

Name	Gender	Role	Discipline
Academic			
Belton, Sarah Jane	F	Lecturer in PE	Pedagogy
Downey, Miriam	F	Teaching Fellow in ATT	Physiotherapy
Egan, Brendan	M	Lecturer in SSH	Physiology
Furlong, Brona	F	Lecturer in SSH	Physiology
Holland, Eimear	F	Lecturer in PE	Pedagogy
Issartel, Johann	M	Lecturer in PE	Motor skills
Kelly, Sarah	F	Lecturer in SSH	Physiology
McArdle, Siobhain	F	Lecturer in SSH	Psychology
McCaffrey, Noel	M	Lecturer in ATT	Sports and exercise medicine
Meegan, Sarah	F	Lecturer in SSH	Adapted physical activity
Moran, Kieran	M	Lecturer in SSH	Biomechanics
Moyna, Niall	M	Head of School, Professor	Physiology
Murphy, Ronan	M	Lecturer in SSH	Cell and molecular biology
O'Connor, Siobhan	F	Lecturer in ATT	Athletic therapy and training
O'Gorman, Donal	M	Lecturer in SSH	Physiology
Passmore, David	M	Lecturer in PE	Coaching
Susta, Davide	M	Lecturer in ATT	Sports and exercise medicine
Whyte, Enda	M	Lecturer in PE	Athletic therapy and training
Technical			
Hourihane, Anna	F	Laboratory Attendant	
Monedero, Javier	M	Technical Officer	
Murphy, Enda	M	Technical Officer	
Administration			
Scally, Aisling	F	School Secretary	
Research			
Browne, Sarah	F	Post Doctoral Researcher	
Loughney, Lisa	F	Post Doctoral Researcher	
O'Donoghue, Grainne	F	Research Fellow	
Twomey, Laura	F	Research Assistant	
Wallace, Robert	M	Research Assistant	

APPENDIX C: Quality Review Visit - Timetable

QUALITY REVIEW OF: School of Health & Human Performance

DATE: 17th – 19th May 2017

Day	Time	Peer Review Group (PRG) Activity/Meeting	Venue	Meeting No.
Day 1 Wed	12.30-14.00	Lunch with Director of Quality Promotion and available PRG members	1838 DCU	Arranged by QPO
	14.00-15.00	Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion; Guidelines provided to assist PRG during the visit and in developing its 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 followed by discussion of SAR. <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>	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	1838 DCU	Arranged by QPO
	19.00-20.30	PRG Dinner with Director of Quality Promotion	1838 DCU	Arranged by QPO
Day 2 Thurs	08.45-09.00	PRG Private meeting	NRF	
	09.00-09.25	Area Head	NRF	1
	09.30-09.55	Area Management Team or other Area staff	NRF	2
	10.00-10.25	Area staff in functional or other groupings, or individually	NRF	3A
	10.30-11.00	<i>Coffee</i>	NRF	
	11.00-11.25	Area staff in functional or other groupings, or individually	NRF	3B
	11.30-11.55	Area staff in functional or other groupings, or individually	NRF	3C
	12.00-12.25	Heads or Senior staff in Support / Service Offices working with Area	NRF	4
	12.30-12.55	Administrative Staff representatives from Schools, Faculties or Research Centres and / or administrative staff representatives from varying levels within central administration	NRF	5
	13.00-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>	NRF	
	14.00-14.25	Tour of Facilities		

	14.30-15.25	Representatives from varying levels of academic staff familiar with Area, including Programme Chairs.	NRF	6
	15.30-16.25	Representatives from students (if applicable) from various academic programmes. Mix of gender, undergrad, postgrad, access, traditional and others	NRF	7
	15.30-15.55 16.00-16.25	<i>Undergraduate Students</i> <i>Postgraduate Students & Post-Doctoral Researchers</i>		
	16:30-16:50	<i>Coffee</i>	NRF	
	16.50-17.15	Open forum for any member of Area staff	NRF	
	17.15-17.55	Meetings with external stakeholders (alumni, employers, suppliers, Colleges of DCU, members of Governing Authority depending on relevance to Area...)	NRF	8
	18.00-18.05	Area Head (update and clarifications if required)	NRF	9
	18.05-18.15	PRG private meeting time	NRF	
	19.30	PRG private dinner	Crowne Plaza Hotel	
Day 3 Fri	08.45– 09.00	PRG Private meeting	NRF	Meeting No.
	09.00-09.55	DCU Senior Management Group (SMG) <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>	AG01	10
	10.00– 10.25	Area Reporting Head (usually member of SMG)	AG01	11
	10.30-11.00	<i>Coffee</i>		
	11.00-13.00	PRG private meeting time	NRF	
	13.00-14:00	<i>Working Lunch</i> Clarification of outstanding issues for PRG if required	NRF	
	14.00-16.25	PRG Prepare Exit Presentation <i>(Coffee provided at 16.00)</i>	NRF	
	16.30-17.00	Exit Presentation – by PRG to Area Head and all members of Area staff <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>	NRF	12

Appendix D

Meetings with Peer Review Group – Quality Review Visit School of Health & Human Performance

Meeting No:	Name(s) Area to include title and names	Position Area to include roles of all staff attending from DCU
1	Prof. Niall Moyna	Head, School of Health & Human Performance
2	Prof. Niall Moyna Dr. Ronan Murphy Dr. Johann Issartel Dr. SarahJane Belton Dr. Siobhain McArdle Dr. Noel McCaffrey Dr. David Passmore	Head, School of Health & Human Performance Deputy Head, School of Health & Human Performance School Teaching Convenor, School of Health & Human Performance, School Research Convenor, School of Health & Human Performance, Programme Chair, BSc. in Sport Science & Health, School of Health & Human Performance Programme Chair, BSc. in Athletic Therapy & Training, School of Health & Human Performance Programme Chair, BSc. in Physical Education with Biology/Mathematics, School of Health & Human Performance
3A	Prof. Niall Moyna Dr. Siobhain McArdle Dr. Brendan Egan Dr. Bróna Furlong Dr. Sarah Kelly Dr. Sarah Meegan Dr. Donal O’Gorman Dr. Javier Monedero Mr. Enda Murphy	Head, School of Health & Human Performance Programme Chair, BSc. in Sport Science & Health, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Sport Science & Health, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Sport Science & Health, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Sport Science & Health, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Sport Science & Health, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Sport Science & Health, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Sport Science & Health, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Sport Science & Health, School of Health & Human Performance Senior Technical Officer, School of Health & Human Performance Senior Technical Officer, School of Health & Human Performance
3B	Dr. Noel McCaffrey Dr. Miriam Downey Dr. Kieran Moran Dr. Siobhan O’Connor Dr. Enda Whyte	Programme Chair, BSc. in Athletic Therapy & Training, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Athletic Therapy & Training, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Athletic Therapy & Training, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Athletic Therapy & Training, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Athletic Therapy & Training, School of Health & Human Performance
3C	Dr. David Passmore Dr. Sarahjane Belton Ms. Emer Holland Dr. Johann Issartel	Programme Chair, BSc. in Physical Education with Biology/Mathematics, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Physical Education with Biology/Mathematics, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Physical Education with Biology/Mathematics, School of Health & Human Performance Lecturer, BSc. in Physical Education with Biology/

	Ms. Bernie Kearney	Mathematics, School of Health & Human Performance Part-time Lecturing Staff, BSc. in Physical Education with Biology/ Mathematics, School of Health & Human Performance
4	Mr. Justin Doyle Ms. Claire Egan Mr. Brendan Gillen / Mr. Anthony Feighan Ms Alison Foran Mr. Richard Kelly Ms. Celine Jameson Dr. Helen Burke Dr. Stephen Carroll Mr. Ross Munnelly Mr. Ken Robinson Mr. Michael Kennedy Mr. Enda Fitzpatrick	Manager, Information Systems & Services Public Relations, Communications & Marketing Financial Operations Accountant / DCU Management & Financial Planning (Acting Head), Finance Office Human Resources Estates Officer, Estates Office Student Enrolment Manager, Registry Senior Research Officer, Research and Innovation Support Office Graduate Training Coordinator, Graduate Studies Office Head of Service, Sports Development Service Chief Executive, DCU Sport Director, DCU GAA Academy Director, DCU Athletics Academy
5	Ms. Bernadette Dowling Mr. Michael Burke Ms. Sonya McKenna Ms. Mairead Callan Ms. Giulia Migliorato	Assistant Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science & Health Facilities Manager, Faculty of Science & Health Administrative Officer, Faculty of Science & Health National Institute of Cellular Biotechnology Project Officer, Insight Centre for Data Analytics
6	Prof. Anne Matthews Dr. Kieran Nolan Prof. Enda McGlynn Dr. Brien Nolan Prof. Alan Smeaton Dr. Finbarr O'Sullivan Dr. Tanya Levingstone	Head, School of Nursing and Human Health Head, School of Chemical Sciences Head, School of Physical Sciences Head, School of Mathematical Sciences Director, Insight Centre for Data Analytics Associate Director, National Institute for Cellular Biotechnology Programme Chair, BEng. in Biomedical Engineering
7A	Mr. Peter Lynott Mr. Cathal Drohan Mr. Gavin Clifford Mr. Robert Keogh Ms. Emma Whelan	BSc. in Sport Science & Health – Year 2 BSc. in Sport Science & Health – Year 4 BSc. in Athletic Therapy & Training – Year 4 BSc. in Physical Education and Biology – Year 1 BSc. in Physical Education and Mathematics – Year 3
7B	Ms. Nicola Hurley Ms. Jennifer Kavanagh Ms. Mairead Cooney Mr. Robert Wallace Dr. Lisa Loughney Dr. Deirdre Walsh	Postgraduate Student – Year 1 Postgraduate Student – Year 2 Postgraduate Student – Year 3 Postgraduate Student – Year 4 Postdoctoral Researcher Postdoctoral Researcher
8	Mr. Pat Daly Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick Ms. Anne Gallagher Mr. Dean Rock Dr. Bryan Cullen	National Director of Games Development & Research, GAA Director, Oriel Revive Cardiac Rehabilitation Coordinator, Mater Misericordiae Hospital Adapted Physical Activity Centre, Stewarts Care Alumni
9	Prof. Niall Moyna	School of Health & Human Performance, Head
10	Prof Brian MacCraith Prof Daire Keogh Prof Eithne Guilfoyle Prof Greg Hughes Dr Declan Raftery Prof Michelle Butler	DCU President Deputy President Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) Vice-President Research and Innovation Chief Operations Officer Dean of Faculty of Science & Health

	Prof Lisa Looney Ms Marian Burns Mr Ciarán McGivern	Dean of Faculty of Engineering & Computing Director of Human Resources Director of Finance
11	Prof Michelle Butler	Area Reporting Head (usually member of SMG)
13		All staff invited