

Quality Assurance/Quality Improvement Programme 2010-2016



Peer Review Group Report Registry

Ms. Mary Ryan (Chairperson)	Director of Academic Administration NUI Galway
Ms. Rosemary Royds	Academic Registrar Richmond, The American International University in London
Mr. Tommy Kavanagh	Records and Benefits Administration Manager, Human Resources AMNCH Hospital
Ms. Pauline Mooney	Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science and Health Dublin City University
Dr. Conor Brennan (Rapporteur)	Lecturer Faculty of Engineering and Computing Dublin City University

Date of Quality Review Visit: **28th – 30th November 2012**

Date of final Peer Review Group Report: **21 January 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). 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 Peer Group Report (PGR) 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 PGR Reports.
5. The PGR and the draft QuIP are considered by the Quality Promotion Committee.
6. The draft QuIP is discussed in a meeting between the School/Faculty/Office/Centre, members of the Peer Group, the Director of Quality Promotion and members of Senior Management. The University's responses are written into the QuIP, and the result is the finalised QuIP.
7. A summary of the PRG Report, the QuIP including the University's response is sent to the Governing Authority of the University, who will approve publication in a manner that they see fit.

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

Peer Review Group Report

1. Introduction and Overview

Registry is a large central unit that delivers administrative services to the University community and supports the implementation of academic policies and regulations. It is responsible for the management of student-related processes and the student academic record from initial application through to graduation. In order to give an indication of the scale and range of the operations performed Table 1 provides a breakdown by category of the 11,340 students supported by Registry over the course of the 2011-2012 academic year.

Qualification Type	Number
Undergraduate	8021
Postgraduate taught	1952
Postgraduate research	769
Non award / Other	598
Total	11340

Table 1: Breakdown of students in academic year 2011-2012

Registry is headed by the Director of Registry, who reports directly to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs (Registrar). This latter post is new having recently transitioned from the post of Deputy President/Registrar. The unit was previously reviewed in 2003 and also underwent a so-called "light touch" review in 2007, as one of the areas that constituted the Office of the then Vice-President for Learning Innovation/Registrar. The structure of Registry has changed dramatically since the last full unit review. It now comprises two large operational teams (Student Enrolment and Student Awards) with a manager of each forming the management team alongside the Director. In addition a Senior Administrative Officer was appointed in 2008 to support the

management team in the continuous enhancement and development of processes and systems. The room booking function and co-ordination of lecture timetabling were amalgamated into Registry in 2008.

Location

Registry is located in the Henry Grattan extension building. It is an open plan office with four individual offices within and a student information point accessible to students from the so-called "Street" area (a glass-roofed thoroughfare leading from the main campus area to the Henry Grattan building proper). Access to the office is by means of swipe access only.

Staff

There are currently 27 full time equivalent members of staff in Registry. A summary of staff details is provided in Table 2. Of these 6 are on so-called "acting-up" contracts, meaning the person's permanent post is at another grade, while 4 are contract positions where the permanent post holder has been seconded to another post. In addition 2 staff members are currently on maternity leave while 2 members work half-time.

Grade	Number (FTE)	Notes
Admin III	1	
Admin II	2	1 acting up
Admin I	1	
Senior Admin Assistant I	3	2 acting up
Admin Assistant	3	1 acting up
Secretary II	10	3 contract, 1 on maternity, 2 at half time.
Secretary III	7	2 acting up, 1 contract, 1 on maternity
Total	27	

Table 2: Current Staff Details

Product / Processes

The Student Enrolment team is responsible for all aspects of the enrolment process for new and continuing students within DCU. The team is subdivided into four main sections; information services, undergraduate admissions, postgraduate admissions and room bookings and lecture timetabling co-ordination.

The information services section provides front line customer service through a central Registry email account, over the phone and face to face with visitors to the student information point. This area has seen a marked increase in the number of callers to the information point and the use of email as a method of contacting Registry.

The undergraduate and postgraduate admissions sections are responsible for processing applications, offering places and registration for all programmes of study within the University. The majority of applications for both postgraduate and undergraduate programmes are now made online through centralised application systems with the exception of direct applications. The room bookings facility is managed by Registry as well as Garda vetting requests. Assistance with the University Higher Education Authority (HEA) reporting requirements is also provided.

The Student Awards team is responsible for all aspects of the examination process including the scheduling of the examination timetables, exam invigilation and the publication of examination results. They manage the running of Progression and Award Boards (PABs) and the arrangements for the University conferring ceremonies. The team also provides services for the University in the

area of postgraduate research and external examiner administration. The Registry Senior Administrative Officer provides high-level administrative support to the Registry Management team.

2. The Self-Assessment Process

The Co-ordinating Committee

Prior to setting up the co-ordinating committee all Registry staff were given the opportunity to express an interest in becoming involved in co-ordinating the quality review. The committee that was formed in January 2012 is representative of all staff in Registry and the membership was as follows:

Name	Position	Area
Phylomena McMorrow (Chair)	Director of Registry	Head of Registry
Gillian Barry	Student Awards Manager	Awards Team
Stephen Barry (Quality Liaison Officer)	Senior Administrative Officer	Process and System Development
Nuala Clancy	Senior Co-ordinator	Enrolment Team
Celine Jameson	Student Enrolment Manager	Enrolment Team
Olivia McGinn	Senior Co-ordinator	Enrolment Team
Niamh McMahon	Deputy Awards Officer	Awards Team
Caitriona Rowsome	Assistant Awards Officer	Awards Team
Jennifer Yore	Senior Co-ordinator	Enrolment Team

Table 3: Registry Quality Review Coordinating Committee

Methodology adopted during process

In preparation for the process Stephen Barry, Olivia McGinn and Phylomena McMorrow attended a quality review seminar in January 2012. This seminar was designed to prepare units for the review process and was facilitated by the Quality Promotion Office and the HR Training and Development unit. The committee meetings commenced in January 2012 and meetings were arranged on a regular basis. The schedule of meetings is included below.

January	February	March	April	May	June	July	October
12,23,30	7,14,27	7,15	2,19,24	24	1,8,13	5,20	8,11,16,23

Table 4: Registry Quality Review Coordinating Committee meeting schedule 2012.

The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) was developed by the Registry Quality Review co-ordinating Committee and incorporates information and feedback obtained from January to October 2012 through:

- A survey of DCU staff,
- A survey of all categories of DCU students,
- Focus group meetings with DCU staff,
- Meetings and facilitated workshops with all Registry staff,
- Registry staff survey.

Statistical information and assistance with the analysis of the results of the surveys was obtained from the University's Institutional Research and Analysis Officer. The feedback received during the development of the SAR proved extremely valuable in assisting with the reflective and self-critical analysis of Registry. A detailed project plan was drafted and tasks were allocated and agreed at each meeting. All members of Registry were kept fully informed at each stage of the self-

assessment process and were also involved in many aspects of the process. The information below summarises some of the ways staff were kept informed:

- A presentation on the quality review process was provided to all Registry staff, by the Director of Quality Promotion in May 2012.
- A Registry reflection day and a unit SWOC analysis was facilitated by an external consultant in May 2012.
- All documentation relating to the quality review was shared with all Registry colleagues through the use of a shared drive, including notes of all committee meetings.
- The quality co-ordination committee provided regular updates on progress by emails to all staff.
- The quality review was a standing item on monthly team meeting agendas from February to November 2012.
- Progress updates and discussion took place at Registry staff meetings held in December 2011, January 2012, February 2012, May 2012, July 2012 and October 2012.

3. The Peer Review Group Process

The Review Group

Ms. Mary Ryan (Chairperson)	Director of Academic Administration NUI Galway
Ms. Rosemary Royds	Academic Registrar Richmond, The American International University in London
Mr. Tommy Kavanagh	Records and Benefits Administration Manager, Human Resources AMNCH Hospital
Ms. Pauline Mooney	Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science and Health Dublin City University
Dr. Conor Brennan (Rapporteur)	Lecturer Faculty of Engineering and Computing Dublin City University

Site Visit Programme

Registry, DCU Timetable Peer Review Group visit

28th – 30th November 2012

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 (DQP)	A204	Arranged by QPO
	15.00- 15.45	PRG selects Chair. Discussion of main areas of interest and concern arising from the SAR; principal issues outlined to guide PRG for the visit.	A204	Arranged by QPO
	15.45-	Coffee	A204	Arranged

	16.00			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. DQP in attendance.	A204	Arranged by QPO
	17:15-17.45	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 Private dinner	1838 DCU	Arranged by QPO
Day 2 Thurs	08.45–09.00	PRG Private meeting	CG35	
	09.00-09.25	Area Head	CG35	1
	09.30-10.10	Registry staff from the Student Enrolment Team	CG35	2
	10.15-10.45	Coffee	CG35	
	10.45-11.25	Registry staff from the Student Awards Team	CG35	3
	11.30-12.05	Registry Management Team	CG35	4
	12.10-12.45	Heads or Senior Personnel of Support / Service Units working with Registry	CG35	5
	12.50-13.25	Senior Academic Staff familiar with Registry	CG35	6
	13.30-14:30	Lunch incorporating a meeting with Director of Information Systems and Services	CG35	
	14.30-14.55	Tour of Facilities	Registry	
	15.00-15.40	Meetings with representative selections of students, undergrad and post grad, access, traditional and others	CG35	7
	15.40-16:00	Coffee	CG35	
	16.00-16.25	Open forum for all Area staff	CG35	8
	16.30-17.10	Meetings with external stakeholders (alumni, employers, suppliers, Colleges of DCU, members of Governing Authority depending on relevance to area...)	CG35	9
	17.15 - 17.30	Area Head (update and clarifications)	CG35	10
	17.35 - 18.00	PRG private meeting time	CG35	
	19.30	PRG private dinner	Clontarf Castle Hotel	
Day 3	08.45–	PRG Private meeting	CG35	Meeting

Friday	09.00			No.
	9.00-10.00	DCU Senior Management Group (SMG). DQP in attendance.	AG01	11
	10.00-10.25	Area Reporting Head	AG01	12
	10.30-11.00	Coffee	CG35	
	11.00-11.25	Representatives from Faculty Administration	CG35	13
	11.30-11.55	Representatives from varying levels within central administration – HR, Finance, SS&D, Academic Affairs, Information Systems and Services, Estates and others	CG35	14
	12.00-12.25	Representatives from varying levels of academic staff, including Programme Chairs.	CG35	15
	12.30-13.00	PRG private meeting time	CG35	
	13.00-14:00	Working Lunch including meeting with Director of Registry.	CG35	
	14.00-16.35	PRG Prepare Exit Presentation	CG35	
	16.30-17.00	Exit Presentation – by PRG to Area Head and all members of Area staff (Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)	CG12	16

Methodology

The Peer Review Group (PRG) members received copies of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR), appendices and other supporting documentation well in advance of the visit. This enabled the members to familiarise themselves with the unit and the issues before embarking on what was to be a tightly scheduled 2.5 day period. On arrival at DCU, the PRG was provided with a clear context for the review and was briefed as to its remit by the Director of Quality Promotion. Thereafter, Ms. Mary Ryan agreed to act as the chairperson for the group. The timetable over the next 2.5 days ran broadly to schedule, with some changes as detailed in the section below. Friday afternoon was given over to formulating an exit presentation for the unit. This consisted of a set of key findings and recommendations that have subsequently been elaborated upon in this, the final report. Overall the PRG feel that the process constituted a rigorous, honest and constructive quality review. The thorough involvement of all staff and stakeholders augurs well for the quality process in DCU. The maturity demonstrated by everybody concerned suggests that the process has been firmly embedded in the mind-set of all at the campus. This has not always been in evidence in other sectors with which members of the PRG have had experience.

Schedule of Activity

The PRG's initial private meeting involved a discussion on overall impressions of the SAR, identification and prioritization of key-issues and the formulation of strategy for how to approach the process and how best to utilize the broad range of meetings planned over the visit to tease out these issues. The PRG then met with members of the unit's Quality Review Committee to discuss the self-assessment process and the key points raised in the SAR. This was followed by a reception that afforded the PRG the opportunity to informally meet with these same staff members. The day concluded with a working dinner in DCU.

Day two comprised a series of meetings with key members of University staff and other stakeholders, as well as a tour of the facilities, as set out in the timetable above. These meetings were very beneficial in supplementing the information provided in the SAR and verifying that all

relevant issues had been identified within it. There was a potential for repetition in some of the meetings, for example 6 and 15 but generally it was always useful to get a fresh articulation of issues that had been raised before, and by such a process of re-emphasis to identify the key areas that need to be addressed. PRG deliberations continued over a working dinner on the evening of day two and meetings with stakeholders took place as detailed in the timetable on the third day.

There were two minor deviations from the timetable. Firstly, given the centrality of the issues of information systems, staffing and physical environment, it proved useful to briefly discuss headline items from the Heads or Senior Personnel of Support / Service Units working with Registry who attended meeting 5, before convening a smaller, more focused meeting, with solely the representatives from Information Systems and Services (ISS), Human Resources (HR) and Estates. This in turn led to a lunchtime meeting with the Head of Information Systems and Services in order to treat the issue of Information Systems in more detail. The second minor deviation was a brief meeting with the Registry Director at lunchtime on the Friday, in order to provide some emphasis and clarification around earlier discussions. A later scheduled meeting with the Director was cancelled as it was subsequently no longer necessary.

The meetings ran broadly to schedule, although we should acknowledge the forbearance of the attendees of the Friday morning meetings who were subject to a slight but growing delay as the morning wore on. Such forbearance was in keeping with the overall mood of the process which was marked by open, thorough, engaged and constructive exchanges from all concerned. The PRG would also like to acknowledge the excellent support received from the DCU Quality Promotion Office, as well as from the Registry staff.

View of the Self-Assessment Report

The PRG were of the view that the SAR largely gave a well-constructed overview of the Registry and its operations. It was clear that its production was given priority and visibility over the preceding 11 months. The staff seemed eager to seek out feedback and, from our discussions, have appreciated the opportunity to take time to reflect as a group on the issues concerning them. The Director was keen that the PRG endorse the SAR, and certainly it captures most of the issues raised in our discussions over the course of the visit. In that sense it is an accurate document.

From a critical perspective the PRG felt that some of the surveys could have been more carefully worded or structured, with a sharper focus on the quality of services provided, as opposed to addressing the quantification and awareness of them. Another area for potential improvement concerns some of the data provided. For example, it was not immediately clear as to precisely when and how some of the data were collected. These contexts are often useful when trying to fully ascertain the information content of such data sets. However we stress that these are minor concerns and they did not detract from the general thrust and clarity of the information provided.

4. Findings of the Review Group

1. Background, Overview, Strategy, Context

The Registry performs a crucial enabling role in the effective running of the University, and the PRG is satisfied that the unit has been discharging its responsibilities in a timely and professional manner at a time of significant change in the higher education landscape. These changes are originating at an institutional, national and international level and their pace and scope are set to increase in the immediate future. At an institutional level the University has published "Transforming Lives and Societies" its strategic plan for 2012-2017 which includes a vision of "operational excellence". Nationally there is a shifting pattern of re-alignment of institutions, within which DCU has played a leading role as part of the 3U Partnership (a major collaboration involving NUI Maynooth and the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland) while the growing internationalisation of education is evident in the increased numbers of overseas students as well as growing academic and research links with international institutions. These unprecedented developments

are taking place against a backdrop of diminishing resources, the restrictions of the Employment Control Framework, increasing student numbers (and inherent in this an increasingly diverse set of students) and a slow evolution in the nature of the work required from Registry from data entry and management towards data analysis and assessment.

In the face of these developments the Registry has shown a willingness to adapt and change, as evidenced by its response to issues raised in the previous quality reviews. These initiatives are to be commended. Nonetheless several of the issues raised in the 2007 partial review have yet to be fully resolved and arose again in this present process. These issues were in many cases beyond the capability of the Registry to fully resolve by themselves and it is important that sufficient support and prioritisation is offered to the unit to manage the change needed in the years ahead. This is elaborated on in the following sections.

2. Organisation and Management

There has been a substantial change in the organisation of the unit over the course of the last number of years. This has been prompted by previous review processes, and to some extent the growth of new areas within the University such as a separate International Office. The largest change has seen a reduction in the number of teams within Registry from seven in 2003 to 2 currently, with a corresponding reduction in the management team from 10 members to 3 (supported by a senior administrative officer).

The emergence of related units such as the International Office and Graduate Studies Office is welcome, but has led to a perception of a diffusion of responsibilities and leadership in the area of academic affairs. The PRG notes the appointment of the new Registrar and welcomes her commitment to working with the relevant Deans, Heads and Assistant and Deputy Registrars to provide clarity in this important space. In particular, and in light of the volume of change alluded to in the previous section, the PRG recommends that the Registrar work with the Registry to provide prioritisation of the tasks and changes required of it and to help ensure that sufficient thought, time and resources are given to the implementation of initiatives emanating from the various university committees, programme boards and other sources that can impact on Registry.

From the perspective of the unit under review, its organisational structure is working well. This is a view mostly, but not universally, shared by the wider community. In particular concerns were expressed about a fragmentation of expertise and consequent scarcity of end to end knowledge of the student cycle. It was observed that previously a dedicated student records team would have supplied this expertise and that perhaps its reconstitution would have a beneficial effect on the flow of work and management of the unit. This is discussed further in later sections.

The reorganisation of the unit, coupled with the subsequent development of complementary units such as Graduate Studies Office and the International Office has resulted in several seemingly anomalous situations, such as the different assessment of EU and non-EU undergraduate applications, and the difference in non-EU research versus taught postgraduate applications. While in many cases there are historical reasons for these there may be some merit in reviewing or monitoring these arrangements, and the intended close working of the Registrar with the relevant Deans etc. may facilitate this. This topic will be returned under the section on processes.

3. Staffing and Accommodation

In terms of emphasis, the issue of staffing is the one of most urgent or critical importance to Registry members of staff and was one of two common issues of note identified by PRG members in the Group's initial discussions.

It should be noted at the outset of this section that a consistent theme in the Group's meetings was the high regard in which Registry staff are held by their colleagues. There were numerous

references both to individuals and key initiatives that had been recognised and appreciated by the wider university community. There was also a widespread understanding of the external constraints under which the unit operates. It was clear to the PRG that the Registry staff as a body is professional and innovative and working hard to respond, and contribute, to the significant and necessary changes taking place within the University.

However it is also clear that the existing staffing structure reflects the historical needs of the Registry, namely a greater focus on bulk data-entry and a reliance on paper-based processes. Such work would have taken place in the context of a relatively uniform, and slowly varying, set of programme structures and processes and in the absence of the technology-based service delivery currently expected by the student body and campus community. The staffing structure is predicated on this and reflects a disproportionate ratio of junior to senior staff. However the changing nature of the university environment in recent years has seen a need emerge for a different skill-set, with an increased emphasis on data analysis and assessment rather than its entry and maintenance. In addition the ability to manage change has also become crucial, given the scale and pace of developments in the higher education sector alluded to earlier.

A small number of senior Registry staff is called upon to provide expert input to these developments. It is evident from the SAR and our discussions that the same small group of staff represents Registry and/or the University on a variety of internal and external working groups. While this group of staff is not only willing but very keen to be involved in and contribute to these developments, their capacity to do so while simultaneously carrying a significant operational workload is not inexhaustible; they are currently working at or beyond the limits of that capacity. As noted earlier there is an immediate need for prioritisation by University senior management of the developments to which Registry input is required. This would be of significant benefit to the unit in managing competing demands for limited resources.

Taking a longer perspective it is clear that rethinking Registry staffing structures would not only be sensible but is an absolute requirement at this point, with a view to transitioning to a staffing structure consistent with the unit's and the University's future needs. The PRG noted the constraints imposed by the current budgetary situation and, more particularly, by the public sector Employment Control Framework. It is the view of the PRG that the number of posts within the unit is adequate to meet current needs, particularly if supported by an in-depth review of current key procedures, and what is required is an articulation by senior staff within Registry of the optimal staffing structure which can be used to inform future staffing decisions.

A related issue to the staffing structure is the impact of the high volume of staff turnover, which in many cases is temporary in nature due to maternity leave, but in other cases is longer term or even permanent as staff members seek promotional opportunities elsewhere in the University. Such turnover poses significant challenges in terms of continuity of service and transfer of knowledge. Stakeholders expressed concerns regarding the loss of expertise that resulted from staff turnover and queried the efficacy of handover in some instances. Academic and central unit members of staff reported difficulties establishing who should be contacted in respect of various processes and a consequent tendency to depend on a single individual within Registry with whom they had established a relationship. While being very aware of this issue stakeholders also expressed understanding of the wider context and displayed empathy with Registry's ongoing efforts to maintain service provision levels in face of these challenges. This issue will be returned to later under communications.

The PRG acknowledges that Registry management is working continuously with HR to minimize, in so far as possible, the impact of staff turnover and to maximise current resources. University Senior Management and HR are aware of the difficulties with which the unit is grappling and recognize the need to address the ratio of junior to senior staff. Mindful of the fact that the allocation of additional resources is unlikely in the short term, there are aspects of the unit's current staff deployment that might be reviewed with a view to achieving further efficiencies where possible.

Stakeholder feedback indicated that the two-team structure within the unit presented a potential difficulty in instances where a process or a communication requires input from both teams at different points in the procedure. Examples given included issues relating to student records (current and historical) that might require input from and resolution by both teams, the updating of academic structures which spans both teams, and the implementation of academic decisions and/or new (non-standard) programmes or awards that have implications for admissions/registration and examinations, again spanning both teams. These examples were cited by Faculty Administrative staff. In addition central units referred to communications difficulties citing the two team structure as an apparent source of those difficulties. This two team structure that has been in operation since 2003 and was the result of the consolidation of a previous multi-team structure might usefully be reviewed to address this stakeholder feedback but also with a view to establishing whether or not further consolidation might mitigate the loss of expertise due to staff turnover, and result in economies of scale. Equally, a review of established processes and the attribution of staffing to same could result in the freeing up of staff time.

As regards accommodation Registry is housed in the Henry Grattan building extension, a relatively central location which affords good access to students. The area available to the unit is adequate in terms of its footprint but the quality of the physical environment is in need of some improvement. This was mentioned by the staff, stakeholders and was apparent to the PRG during their tour of the facilities. The open plan office serves the team function, cross training and sharing of information very well. However, the majority of staff work in a central area in clusters of desks lit by quite harsh lighting systems. Access to natural light via the “street” is largely blocked due to a partitioning off of some small storage spaces. In addition the ventilation system is physically intrusive and not working well.

The student information point is a useful development, but could benefit from further improvement. In particular it would be useful to have a dedicated space within which one to one private meetings could be held with students. Currently such meetings are held in a shared office / storage space which is not ideal. In addition the area is prone to overflow, although that may be ameliorated with an improved system of query management.

The space given over to archiving is a little cramped. It may be beneficial to review the archiving system, specifically the retention policies. There is a commitment to scan as many documents in the future as is possible (or deal solely with electronic documents where appropriate) which is welcome. However some space is presently given over to storing some material, such as past examination papers, whose proper home may be the library, given its lack of relevance to current student matters. The issue of archiving is of secondary importance and its resolution will not free up a significant volume of space.

To date there has been little formal intervention on the issue of improving the physical environment. Realistically the current budgetary position makes it unlikely that any large-scale renovations can be carried out for the foreseeable future. The continued expansion of the University also makes it unlikely that an improved location can be found. However the staff are realistic in their expectations in this regard and it is clear that even some modest improvements could have a positive impact and would be appreciated. There may well be scope to explore this issue with a view to identifying simple low-cost innovations that can be readily acted upon.

4. Management of Financial and other Resources

The core function of Registry is heavily dependent on access to suitable IT systems and the topic of such systems was returned to regularly throughout the PRG’s meetings with stakeholders. Registry uses a variety of software systems, each dealing with different aspects of the student life-cycle. While each of these are important the core system in use is the ITS student record system.

Throughout our engagements there was universal acceptance that the ITS system had reached the limits of its developmental capability in its present form. Its core functionality is viewed as

robust, reliable, secure and well-capable of meeting the academic needs for which it was designed. However, recent academic innovations such as the development of more flexible degree programmes and academic pathways, have required time-consuming and costly work-arounds. While these recent innovations have been supported there is a risk however that the increased pace of innovation expected in the years ahead could see the limitations of the system shortly become a retarding and inhibiting influence.

ITS solutions provided to date in response to these University development needs are not necessarily optimal and in some cases have added to administrative workloads. The company's reduced presence in Ireland has led to a perception that it is refocusing on its southern hemisphere client base which would be a cause for concern in terms of ongoing engagement, support and product development.

A related concern particularly emphasised by Registry staff is the provision of systems support. In this context the need for expert advice in relation to the procurement of a CRM system (with reference to more effective management of the Information Point) was raised. There was a clear desire to ensure that any system thus identified would be a University (rather than a Registry-specific) system that would be capable of integration with other University systems and that would be supported by Information Systems and Services.

More generally the issue of systems support is one that clearly needs to be addressed. In particular the respective roles and responsibilities of Registry and Information Systems and Services in relation to future systems development need immediate clarification.

Several Registry staff expressed concern that they had been expected to sign off on the technical aspects of system specifications. This viewpoint was not shared by Information Systems and Services staff who were confident that appropriate technical sign-off was provided by them, albeit verbally. They did assert however that Registry sign-off is expected at the appropriate business process level. Some of this divergence in opinion may be attributable to a difference in expectation and vocabulary between the two units as to what exactly constitutes technical sign-off and appropriate business process expertise but, whatever the reason, it was clear to the PRG that the working relationship between the two units should be clarified and formalised in this regard. At a minimum, there is an immediate need to put in place a formal, written protocol for Registry and Information Systems and Services input to, and approval of, both the business process and technical aspects of any systems development specifications.

At another level the operational relationship between the two units may also have suffered from an expertise and/ or resource gap – someone who is expert in Registry processes who also has sufficient IT expertise to liaise with Information Systems and Services and/or directly with systems providers. The PRG welcome the fact that a position has been filled in this space and recommends that the person continues to be supported in further developing this important interfacing role.

Another concern of the PRG centred around the growth in the number of systems in use. This is not of itself problematic provided that the systems in use are subject to regular review and, where relevant, retirement. It is important that a holistic approach is taken with regard to future development to ensure that systems are integrated to the fullest extent.

In the context of the above observations the PRG warmly welcomes the clear commitment to systems infrastructure signalled by the Senior Management Group at our meeting with them. In particular we welcome the establishment of the University's IS Governance Committee, which is due to commence meetings in January 2013 and is charged with the oversight of all University IT systems (not just the Registry-relevant systems under discussion here). It is clear that a top-level, high-visibility, university-wide stewardship of the future development of these systems will be key to the creation of a systems infrastructure, and supporting layer, capable of meeting the University's vision of a digital campus.

The PRG also welcomes the University Senior Management Group's recognition that the ITS system is not fit for future purposes and its expressed intention to replace the system. Given that lessons learned from the purchase and operation of ITS should be addressed in the specification for any replacement the PRG strongly recommends that the Registry take a leading role in the institution-wide dialogue that needs to take place around this and take ownership of the specification of the functionality of any new student records system. In addition the need for any system to interface with existing and potential new institutional partners (such as the other members of the 3U partnership) should be investigated as should their potential ability and willingness to share costs and development.

A key issue for consideration in the development of any future core system will be one of expectation management. It is important that any future development of a student record system has institution-wide buy in. A concern expressed by academics was that they had not enough input into the design of current systems. This should be rectified but expectations must be tempered by the knowledge that no system will be a panacea. As is always the case when a major IT system no longer adequately supports a major process, there are high hopes that a new system will solve all current problems, therefore, expectations need to be managed both within Registry and amongst the wider University community. It needs to be recognized that it is not likely that any one system will be able to meet the huge demands that implementing the transformational change required by the strategic pillar of "Operational Excellence". It is, therefore, likely that any new 'core' student record system will continue to require a number of 'plug-in' support systems to deliver the full and on-going change agenda.

The system(s) that are eventually implemented should enable Registry to be pro-active in process review and development as requirements change over the next number of years. To enable Registry in responding quickly to new initiatives key personnel should be included at the early stages of discussion on any new initiatives which will either directly or indirectly affect its operations.

It is useful to distinguish between systems and processes. The application of systems solutions to processes that in and of themselves may no longer be fit for purpose, or which are not sustainable in their current format, is at best questionable and potentially wasteful. System replacement should only take place after a thorough review of the associated processes which they are designed to facilitate, a topic we return to later.

5. Functions, Activities and Processes

Much of the work of Registry is subject to strict deadlines, many of which are externally-driven and non-negotiable. Consequently their processes, both within the unit itself and across the interface with Faculty Offices and other units, need to be accordingly well-defined, well-organised and properly resourced. A common theme in the discussions was an acknowledgement that this was by and large the case as well as recognition of the professionalism of the staff in carrying out these functions. There was appreciation of the, largely unseen and under-acknowledged, job being done at present and awareness of the constraints that the unit is operating under.

However as alluded to in section 3 the team is finding it increasingly difficult to manage the scale and pace of change underway. Its anticipated increase in the years ahead will put extra strain on the system. Leadership from the Registrar, working in conjunction with Registry and associated units to prioritise and manage change will be crucial.

In this context the PRG warmly welcomes the Senior Management Group's commitment to an institution-wide process review and organizational examination, due to commence in early 2013. Such an exercise would in any case be the norm prior to the system-design and requirements gathering phase for any new student records system, but is a timely opportunity to streamline university-level operations affecting the Registry. We recommend that Registry engage fully with this institutional process review exercise and use it as an opportunity to examine all its operations based around the student life-cycle, with a view to freeing up capacity if possible. Several staff

noted that Registry have shown commitment in initiating such reviews in areas such as the conduct of Progression and Awards Boards, but it was felt that, welcome as such reviews of individual processes are, they need to be performed in the context of a more holistic view of the overall operation. In addition it is important that any processes put in place do not merely push problems in efficiencies out from the centre to other units.

In particular, it would be of benefit if processes that straddle both teams within Registry were reviewed in order to identify whether it would be more efficient for that process to be handled solely by one team for completion prior to the commencement of each new academic year. An example of such a process would be the inputting of academic structures data into ITS, although other examples were raised by Faculty Office representatives who indicated that some queries that straddle both teams can be delayed due to the seeming lack of a cohesive overview of the query or process involved. Other areas of work where a review of current practice and a process mapping exercise may be of great benefit include:

- Any process where duplication (or even a lack of streamlining) of effort between the Faculties and Registry may occur ;
- Processes that require double-checking (with a view to ensuring that the first pass is sufficiently thorough).
- Heavily paper-based processes with a view to moving to electronic processing.
- Any processes which straddles both teams and whether that process might be better handled end-to end within one team.
- Identification of seemingly anomalous division of processes across units such as the distinction between EU and non-EU student applications which result in them being processed by different units for taught students, but by the Registry solely for research students. Similarly the fact that applications to Oscail are not processed by Registry.
- Major events that consume all team resources, e.g. registration and conferring.

Such a process review is a large undertaking and will require time to complete. In the shorter term it would be beneficial to perform a preparatory process-mapping exercise in order to identify potential bottlenecks and problems that can perhaps be immediately addressed, or examined more closely in the review process. The PRG feels it important that sufficient space be given to this exercise and suggest that stakeholders and Registry key staff, preferably with an external-to-Registry facilitator, should undertake half-day exercises of mapping:

- a) the student journey through Registry processes, noting hand-offs to others and distributed responsibilities which require students to queue, carry paper forms between academic staff and offices etc.
- b) the Registry processes over an academic year noting hand-offs to others and distributed responsibilities both within and outside Registry, and concentrating on areas where processes are particularly manual/labour-intensive.

A subsequent examination should be made of areas where paper-based processes could be conducted electronically, duplication of effort or cross-checking is occurring, processes are temporarily suspended during transfer of responsibilities between teams, or where simplification is possible.

It is worth elaborating on the last bullet point above and noting that the organisation of the graduation ceremony was universally commended by staff and stakeholders. Many staff commented on how well the event reflects on DCU and how they derived a personal sense of pride and achievement from the day. The event is not without its opportunity cost however as it ties up many resources for a lengthy period of time with a consequent limitation of services that can be offered elsewhere, such as running Progression and Awards Boards. In the context of diminishing resources it may well be useful to apply the 80/20 rule, and ask whether largely the same over-all result could be achieved with fewer resources permitting effort to be diverted elsewhere and an overall net gain in output realized. It would be worthwhile giving consideration to giving the responsibility to co-ordinate and manage graduation processes, as well as undertaking ongoing review of established requirements and managing indicated growth and complexity, to a single

member of staff (as opposed to its present team-based delivery). This would facilitate strategic development and changes in this area.

As with the other stakeholders students seem mostly satisfied with the Registry and suggested that they were very sensitive to students' needs. Most concerns addressed to the Student's Union and voiced by their representative were around the issue of waiting and response times (although some of the expectations in this regard seemed a little unrealistic to the PRG). Nonetheless there were several concrete suggestions around the student information point. These included extended lunchtime opening hours, ticketing and appointment systems, as well as more flexible short-term manning of the desk at peak times (in and around lecture changeover for example) and the use of a dedicated desk to handle common queries at certain times of the year.

The students were aware of the growing levels of information available on the web but in many cases were critical of the form of the content. They praised the Information Systems and Services video tutorials for example and it seemed to the PRG that some thought should be given to the form in which Registry information is presented on the web. Finding the correct medium for a given message may well increase its impact. The introduction of self-service kiosks was praised by the students interviewed when they were told about it, but they did not seem aware of their presence beforehand. This is quite a recent innovation (and provides quite specific services) and so perhaps more time is needed for knowledge of their availability to percolate through the entire student community. Nonetheless it suggests a little more thought could be given to their positioning and signage within the information area.

On this topic of communications several academic and central unit members of staff reported difficulties establishing who in Registry they should contact in respect of various processes and a consequent tendency to depend on a single individual within Registry with whom they had established a relationship. This difficulty was acknowledged by Registry in the SAR. Simple steps might be taken to address these difficulties such as the provision of greater detail on the Registry web pages as to whom to contact etc. This difficulty should be reasonably easily addressed once the planned revision of the University web site has been effected and Registry has been provided with the requisite access to manage the content of its own web pages.

The organization of information on the Registry web pages was also the source of some confusion. Stakeholders indicated that the most effective way to locate specific Registry forms or information was to use Google search (a shortcoming not confined to the Registry pages) and that this communication deficiency was resulting in problems regarding out-dated forms being used on occasion. This too may be addressed in the context of the redesign of the web.

Similar confusion was expressed regarding whether or not Registry or another office should be contacted in relation to particular matters. The division of responsibilities between Registry, the International Office, GSO, Student Support and Development and Faculty Offices were variously cited as a source of confusion. The specific issue of deadlines in the research student process (thesis submission etc.) came up more than once, with the opinion being expressed that academic supervisors were not always fully aware of what needed to be done. This would seem to be a short-coming on the part of the specific supervisors, but there is perhaps an opportunity for Registry to offer greater support in this regard. A similar comment regarding the delineation of responsibility, and access to information, between units was raised in the context of registration time with an acknowledgement that students (both research and taught) can sometimes get unduly directed back and forth between Finance and Registry as a consequence.

The above constitute examples of specific issues raised in the area of communication of responsibilities and deadlines. More generally a particular request for an induction process for new programme chairpersons was also raised, outlining all key events impacting during the year along with supporting information.

A relatively minor issue about communications that was nonetheless raised several times concerns the need to properly nuance the reporting of post-PAB amendments, i.e. changes to examination marks that occur after the close of the formal examination boards. These are obviously not desirable and should be minimised, but equally cannot be eradicated completely. Whilst the programme chairs and faculty staff understood the need for compliance reporting, several felt that the reporting of the totals of such changes within each Faculty carried with it a mild tone of admonishment which could serve to create an atmosphere whereby staff would be reluctant to bring mistakes to light. Equally the reporting of absolute numbers of such changes (as opposed to in terms of percentages of students) could potentially place Faculties with large numbers of students in a worse light than others.

6. User/Customer/Supplier Perspective

The specific concerns of, and issues raised by, the stakeholders have been dealt with in the preceding sections. In this section the PRG would like to again note the overall levels of satisfaction with the Registry expressed by this diverse group. The importance of the unit's function was evident in the eagerness of the stakeholders to engage with the process and criticism, where it came, was constructive and generally accompanied with recognition of the constraints that Registry operates under. Students in particular were highly appreciative of the empathy displayed by Registry in dealing with their concerns.

7. Staff Perspective

Again we note that the issues raised by staff have been dealt with in the relevant sections above. Here we note that the staff would appear to have embraced the Quality Improvement Process and, indeed, throughout the SAR there are examples of the staff making incremental improvements on foot of feedback from their customer base.

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

<p>Strengths Hard working, well-regarded, staff possessing expert knowledge of processes and policies</p> <p>Demonstrated ability to deliver core processes and events to deadline.</p> <p>Visible profile - Engagement with and contribution to University working groups/committees - internal and external</p> <p>Commitment to training of staff.</p> <p>Commitment to specification, maintenance and review of standard operating procedures.</p> <p>Ability to build relationships with stakeholders.</p> <p>Commitment to regular reviews of processes.</p> <p>Willingness to innovate in service delivery.</p>	<p>Opportunities Drive specification and development of future IT systems.</p> <p>Increased levels of self-service and online solutions</p> <p>Increased flexibility and improved processes for dealing with queries and demands at peak times.</p> <p>Willingness of other areas to engage with Registry on developments and processes Programme Chairs</p> <p>Assess opportunities to increase in-house training</p> <p>Work with Registrar and associated units to prioritise tasks and improve communication flow and lead in time on requested change.</p>
<p>Weaknesses Turnover of staff – loss of knowledge and training requirements to back fill posts</p> <p>Staffing structure and grades</p> <p>Flexibility of Registry processes and tools to deal with increasing variation in academic activities</p> <p>Point of contact details not always clear .</p> <p>Over-reliance on paper-based processes.</p> <p>Link between Registry/Finance/Information Systems and Services can appear to be disjointed</p> <p>Physical infrastructure.</p> <p>Staff currently operating at limit.</p> <p>Managing expectations of Registry's role.</p>	<p>Concerns Capacity to cope with pace and scope of change given limitations of current IT infrastructure and staff structures.</p> <p>Support for multiple IT systems</p> <p>Lack of lead in time for the implementation of externally driven projects</p> <p>Staff turnover and movement of staff</p> <p>Imbalance of junior and senior staff grades</p> <p>Managing expectations of role of Registry;</p> <p>Physical office environment</p> <p>Fragmentation of expertise within Registry.</p> <p>Strategic input of Registry to relevant senior management decisions</p> <p>Creating space and time for staff development activities</p> <p>Physical infrastructure.</p>

9: Recommendations for Improvement

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 (Registry)

U: University Senior Management

No.	Priority	Level	Recommendation
1	P1	A + U	Develop a prioritisation of tasks and changes required of Registry and ensure that sufficient thought, time and resources are given to the implementation of initiatives emanating from the various university committees, programme boards and other sources that can impact on Registry.
2	P1	A	Develop an outline of the optimal staffing structure for Registry that can be used by the University to inform future staffing decisions.
3	P1	A + U	Develop a strategy with HR to best manage the impact of large-scale staff movement on Registry and its service provision. Give adequate consideration to working arrangements and structures that allow expertise to be flexibly accessed during times of peak activity.
4	P2	A	Undertake a review of the time commitment associated with representation by Registry on University committees and consider whether such representation could be managed by receiving minutes/agendas and attending only occasionally; review whether more than one Registry representative needs to attend any meeting; review whether opportunities are available for more junior staff to represent the Registry supported by senior management mentoring.
5	P2	A + U	Facilitate, along with HR, a Training Needs Analysis for junior and middle grade staff within the Registry to ensure their continued professional development in the context of the Operational Excellence strand of the University strategy.
6	P1	U	Make appropriate funding available to Registry to carry out an initial investigation of potential improvements to the Registry working environment.
7	P1	A	Select an individual member of Registry staff to have overall responsibility for progressing negotiation with Estates, external designers, colleagues and others in reviewing, re-organising and refurbishing the workspace, reporting regularly to the Registry Senior Team for advice and support.
8	P2	A	Conduct a fundamental review of filing, retention, disposal and archiving policies and practices and cost and consider off-site or off-Registry storage of essential documentation.

9	P1	A+U	Work with Information Systems and Services to review the capability of the IT systems in current use to respond to indicated growth pressures and necessary developments required, in order to assess their suitability/robustness over the next 2-3 years.
10	P2	A+U	Consolidate the IT systems used, where appropriate, with a view to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the services delivered by Registry.
11	P1	A+U	Identify and prioritise the institutional risks from critical Registry IT systems failures within the next 2-3 years. This should be submitted to the Registrar for review. An agreed risk management plan should be submitted to the senior management team.
12	P1	A+U	Commit to the process of calling for tenders for a suitable student record system for implementation and rollout within the next 3 years. Registry to play a leading role in the university-wide dialogue associated with this process.
13	P2	A+U	Seek guidance and information from contacts within the sector that indicates how roles and responsibilities between IT Services and Registry/Support Services have been articulated and identified at other HEIs. Prepare for consideration a DCU-specific version that can be agreed by both Information Systems and Services and Registry.
14	P1	A	Undertake a review of Registry workgroup structures to consider whether the establishment of a Student Records and Systems team working across all Registry operational areas could add value to process management, to systems support, to staff satisfaction and skills development and to Registry senior management team support.
15	P2	A	Consider making the co-ordination and management of graduation processes, as well as the ongoing review of established requirements and managing indicated growth and complexity, the responsibility of a single member of staff.
16	P2	A	Introduce a rolling programme of reviewing the structure and content of Standard Operating Procedures for key processes to ensure that these are consistent across procedures (see evidence provided in SAR) and suitably structured in order that they may be used by temporary or new staff without requiring further clarification in order to carry out functions.
17	P1	A	Undertake an exercise with relevant stakeholders and Registry key staff, preferably with an external-to-registry facilitator, to map the student life-cycle, and Registry processes over an academic year as described in section 5 of the PRG findings.
18	P2	A	Engage with the institutional process review with a view to streamlining Registry processes and freeing capacity if possible.
19	P1	A	Make more use of information sharing and promotion of self-managed services using the electronic message board outside the Registry main door.
20	P2	A	Develop further the functionality of existing student self-service points and increase their visibility to the student community.

21	P1	A	Manage front-line services more proactively to reduce duplicated [student] effort and paper-movement where electronic submission would be acceptable; provide more study-friendly service delivery options in opening hours and staffing of the counter, queue-management strategies, greater sharing of counter service delivery responsibilities at busy times
22	P1	A	Provide up to date information and greater detail in respect of Registry points of contact on the Registry web pages.
23	P1	A	Review the location of essential forms and/or policy and procedures documents on the Registry web pages with a view to making their location more intuitive and readily accessible.
24	P1	A+U	Investigate the application of a CRM system for the recording and management of student contacts with a view to selecting a system that can and will be supported as a University system.

APPENDIX 1

Review of Registry, DCU 28-30 November 2012 Meetings with Peer Review Group

Meeting No:	Name(s)	Position
1	Ms. Phylomena McMorrow	Director of Registry
2	Ms Celine Jameson Ms Georgina Roberts Ms Carol Grehan Ms Allison Fox Ms Jennifer Yore Ms Olivia McGinn Ms Noeleen Peel Ms Triona Kirwan Ms Noeleen Smullen	Student Enrolment Manager Deputy Enrolment Manager Co-ordinator Customer Service Co-ordinator Customer Service Senior Co-ordinator Postgraduate Admissions Senior Co-ordinator room bookings and undergraduate admissions Senior Co-ordinator Undergraduate Admissions Assistant Enrolment Officer Senior Administrative Officer, Lecture Timetabling, Room Bookings and Support for HEA reporting
3	Ms Gillian Barry Ms Niamh McMahan Mr Stephen Barry Ms Coreen Malone Ms Claudine Devereux Ms Geraldine Leavy Ms Susan Fennell	Student Awards Manager Deputy Awards Manager Senior Officer for Registry Processes and Systems Examinations and Graduation Planning Postgraduate Research and External Examiners Invigilation and Graduation Examinations and Graduation Planning
4	Ms Phylomena McMorrow Ms Gillian Barry Ms Celine Jameson	Director of Registry Student Awards Manager Student Enrolment Manager
5	Ms Barbara McConalogue Ms Claire Bohan Mr Mike Kelly Ms Sylvia Schroeder Ms Eileen Tully Mr Martin Leavy Ms Ita Tobin Mr Ted Harvey	Director of ISS (Information Systems & Services) Director of Student Support and Development Director of Estates Head of International Office Health and Safety Officer Human Resources Head of Access Disability Service
6	Dr Lisa Looney Mr Billy Kelly Dr Enda McGlynn Prof Colm O’Gorman Dr Malcolm Brady Mr Ray Walshe Ms Mairead Nic Giolla Mhichil Mr Seamus Fox Ms Jennifer Bruton Ms Juliette Pechenart	Dean of Graduate Studies Dean of Teaching and Learning – Deputy Registrar Associate Dean for Research – Faculty of Science and Health Associate Dean for Research – Dublin City University Business School Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning - Dublin City University Business School Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning – Faculty of Engineering and Computing Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning – Humanities and Social Sciences Director of Oscail Faculty Of Engineering and Computing Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
7	Mr Aaron Clogher	Students Union – Education Officer

	Ms Shona McGrath Ms Patricia Moore Mr Oisín MacFhearai Ms Rosina Owens	Undergraduate Student Postgraduate research student Postgraduate research student Postgraduate research student
8	Open Meeting	All Area Staff invited. No appointment necessary.
9	Mr Paul Smith Ms Annabella Stover Ms Geraldine Lavin Ms. Siobhan Murphy Ms Mary Condon Mr Pat Power	Member of Governing Authority Administrative Registrar, Mater Dei Institute of Education – a college of DCU Programme Manager, DCU Ryan Academy Catering Manager, Trispace Ltd. External Senior Invigilator External Invigilator
10	Ms. Phylomena McMorrow	Director of Registry
11	Prof. Brian MacCraith, Mr Jim Dowling Prof. Eithne Guilfoyle Prof. Alan Harvey Dr. Declan Raftery Dr. John Doyle Dr. Anne Sinnott Prof. John Costello Prof. Barry McMullin Ms Marian Burns Mr. Ciarán McGivern Mr. Ciarán Ó Cuinn	DCU President Deputy President Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) Vice-President Research & Innovation Chief Operating Officer Dean of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Dean of DCU Business School Dean of Faculty of Science & Health Dean of Faculty of Engineering & Computing (Interim) Director of Human Resources Director of Finance Executive Director External and Strategic Affairs
12	Prof. Eithne Guilfoyle	Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar)
13	Ms Karen Keating Ms Ursula Baxter Mr Jonathan Begg Ms Michele Brennan Ms Bernadette Dowling Ms Margaret Irwin-Bannon	Faculty administration – Faculty of Engineering & Computing Faculty Manager, Dublin City University Business School Faculty administration - DCU Business School Faculty administration – Oscail Faculty administration, Faculty of Science & Health Faculty administration, Faculty of Science & Health
14	Mr Ray Wheatley Mr Liam Gaughran Mr Ian Bell Mr Aengus Gordon Ms Deirdre Kelly Ms Louise McDermott Ms Valerie Cooke Ms Aisling McKenna Ms Sinead Carr Ms Jane Neville Ms Deirdre Wynter	Security Superintendent, Estates Office Security Supervisor Business Systems, Information Systems and Services Business Systems, Information Systems and Services Student Fees Officer, Finance Office Assistant Registrar, Office of Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) Office of Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) Institutional Research and Analysis Officer International Office Operations Manager, Presidents Office Marketing Manager, Communications and Marketing

	Ms. Celine Geraghty	Student Support and Development
15	Ms Joanne Lynch Mr Des McGuinness Dr Carol Barron Dr Caroline McMullan Dr Rory O'Connor Dr Ciaran Fagan Dr Ronan Scaife Dr Tamas Szecsi Ms Pauline Willis	Academic - Dublin City University Business School Academic - Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Academic – Faculty of Science and Health Academic - Dublin City University Business School Academic – Faculty of Engineering and Computing Academic – Faculty of Science and Health Academic – Faculty of Engineering and Computing Academic – Faculty of Engineering and Computing Academic - Dublin City University Business School
16	Ms. Phylomena McMorrow	Director of Registry
17	All Area Staff	Exit Presentation by PRG