



University College Dublin

REVIEW GROUP REPORT

Periodic Quality Review

UCD Research and Innovation

February 2017

Accepted by the UCD Governing Authority at its meeting on 27 June 2017

Table of Contents

Key Findings of the Review Group	3
1. Introduction and Overview of UCD Research and Innovation	6
2. Planning, Organisation and Management	11
3. Role, Function and Activities	16
4. Management of Resources	19
5. User Perspective	20
6. SWOT Analysis	22
Appendix 1: Summary of Commendations and Recommendations	24
Appendix 2: UCD Research and Innovation Response to the Review Group Report	33
Appendix 3: Schedule for Review Site Visit to UCD Research and Innovation	35

Key Findings of the Review Group

The Review Group (RG) has identified a number of key findings in relation to areas of good practice operating within UCD Research and Innovation (UCD R&I), and also areas which the RG would highlight as requiring improvement. The main section of this Report sets out all observations, commendations and recommendations of the RG in more detail. An aggregated list of all commendations and recommendations is set out in Appendix 1.

Examples of Good Practice

The RG identified a number of commendations, in particular:

1. Professionalism, commitment and engagement of staff across UCD R&I
 - a. Strength of inter-personal relationships between Faculty and UCD R&I staff highly regarded by both groups.
 - b. Staff felt well supported, with personal development enabled.
 - c. Staff morale is generally good overall.
2. Pre-Award Support
 - a. Positive feedback and enthusiastic commentary from all those who have received support.
3. Innovation & Technology Transfer
 - a. Highly professional staff, with excellent reputation (internally and externally) and performance.
4. Grant registration process
 - a. Electronic process rather than paper based was seen as a significant improvement.
 - b. Recognition of the significant reduction in time taken to complete the process was highly appreciated by users.
5. Engagement of UCD R&I with key stakeholders strong across breadth of constituencies

Proactive and strong engagement by staff in UCD R&I with key stakeholders across constituencies such as Funding agencies, Government Departments, Industry links, and reputational enhancement and input to rankings.

- a. Funding agencies
- b. Government departments
- c. Industry links
- d. Reputational enhancement and input to rankings

Prioritised Recommendations for Improvement

The full list of recommendations is set out in Appendix 1, however, the RG would suggest that the following be prioritised:

1. Post-Award Support Provision
 - a. This area was the single biggest area of confusion and dissatisfaction articulated by internal and external stakeholders across UCD R&I, HR, Finance and Legal functions, together with operational aspects of grant tracking and overall administration. The issue would primarily seem to be one of lack of ownership of this aspect of research administration.
 - b. It is recommended that the review of requirements by stakeholders be prioritised with fit-for-purpose structural and process changes implemented to support Finance, HR, grant tracking and administrative requirements, together with Technology Transfer as necessary. Implementation will require pan-institutional collaboration and commitment across Schools, Colleges and Administration and UCD R&I should take a leadership role in facilitating these changes.
2. UCD R&I should continue to build on its initial reorganisation, particularly in improving its Internal R&I integration and communication. This should include:
 - a. Communication across and within teams in UCD R&I to improve the flow of information to ensure that all staff are informed of developments and contribute to initiatives internal and external to the Unit. This can be achieved through ensuring:
 - Bottom up input to agenda setting
 - Understanding what each other do
 - Integration within and between teams – e.g. Communications personnel, Research Partners and Technology Transfer Team
3. Dialogue and Pro-active Engagement with UCD stakeholders
 - a. Build on positive intent expressed by Schools and Colleges with regard to R&I and establish closer links, assessing how best to include them into the core UCD R&I mission.
 - b. Further clarity is needed regarding the College VP Research role and increased engagement in the delivery of the UCD R&I mission is also needed. UCD R&I should take a leadership role in this.
 - c. Increase support provided by UCD R&I for non-major grant funding research and scholarship across the University. The challenge for UCD R&I is how to increase engagement with “*the 80%*” who do not engage with or avail of its services.
 - d. Continue to address requirements for support provision to non-STEM activity within the University, recognising that one-size doesn't fit all.
4. Clarity of Responsibility and Enabling Engagement
 - a. Signposting of ‘who to contact’ requires significant improvement.
 - b. Role, focus and mode of engagement of Research Partners needs to be clarified and agreed with stakeholders.

- c. The UCD R&I Physical environment (Research Building) should be reviewed with regard to facilitating engagement and communication - e.g. space could be ringfenced for outreach activities.

1. Introduction and Overview of UCD Research and Innovation

Introduction

- 1.1 This report presents the findings of a quality review of UCD R&I, which was undertaken from 18-21 April 2016. The Unit response to the Review Group Report is attached as Appendix 2.

The Review Framework

- 1.2 Irish Universities have collectively agreed a framework for their quality review and quality improvement systems, which is consistent with both the legislative requirements of the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012, and international good practice (e.g. Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, 2015). Quality reviews are carried out in academic, administrative and support service units.

- 1.3 The purpose of periodic review is to assist the University to assure itself of the quality of each of its constituent units, and to utilise learning from this developmental process in order to effect improvement, including:

- To monitor the quality of the student experience, and of teaching and learning.
- To monitor research activity, including: management of research activity; assessing the research performance regarding: research productivity, research income, and recruiting and supporting doctoral students.
- To identify, encourage and disseminate good practice, and to identify challenges and how to address these.
- To provide an opportunity for units to test the effectiveness of their systems and procedures for monitoring and enhancing quality and standards.
- To encourage the development and enhancement of these systems, in the context of current and emerging provision.
- To inform the University's strategic planning process.
- The output report provides robust evidence for external accreditation bodies.
- The process provides an external benchmark on practice and curriculum.
- To provide public information on the University's capacity to assure the quality and standards of its awards. The University's implementation of its quality procedures enables it to demonstrate how it discharges its responsibilities for assuring the quality and standards of its awards, as required by the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012.

The Review Process

1.4 Typically, the review model comprises four major elements:

- Preparation of a self-assessment report (SAR)
- A visit by a RG that includes UCD staff and external experts, both national and international. The site visit normally will take place over a two or three-day period
- Preparation of a review group report that is made public
- Agreement of an action plan for improvement (quality improvement plan) based on the RG report's recommendations. The University will also monitor progress against the improvement plan

Full details of the review process can be found on the UCD Quality Office website: www.ucd.ie/quality.

The Review Group

1.5 The composition of the RG for UCD R&I was as follows:

- Professor David FitzPatrick, UCD College of Engineering and Architecture (Chair)
- Dr David Foster, UCD Career Development Centre (Deputy Chair)
- Professor Patrick O'Shea, University of Maryland, USA (Extern)
- Ms Nikki Muckle, University of Warwick, UK (Extern)

1.6 The RG visited the Unit from 18-21 April 2016 and held meetings with Unit staff; College Principals, Vice-Principals for Research, Innovation and Impact (VPRII), Research Institute and Centre Directors, academic staff, Heads of Support Units, HR partner, and external stakeholders. The site visit schedule is included as Appendix 3.

1.7 In addition to the Self-Assessment Report, the RG considered documentation provided by the Unit and the University during the site visit.

1.8 This review covered a broad range of functions and activities provided by UCD R&I. A series of meetings provided the Review Group with an opportunity to address issues raised from their reading of the Self-Assessment Report, its appendices and additional supplementary information provided by the Unit. Key stakeholders, including staff from within the Unit and wider University, and students met with the Review Group. All members of the Review

Group participated in all discussions and meetings. The Report has been read and approved by all members of the Review Group.

Preparation of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR)

1.9 Following a number of briefings from the UCD Quality Office, a Self-Assessment Report Coordinating Committee (SARCC) was established with responsibility for producing a draft SAR report. All members of the Unit had an opportunity to contribute to the report and participated in an externally facilitated SWOT workshop held in December 2015.

1.10 Input from user surveys and focus groups also informed the SAR report.

The University

1.11 University College Dublin (UCD) is a large and diverse university whose origins date back to 1854. The University is situated on a large modern campus about 4 km to the south of the centre of Dublin.

1.12 The University Strategic Plan (to 2020) states that the University's mission is: "to contribute to the flourishing of Dublin, Ireland, Europe and the world through the excellence and impact of our research and scholarship, the quality of our graduates and our global engagement; providing a supportive community in which every member of the University is enabled to achieve their full potential".

The University is currently organised into six colleges and 37 schools:

- UCD College of Arts and Humanities
- UCD College of Business
- UCD College of Engineering and Architecture
- UCD College of Health and Agricultural Sciences
- UCD College of Social Sciences and Law
- UCD College of Science

1.13 As one of the largest universities on the island of Ireland, UCD supports a broad, deep and rich academic community in Science, Business, Engineering, Architecture, Health Sciences, Agriculture, Veterinary Medicine, Arts, Law, Celtic Studies and Human Sciences. There are currently more than 26,000 students on the UCD campuses (approximately 16,300 undergraduates, 7,800 postgraduates and 2,200 Occasional and Adult Education students) registered on over 70 University degree programmes, including over 6,300 international students from more than 121 countries. The University also has over 5,400 students studying UCD degree programmes on campuses overseas.

1.14 UCD is a research-intensive university and ranked first nationally for research by Times Higher Education 2016.

UCD Research and Innovation

1.15 There are 50 staff within UCD R&I, 34 female and 16 male. The age profile of the unit is lower than the University norm reflecting the age of the Unit, its growth and staff turnover. The gender balance for the Unit is positive with some imbalance at the Senior Executive Assistant (SEA) level.

1.16 UCD R&I is located in two main locations on the Belfield campus.

1.17 The Unit's current structure was established in 2014 with the merger of UCD Research and UCD Innovation (including NovaUCD). The Unit has recently restructured into seven teams:-

- Research Partners
- Research Programmes
- Research Finance and Operations
- Planning, Performance and Support
- Technology Transfer
- Operations and Facilities
- Innovation Specialists

1.18 Innovation also has responsibility for the UCD Enterprise Gateway in the O'Brien Centre for Science, and NexusUCD, the University's Industry Partnership Centre.

1.19 The Unit is primarily responsible for stimulating, enabling and supporting excellent research and innovation in the University. UCD's Strategy for Research, Innovation and Impact 2015-20 was launched in October 2015 and is linked to achieving the University's strategy of increasing 'the quality, quantity and impact of our research, scholarship and innovation' (*UCD Strategy 2015-2020*). Six major research themes have been identified: Energy, Health, ICT, Culture, Economy & Society, Environment, and Agri-Food.

1.20 UCD Research and Innovation is currently operating within a challenging national funding environment.

1.21 During the site visit the Review Group met highly experienced and professional staff from each of the seven teams of UCD R&I. Summary comments on these meetings include:

- Strong sense of engagement by staff with the QA/QI process but several individuals in key roles ended up contributing/attending several different meetings. This is an aspect of the QA/QI process that should be improved.
- Discussion with sections highlighted effectiveness of, and reliance on, personal relationships with other staff, Faculty or units across UCD.

- Staff clearly felt that UCD R&I Senior Management Team are leading the development of strategy and new initiatives. Perceived level of consultation and buy-in was variable across sections.
- 1.22 A clear overview of the methodology undertaken in writing the SAR was presented to the Review Group. However, the Review Group noted that:
- The Self-Assessment Report was not particularly self-critical and/or reflective.
 - In particular, the SWOT analysis was not felt to have been drilled into in any real depth or with a self-critical/reflective perspective.
- 1.23 Feedback from stakeholder groups to the RG included:
- The change in organisational structure was seen as positive by the Review Group. The merger of NovaUCD and UCD Research, together with the development of a less ‘executive’ management model, provides a more integrated engagement with stakeholders along with a more agile and effective service provision.
 - Support and assistance provided was seen as supportive when called on. However, there was some divergence of view as to how to identify the most appropriate person to talk with.
 - The College VPRIIs suffer from a lack of a structured/consistent approach to their role at College level, particularly in terms of support available. In addition, they perceived that the agenda was primarily driven from UCD R&I, and that they were not involved in developing and leading the Research, Innovation and Impact agenda.
 - Challenges identified include the need to improve engagement at EU level, to develop mechanisms that enable a wider engagement with agencies and policy bodies.
 - Nova UCD was seen as being a strong performer, working with the academic community in a proactive manner.
 - The Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences (AHSS) communities expressed concern about the focus on STEM and the potential need to evaluate how AHSS can become more integrated into core UCD R&I activities and priorities.
 - The issue of pre and post-award support was raised from a number of stakeholder groups and it is clear that a consistent approach to finance support functions needs to be developed. This needs to be discussed between UCD R&I and UCD Finance as a matter of urgency.
- 1.24 UCD R&I has been through a period of significant change that, arguably, will need some additional time to fully settle into a steady-state working environment. In that context, the QA/QI review is timely as it provides the opportunity to review activity and work processes,

reinforce positive actions/changes and to identify areas for further refinement and improvement.

- 1.25 From meetings with both internal and external stakeholders, it is clear that individual sections within UCD R&I are seen as working in an effective and supportive manner, particularly for those who fit the mainstream priorities of UCD R&I. These priorities are perceived to be those of (a) significant grant funding at National and International level and, in part as a direct consequence of that (b) research in STEM themes, with AHSS feeling at risk of being side-lined or, at best, not being fully recognised and/or engaged with.
- 1.26 Although the primary structural change has been the integration of UCD Research and Nova UCD within a single unit, further work on integration of these units should be considered, as they seem to be continuing their work activities and practices without any real change in modus operandi. A specific example would be the communications functions which remain located within their original units, but could perhaps operate in a more fluid and combined role.

2. Planning, Organisation and Management

Strategy

Comments

- 2.1 The strategy for UCD R&I maps to the ten objectives of the UCD Strategy and outlines how the objectives can be supported with a key set of specific actions. It sets out the area with responsibility such as the relevant academic unit, UCD R&I. Currently UCD R&I has thirteen project strands mapped to the University's ten objectives and these are outlined in the Unit's SAR. Some of the programmes are large scale in nature with phased deliverables to 2018, others with clear deliverables within a shorter timescale. Each project is supported by a project team and includes members from across the University.
- 2.2 UCD R&I has a well-articulated Work Programme in place in response to the UCD Strategy 2015-2020. The Programme is comprehensive and well managed, and can be seen to be producing results through the change programmes in place. However, consideration should be given to ensure that UCD R&I is able to fully respond to a continually changing external environment and to ensure the Work Programme stays relevant and, indeed, anticipates likely future changes.

Commendation

- 2.3 UCD R&I should be commended on its comprehensive Work Programme in response to the Strategy 2015 – 2020, and the measures in place to ensure this Work Programme is monitored and delivered.

Recommendations

- 2.4 UCD R&I should continue to monitor its Work Programme and ensure its continued relevance and responsiveness to changing external factors.
- 2.5 The Strategy and Work Programme was well received by those in the University who knew the detail of it. However, not all were aware of the particulars of the Strategy and the work being done in UCD Research and Innovation in response to it. Thus communication of the activities of the Unit in response to the Strategy should be reviewed to help the 'buy in' to these activities by Schools and Colleges.

Pre-award

Comment

- 2.6 There was much discussion during the site visit about the pre-award function, and recognition of significant positive changes in this area over the last few years.

Commendations

- 2.7 There was positive feedback and enthusiastic commentary from all areas relating to the entirety of the pre-award function and the support received, and all the staff should be commended on their dedication and professionalism.
- 2.8 In particular, there was recognition of systems improvement and the reduction in time for grant registration.
- 2.9 The support for People and European funding were particularly commended. Schools and Colleges were satisfied with the training offered to academic staff through workshops in these areas, and the targeting of promising academics (for example, for ERC fellowships). It was felt support in these areas was a particularly visible aspect of the overall support offered by UCD R&I, and the model could be used to inform other areas of support.

Recommendations

- 2.10 Whilst the pre-award support was seen as positive across the board, it was suggested that further consideration should be given to how support for Arts and Humanities subjects is delivered, as this requires a slightly different type of support than larger scale Science funding. Support in this area has improved, but it is recommended that further work would yield additional benefits.
- 2.11 Whilst support for EU funding was considered excellent, particularly in the EU People programme areas, consideration should be given to how UCD R&I can support more EU funded collaborative research projects. In particular, researchers wanted more support in building networks and collaborations in Europe. In addition consideration should be given to how the University can influence the agenda setting in the EU for research in key areas –

possibly influencing through working in partnership with other universities or research organisations such as U21.

- 2.12 Whilst there was general satisfaction with the contracting process, it was suggested that the process could have a clearer workflow. Consideration should be given to how this process can be further clarified, stream-lined and communicated.
- 2.13 Whilst there was widespread satisfaction with the content of the support provided for funding applications, one recurring theme was the concern with the scale of bids for which support is provided. There is a perception that UCD R&I only support 'large' bids and those that are already actively securing funding, which in some areas is a relatively small minority. Schools and Colleges would welcome the opportunity to work with UCD R&I to target individuals that have the potential to become (more) successful in winning research funding.
- 2.14 It is recommended that UCD R&I review how best to support those that are not submitting the large, strategic proposals (the "*missing 80%*"), with a view to working with Schools and Colleges to target a wider group of individuals who could secure significant funding at the next level down.

Partners/Themes

- 2.15 The Review Group recognised the development of the new Research Partner roles to support Research Themes. It was clear that these roles are a significant development for UCD R&I, introducing a new way of working with the six thematic areas and cross-cutting Schools and Colleges.
- 2.16 These roles have only been in place for a few months, and have spent much of that time working on the SFI funding bids, so there has been little opportunity to really develop the roles and new ways of working. Nonetheless, the existence of the new roles was widely recognised and well received.

Commendations

- 2.17 The development of the new Research Partner roles was welcomed, as was the new way of working across disciplines, Schools and Colleges. The input of the Research Partners to the development of the recent SFI bids demonstrates the value of these roles going forward.
- 2.18 In particular, the Arts and Social Sciences welcomed the Research Partner role. It would help these disciplines contribute to multidisciplinary activities across the University, where it was felt there was considerable untapped potential and opportunities for greater engagement.

Recommendations

- 2.19 Whilst it was understood that the immediate focus of the Research Partners had been on the SFI bids, consideration should now be given to how the Partners would be able to contribute to strategy development in the thematic areas. Indeed, recognising the often competing

demands of strategy and bid work, consideration should be given to how to balance these activities with the role portfolio.

- 2.20 The Colleges felt that, even though the Research Partner roles were co-funded by them, they had had little opportunity to input on the strategic priorities for the roles. Therefore, consultation should be undertaken with the Colleges to understand their priorities for the roles, and how these priorities would be balanced by the bid work needed by UCD R&I.
- 2.21 In addition, whilst recognising that it was early days, the Colleges would welcome a more visible presence by the Research Partners. Therefore, consideration should be given to how the Research Partners can be more present in the Colleges whilst often needing to work across multiple Colleges in some themes. The Human Resources Partners model currently in operation across Colleges is an effective working example.
- 2.22 It should be noted that, whilst the Research Partner roles were developed to work on strategic priorities, it was felt that UCD R&I often equated strategic with 'large'. Whilst this connection was often the case, for some areas it was felt that support for smaller funding bids or other groups of researchers (such as early stage researchers) could also be strategic, and the Research partners should consider how to incorporate these areas into their portfolio, when appropriate.

Internal structures and communications

- 2.23 It was recognised that UCD R&I had recently undergone a significant merger and restructure. Whilst many plans and initiatives had been put in place to ensure good communications and practice within the Unit, it is still very early days and new structures are still bedding down.
- 2.24 Team meetings have been established as the primary conduit of the Unit's strategy, work allocation, interaction between teams, monitoring of performance, resolving of issues and risks, and feeds into the management group meeting. This has been supplemented by cross-unit and unit meetings both formal and informal.

Commendations

- 2.25 The merger between UCD Research and UCD Innovation was broadly welcomed, and gave many opportunities for more joined up working between the two halves of the new unit. The 'buddy system' between the Research Partners and Innovation Managers is an example of good practice that could be further replicated, and the pipeline meetings in pre-award are another example of useful working practices.
- 2.26 The Review Group considered the new Competency Framework to be a very welcome development to support the career development of all staff. However, whilst staff knew of its existence, many were not sure how it could be used to support their development and UCD R&I should ensure the Framework is rolled out widely across the Unit.

- 2.27 The analytics function of the Unit was highly valued by the Schools and Colleges, and seen as quick to respond to requests for support.

Recommendations

- 2.28 The multiple roles in UCD R&I, and the structure of the new Unit, were not fully understood neither by staff within the Unit nor by academic colleagues. Whilst acknowledging that the restructure is very recent, work should be undertaken to ensure that the whole Unit understands the roles and responsibilities across all areas, and how this information is communicated across the University.
- 2.29 Whilst there were obviously a suite of team meetings in place in all areas of the Unit, it was clear that not all messages are cascading throughout the Unit. Consideration should be given to the format and content of team meetings to ensure they are not just about downward communication, how input can be encouraged from the bottom up, and to consider how these meetings can be used to facilitate teams to actually work together in practice.
- 2.30 Consideration should be given to further integration of teams from Research and Innovation, particularly with respect to the communications functions of the two sides of the Unit.

Communication with Schools and Colleges

- 2.31 Schools and Colleges were broadly happy with the services provided by UCD R&I, with particular areas singled out for good practice being the People and European Support, the innovation of the Research Partners, and the support received from NovaUCD. However, one area that repeatedly came up where improvements could be made was on the communications between UCD R&I and the Schools, Colleges and individual researchers. Particularly, once researchers had a working relationship with the Unit, they valued the professionalism and support offered by the staff. However, many found it difficult to know who to call to help with particular issues. This was particularly evident since the restructure.

Commendation

- 2.32 The funding bulletins sent out by UCD R&I are useful and should be continued, although these don't always reach the people that need to see them, and need to be followed up by more face- to-face contact.

Recommendations

- 2.33 It is recommended that UCD R&I review all its communications with Schools, Colleges and individual researchers (including the website, email communications and face-to-face contact) to clarify both the communications channels used and how researchers find the correct support for their need. In particular, Schools and Colleges were keen for Research and Innovation staff to be much more visible out in the Schools and Colleges, and UCD R&I should work with Research Directors to consider how best to achieve this.

- 2.34 There is sometimes a disconnect in the cascade of information between the Colleges and Schools and it should not be assumed that all information reaches those that need it. Much more use could be made of the communications functions in the Schools themselves to cascade information, and this should be investigated.
- 2.35 UCD Research is in a prime location on campus, and has open space that lends itself well to being a hub for information on research funding and opportunities. However, this space is not well utilised at present. It is recommended that the possible uses for the ground floor space should be reviewed to better facilitate communications with research staff from across the University.

External Communications

- 2.36 The external (to the University) communications from both Research and Innovation are seen as strong, in terms of communications with funding bodies, research policy setters and industry, as well as the support offered to researchers on impact, innovation and research communications. However, these two halves of the Unit work separately in this respect and there is scope here for better integration of the service provided.

Commendation

- 2.37 The teams should be commended on their external communications, that is, both communications staff who support researchers and those that seek to influence external agendas as part of their wider roles.

Recommendation

- 2.38 Whilst being strong, there is scope for better coordination of the communications' operations of the two areas of the Unit, and these should be reviewed to bring them together as one team, where their work can better complement each other.

3. Role, Function and Activities

General Comments and Context

- 3.1 UCD R&I is the primary delivery unit for research and innovation services and for the development of research policy for UCD. The core service function activities of the unit support researchers in developing competitive proposals, registering new awards and capturing the outputs and impacts of their research. This latter activity includes the transfer of knowledge through commercialisation of research outputs.
- 3.2 All activities of the unit are underpinned by systems, supports and processes that aid the researcher and provide valuable management information on research activities to internal

management and external agencies. UCD R&I is not responsible for pre- or post-award financial administration nor post-award administration.

- 3.3 UCD R&I leads the development of the University's Strategy for Research and Innovation and seeks to ensure that key actions identified in the Strategy are planned, developed and implemented. The Unit promotes a culture of ambition and excellence in research and innovation within the University, through its input into key University decision-making bodies and its interactions with faculty and research staff at all levels.
- 3.4 In addition, the Unit also plays an important role in corporate services, University planning and University-wide initiatives.
- 3.5 UCD R&I also has an outward-facing role. It interacts operationally with research and innovation funding agencies, where it must present a high-quality professional interface. It also interacts on a strategic basis with industry and government agencies, building support for the University and its mission. Internationally, it leads in the development and management of research partnerships and broader collaborations.
- 3.6 The Review Group met with all staff and selected stakeholders during the site visit, including a meeting specifically with newly appointed staff.
- 3.7 The Unit provided examples in their SAR of good practice of the activities and services provided such as the Unit's agility; the provision of commercialization programmes in supporting UCD researchers; its role in managing external stakeholder relationships; the gender diversity programme; and the provision of research analytics and management information in supporting researchers in managing research.

Commendations

- 3.8 The professionalism, commitment and engagement of staff across UCD R&I was evident in the feedback received by the RG. The morale of the staff was perceived to be excellent overall.
- 3.9 The Review Group commends the leadership role provided by the Vice-President for Research, Innovation and Impact who was appointed in 2014.
- 3.10 The strength of inter-personal relationships between Faculty and UCD R&I showed that the staff are highly regarded. Overall, the UCD R&I staff felt well supported, and their personal development was well enabled.
- 3.11 The RG received enthusiastic feedback on pre-award proposal preparation and submission support. The support of major research proposals received particular praise.
- 3.12 The recent shift to an electronic process for post-ward grant registration process rather than paper based was seen as a significant improvement. Recognition of the significant reduction in time taken to complete the process was highly appreciated by users.

- 3.13 The practices applied by NovaUCD in support of technology transfer and start-up companies have delivered a track record of success and a reputation that make it a major asset for the University. The highly professional staff, have an excellent reputation (internally and externally) and performance.
- 3.14 The engagement of UCD R&I with key stakeholders is strong across the breadth of constituencies, funding agencies, Government Departments, and industry.

Recommendations

Post-Award Support

- 3.15 Post-award Support was identified by the Review Group as the single biggest area of confusion and dissatisfaction across UCD R&I, UCD HR, UCD Finance and UCD Legal functions, together with operational aspects of grant tracking and overall administration. It appears to the RG that the problem is primarily one of lack of ownership of this aspect of research administration.
- 3.16 The RG received both internal and external commentary regarding this topic. The RG recommend the prioritisation of the review of requirements in this space and implement relevant structural and process changes to support Finance, HR, grant tracking and administrative requirements, together with commercialization, as appropriate. Implementation may require pan-institutional collaboration and commitment across Schools, Colleges and Administration.

Contract negotiation

- 3.17 During the site visit the RG heard that the review and negotiation of contracts can be a slow and protracted process, and this is sometimes a source of complaint from researchers. In some cases delays are due to processes within external partners; however, it is also true that internal processes could also be improved. Legal support within the Innovation team is currently just 0.5 of an FTE. Increased support is needed here, though not necessarily within UCD R&I.

Reorganisation

- 3.18 The initial reorganisation of UCD R&I has been a success. Therefore, the Unit should seek to build on this to improve internal UCD R&I integration and communication. As discussed in an earlier section, communication across and within teams in UCD R&I is needed, to improve the flow of information, so that there can be a better understanding of what each team is doing. There also needs to be more bottom-up rather than top-down input to agenda setting. In addition, there is a need for better integration within and between teams – e.g. Communications, Research Partners and Technology Transfer Team.

Dialogue and Pro-active Engagement with UCD stakeholders

- 3.19 Build on positive intent expressed by Schools and Colleges in engaging with UCD R&I. UCD R&I should be pro-active in developing and establishing closer links, as well as assessing how best to include them into the core UCD R&I mission.

College VP Research, Innovation and Impact role

- 3.20 The role of the College VPRIs needs to be clarified so that they can have an increased role and engagement in the promotion and delivery of the UCD R&I mission. There should also be a reward structure that acknowledges the contributions of the College VPRIs.

Support for non-STEM researchers

- 3.21 The support for active researchers in major STEM units is strong. This is less so for the non-research intensive non-STEM units. Working with Colleges, UCD R&I should develop programmes to assist the less active researchers and units and provide support for non-major grant funding research and scholarship. Examples could include shared proposal preparation services, and training programmes geared to non-STEM units, recognising that one-size doesn't fit all.

Clarity of Responsibility and Enabling Engagement

- 3.22 The RG heard that new or emerging researchers often found it difficult to navigate UCD R&I. Therefore, signposting of 'who to contact' needs to be improved. The roles of the newly formed Research Partners were unclear to many stakeholders. The focus and mode of engagement of the Research Partners needs to be understood by and agreed with the stakeholders.

4. Management of Resources

General Comments and Context

- 4.1 The Unit provides client services from four locations on campus: the UCD Research building, NovaUCD, NexusUCD and the UCD Enterprise Gateway located in the UCD O'Brien Centre for Science. The physical facilities are generally of a high standard with the exception of one area in NovaUCD, which is due for upgrading within the University's new Capital Development Plan.
- 4.2 The Unit is also responsible for distributing income received from commercialization (trade sales and licensing) and disbursements from the Research Capacity Fund which supports the University's strategic objective of increasing the quality, quantity and impact of its research, scholarship and innovation. Other funding schemes include the Seed Funding schemes and the Strategic and Major Initiatives scheme.

- 4.3 More recently, UMT has approved a new funding initiative in support of expenditure incurred running research activities, and based on individual Faculty publications and PhD supervision.
- 4.4 UCD R&I receives funding from a range of funding streams: direct core University provision; allocation from research overheads through the University Overhead Investment Plan; an Enterprise Ireland TTSI grant; and a number of external research awards.
- 4.5 The Review Group noted the risk associated with a reliance on future TTSI funding to support the technology transfer team.

Commendations

- 4.6 There were no significant deficiencies identified in the management of the Unit and its resources.

Recommendations

- 4.7 The physical environment in the UCD Research building should be reviewed with respect to facilitating engagement and communication.
- 4.8 Prioritisation and redevelopment of the East Wing of NovaUCD would allow for growth in incubation space.
- 4.9 UCD R&I needs to match the current level of provision with existing resources. This includes the management of stakeholders' expectations. Potential risks such as cuts in budgets and TTSI funding need to be managed.

5. User Perspective

General Comments and Context

- 5.1 Considerable evidence exists that UCD R&I make significant effort to engage the client base in gauging levels of "customer" satisfaction, using the results to inform continuous improvement of services.
- 5.2 A triangulated approach of both on-line questionnaires and focus groups is a solid base upon which an exploration of client/customer needs can be based.
- 5.3 There is some evidence in the literature to suggest on-line response rates to satisfaction surveys can be significantly higher than the 11.4% recorded by UCD R&I in a survey of 1860 UCD Faculty and Researchers. While satisfaction levels are reported as generally being good or very good amongst Faculty and Researchers, it would have been beneficial to explore further with staff, the reasons for recording either a neutral or negative level of satisfaction

with the Unit, which when added together, in some instances represented significant numbers of this cohort.

- 5.4 Given the breadth of the UCD R&I portfolio, there is clear evidence of an impactful spread of services and supports across the functions, in particular on the Innovation side.

Commendations

- 5.5 Feedback on Pre-award research and support for major proposals was unanimously positive from all stakeholders with whom the function interacts. This is clearly an exceptional service that has impact and is held in very high regard amongst the customer base.
- 5.6 The Innovation and Technology Transfer function at Nova UCD is held in high regard, both internally within UCD and also externally, enhancing institutional profile and reputation.
- 5.7 Members of staff at UCD R&I are perceived as being professional, committed and engaged by both internal and external customers/clients. There is clear evidence of effective engagement with Government, funding bodies, industry and considerable input to university rankings.
- 5.8 Staff at UCD R&I reported feeling well supported in their professional development with high levels of morale evident.

Recommendations

- 5.9 There exists an urgent need to review the entirety of the Post-Award support function and implement structural and process changes to the current system, processes and procedures. Implementation of any effective solution may require pan-institutional collaboration and commitment across UCD Colleges, Schools and Administration, with due attention to providing a first-class customer service. There is significant confusion and high levels of dissatisfaction across customer groups about this function. The interrelationship between UCD R&I, UCD Legal, UCD HR and UCD Finance, appears opaque and difficult for clients to understand and engage with. Significantly, there was external commentary to the Review Group during the site visit on what is an internal UCD process, leading to the potential for reputational damage.
- 5.10 Build upon positive feedback from Schools and Colleges and establish closer relationships in supporting/developing research agendas, in line with the needs of disciplines and the broader UCD research agenda.
- 5.11 Further develop supports and services to Schools and Colleges that ensure UCD R&I is recognised as relevant to areas such as Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. While this is addressed in the SAR, there is significant on-the-ground concern around the relevance and support of UCD R&I in these areas.

- 5.12 Attention should be given to enabling UCD/external clients access the most appropriate member(s) of staff at UCD R&I, to ensure good levels of customer care and experience. While members of staff at UCD R&I were viewed as professional and helpful, many customers were unaware of whom to contact in the first instance.
- 5.13 As the recent re-structuring at UCD R&I beds-down, attention should be given to further integration of what still feels to users, like two separate entities (UCD Research and NovaUCD). The integration of separate functions in areas such as communications may benefit from further integration, to present UCD R&I as a single entity.

6. SWOT Analysis

General Comments and Context

- 6.1 As part of the Unit's preparation for quality review, a SWOT workshop was undertaken and all staff were invited to attend. It was clear to the Review Group that there was a high level of engagement by staff, identifying the current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges for the Unit. This was also evident to the Review Group during their site visit discussions.
- 6.2 Weaknesses identified in this section and highlighted in other areas of the Self-assessment report have arisen due to the challenging economic environment, the recent merger of two units and resultant restructuring, and internal and external communications challenges. The Unit needs to ensure that the risks identified as weaknesses and threats are monitored and addressed.

Commendations

- 6.3 The Review Group commends the Sample Standard Operating Procedures in operation within UCD R&I.
- 6.4 The SWOT analysis appears to have identified the key high level strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats facing UCD R&I. The SWOT wasn't particularly self-critical and would have benefited from deeper analysis.

Recommendations

- 6.5 The analysis does not include a plan of action for each item identified. The SWOT analysis should be extended to include this.
- 6.6 UCD R&I have identified the strategic role that it plays in furthering research and innovation activity across the University. It is, however, dependant on having working relationships with the academic communities and other professional units. UCD R&I would benefit is working with these areas to build and implement a more structured and co-ordinated service delivery as well as agreeing targets with academic units.

6.7 In order to address the impact of potential internal and external threats to the Unit, UCD R&I should put in place a risk register.

UCD Research and Innovation
Full List of Commendations and Recommendations

This Appendix contains a full list of commendations and recommendations made by the Review Group for UCD R&I, and should be read in conjunction with the specific chapter above. *(Please note that the paragraph references below refer to the relevant paragraphs in the report text)*

2. Planning, Organisation and Management

Strategy

Commendation

- 2.3 UCD R&I should be commended on its comprehensive Work Programme in response to the Strategy 2015 – 2020, and the measures in place to ensure this Work Programme is monitored and delivered.

Recommendations

- 2.4 UCD R&I should continue to monitor its Work Programme and ensure its continued relevance and responsiveness to changing external factors.
- 2.5 The Strategy and Work Programme was well received by those in the University who knew the detail of it. However, not all were aware of the particulars of the Strategy and the work being done in UCD Research and Innovation in response to it. Thus communication of the activities of the Unit in response to the Strategy should be reviewed to help the ‘buy in’ to these activities by Schools and Colleges.

Pre-award

Commendations

- 2.7 There was positive feedback and enthusiastic commentary from all areas relating to the entirety of the pre-award function and the support received, and all the staff should be commended on their dedication and professionalism.
- 2.8 In particular, there was recognition of systems improvement and the reduction in time for grant registration.
- 2.9 The support for People and European funding were particularly commended. Schools and Colleges were satisfied with the training offered to academic staff through workshops in these areas, and the targeting of promising academics (for example, for ERC fellowships). It

was felt support in these areas was a particularly visible aspect of the overall support offered by UCD R&I, and the model could be used to inform other areas of support.

Recommendations

- 2.10 Whilst the pre-award support was seen as positive across the board, it was suggested that further consideration should be given to how support for Arts and Humanities subjects is delivered, as this requires a slightly different type of support than larger scale Science funding. Support in this area has improved, but it is recommended that further work would yield additional benefits.
- 2.11 Whilst support for EU funding was considered excellent, particularly in the EU People programme areas, consideration should be given to how UCD R&I can support more EU funded collaborative research projects. In particular, researchers wanted more support in building networks and collaborations in Europe. In addition consideration should be given to how the University can influence the agenda setting in the EU for research in key areas – possibly influencing through working in partnership with other universities or research organisations such as U21.
- 2.12 Whilst there was general satisfaction with the contracting process, it was suggested that the process could have a clearer workflow. Consideration should be given to how this process can be further clarified, stream-lined and communicated.
- 2.13 Whilst there was widespread satisfaction with the content of the support provided for funding applications, one recurring theme was the concern with the scale of bids for which support is provided. There is a perception that UCD R&I only support ‘large’ bids and those that are already actively securing funding, which in some areas is a relatively small minority. Schools and Colleges would welcome the opportunity to work with UCD R&I to target individuals that have the potential to become (more) successful in winning research funding.
- 2.14 It is recommended that UCD R&I review how best to support those that are not submitting the large, strategic proposals (the “missing 80%”), with a view to working with Schools and Colleges to target a wider group of individuals who could secure significant funding at the next level down.

Partners/Themes

Commendations

- 2.17 The development of the new Research Partner roles was welcomed, as was the new way of working across disciplines, Schools and Colleges. The input of the Research Partners to the development of the recent SFI bids demonstrates the value of these roles going forward.
- 2.18 In particular, the Arts and Social Sciences welcomed the Research Partner role. It would help these disciplines contribute to multidisciplinary activities across the University, where it was felt there was considerable untapped potential and opportunities for greater engagement.

Recommendations

- 2.19 Whilst it was understood that the immediate focus of the Research Partners had been on the SFI bids, consideration should now be given to how the Partners would be able to contribute to strategy development in the thematic areas. Indeed, recognising the often competing demands of strategy and bid work, consideration should be given to how to balance these activities with the role portfolio.
- 2.20 The Colleges felt that, even though the Research Partner roles were co-funded by them, they had had little opportunity to input on the strategic priorities for the roles. Therefore, consultation should be undertaken with the Colleges to understand their priorities for the roles, and how these priorities would be balanced by the bid work needed by UCD R&I.
- 2.21 In addition, whilst recognising that it was early days, the Colleges would welcome a more visible presence by the Research Partners. Therefore, consideration should be given to how the Research Partners can be more present in the Colleges whilst often needing to work across multiple Colleges in some themes. The Human Resources Partners model currently in operation across Colleges is an effective working example.
- 2.22 It should be noted that, whilst the Research Partner roles were developed to work on strategic priorities, it was felt that UCD R&I often equated strategic with 'large'. Whilst this connection was often the case, for some areas it was felt that support for smaller funding bids or other groups of researchers (such as early stage researchers) could also be strategic, and the Research partners should consider how to incorporate these areas into their portfolio, when appropriate.

Internal structures and communications

Commendations

- 2.25 The merger between UCD Research and UCD Innovation was broadly welcomed, and gave many opportunities for more joined up working between the two halves of the new unit. The 'buddy system' between the Research Partners and Innovation Managers is an example of good practice that could be further replicated, and the pipeline meetings in pre-award are another example of useful working practices.
- 2.26 The Review Group considered the new Competency Framework to be a very welcome development to support the career development of all staff. However, whilst staff knew of its existence, many were not sure how it could be used to support their development and UCD R&I should ensure the Framework is rolled out widely across the Unit.
- 2.27 The analytics function of the Unit was highly valued by the Schools and Colleges, and seen as quick to respond to requests for support.

Recommendations

- 2.28 The multiple roles in UCD R&I, and the structure of the new Unit, were not fully understood neither by staff within the Unit nor by academic colleagues. Whilst acknowledging that the restructure is very recent, work should be undertaken to ensure that the whole Unit understands the roles and responsibilities across all areas, and how this information is communicated across the University.
- 2.29 Whilst there were obviously a suite of team meetings in place in all areas of the Unit, it was clear that not all messages are cascading throughout the Unit. Consideration should be given to the format and content of team meetings to ensure they are not just about downward communication, how input can be encouraged from the bottom up, and to consider how these meetings can be used to facilitate teams to actually work together in practice.
- 2.30 Consideration should be given to further integration of teams from Research and Innovation, particularly with respect to the communications functions of the two sides of the Unit.

Communication with Schools and Colleges

Commendation

- 2.32 The funding bulletins sent out by UCD R&I are useful and should be continued, although these don't always reach the people that need to see them, and need to be followed up by more face- to-face contact.

Recommendations

- 2.33 It is recommended that UCD R&I review all its communications with Schools, Colleges and individual researchers (including the website, email communications and face-to-face contact) to clarify both the communications channels used and how researchers find the correct support for their need. In particular, Schools and Colleges were keen for Research and Innovation staff to be much more visible out in the Schools and Colleges, and UCD R&I should work with Research Directors to consider how best to achieve this.
- 2.34 There is sometimes a disconnect in the cascade of information between the Colleges and Schools and it should not be assumed that all information reaches those that need it. Much more use could be made of the communications functions in the Schools themselves to cascade information, and this should be investigated.
- 2.35 UCD Research is in a prime location on campus, and has open space that lends itself well to being a hub for information on research funding and opportunities. However, this space is not well utilised at present. It is recommended that the possible uses for the ground floor space should be reviewed to better facilitate communications with research staff from across the University.

External Communications

Commendation

- 2.37 The teams should be commended on their external communications, that is, both communications staff who support researchers and those that seek to influence external agendas as part of their wider roles.

Recommendation

- 2.38 Whilst being strong, there is scope for better coordination of the communications' operations of the two areas of the Unit, and these should be reviewed to bring them together as one team, where their work can better complement each other.

3. Role, Function and Activities

Commendations

- 3.8 The professionalism, commitment and engagement of staff across UCD R&I was evident in the feedback received by the RG. The morale of the staff was perceived to be excellent overall.
- 3.9 The Review Group commends the leadership role provided by the Vice-President for Research, Innovation and Impact who was appointed in 2014.
- 3.10 The strength of inter-personal relationships between Faculty and UCD R&I showed that the staff are highly regarded. Overall, the UCD R&I staff felt well supported, and their personal development was well enabled.
- 3.11 The RG received enthusiastic feedback on pre-award proposal preparation and submission support. The support of major research proposals received particular praise.
- 3.12 The recent shift to an electronic process for post-award grant registration process rather than paper based was seen as a significant improvement. Recognition of the significant reduction in time taken to complete the process was highly appreciated by users.
- 3.13 The practices applied by NovaUCD in support of technology transfer and start-up companies have delivered a track record of success and a reputation that make it a major asset for the University. The highly professional staff, have an excellent reputation (internally and externally) and performance.
- 3.14 The engagement of UCD R&I with key stakeholders is strong across the breadth of constituencies, funding agencies, Government Departments, and industry.

Recommendations

Post-Award Support

- 3.15 Post-award Support was identified by the Review Group as the single biggest area of confusion and dissatisfaction across UCD R&I, UCD HR, UCD Finance and UCD Legal functions, together with operational aspects of grant tracking and overall administration. It appears to the RG that the problem is primarily one of lack of ownership of this aspect of research administration.
- 3.16 The RG received both internal and external commentary regarding this topic. The RG recommend the prioritisation of the review of requirements in this space and implement relevant structural and process changes to support Finance, HR, grant tracking and administrative requirements, together with commercialization, as appropriate. Implementation may require pan-institutional collaboration and commitment across Schools, Colleges and Administration.

Contract negotiation

- 3.17 During the site visit the RG heard that the review and negotiation of contracts can be a slow and protracted process, and this is sometimes a source of complaint from researchers. In some cases delays are due to processes within external partners; however, it is also true that internal processes could also be improved. Legal support within the Innovation team is currently just 0.5 of an FTE. Increased support is needed here, though not necessarily within UCD R&I.

Reorganisation

- 3.18 The initial reorganisation of UCD R&I has been a success. Therefore, the Unit should seek to build on this to improve internal UCD R&I integration and communication. As discussed in an earlier section, communication across and within teams in UCD R&I is needed, to improve the flow of information, so that there can be a better understanding of what each team is doing. There also needs to be more bottom-up rather than top-down input to agenda setting. In addition, there is a need for better integration within and between teams – e.g. Communications, Research Partners and Technology Transfer Team.

Dialogue and Pro-active Engagement with UCD stakeholders

- 3.19 Build on positive intent expressed by Schools and Colleges in engaging with UCD R&I. UCD R&I should be pro-active in developing and establishing closer links, as well as assessing how best to include them into the core UCD R&I mission.

College VP Research, Innovation and Impact role

- 3.20 The role of the College VPRIs needs to be clarified so that they can have an increased role and engagement in the promotion and delivery of the UCD R&I mission. There should also be a reward structure that acknowledges the contributions of the College VPRIs.

Support for non-STEM researchers

- 3.21 The support for active researchers in major STEM units is strong. This is less so for the non-research intensive non-STEM units. Working with Colleges, UCD R&I should develop programmes to assist the less active researchers and units and provide support for non-major grant funding research and scholarship. Examples could include shared proposal preparation services, and training programmes geared to non-STEM units, recognising that one-size doesn't fit all.

Clarity of Responsibility and Enabling Engagement

- 3.22 The RG heard that new or emerging researchers often found it difficult to navigate UCD R&I. Therefore, signposting of 'who to contact' needs to be improved. The roles of the newly formed Research Partners were unclear to many stakeholders. The focus and mode of engagement of the Research Partners needs to be understood by and agreed with the stakeholders.

4. Management of Resources

Commendations

- 4.6 There were no significant deficiencies identified in the management of the Unit and its resources.

Recommendations

- 4.7 The physical environment in the UCD Research building should be reviewed with respect to facilitating engagement and communication.
- 4.8 Prioritisation and redevelopment of the East Wing of NovaUCD would allow for growth in incubation space.
- 4.9 UCD R&I needs to match the current level of provision with existing resources. This includes the management of stakeholders' expectations. Potential risks such as cuts in budgets and TTSI funding need to be managed.

5. User Perspective

Commendations

- 5.5 Feedback on Pre-award research and support for major proposals was unanimously positive from all stakeholders with whom the function interacts. This is clearly an exceptional service that has impact and is held in very high regard amongst the customer base.
- 5.6 The Innovation and Technology Transfer function at Nova UCD is held in high regard, both internally within UCD and also externally, enhancing institutional profile and reputation.
- 5.7 Members of staff at UCD R&I are perceived as being professional, committed and engaged by both internal and external customers/clients. There is clear evidence of effective engagement with Government, funding bodies, industry and considerable input to university rankings.
- 5.8 Staff at UCD R&I reported feeling well supported in their professional development with high levels of morale evident.

Recommendations

- 5.9 There exists an urgent need to review the entirety of the Post-Award support function and implement structural and process changes to the current system, processes and procedures. Implementation of any effective solution may require pan-institutional collaboration and commitment across UCD Colleges, Schools and Administration, with due attention to providing a first-class customer service. There is significant confusion and high levels of dissatisfaction across customer groups about this function. The interrelationship between UCD R&I, UCD Legal, UCD HR and UCD Finance, appears opaque and difficult for clients to understand and engage with. Significantly, there was external commentary to the Review Group during the site visit on what is an internal UCD process, leading to the potential for reputational damage.
- 5.10 Build upon positive feedback from Schools and Colleges and establish closer relationships in supporting/developing research agendas, in line with the needs of disciplines and the broader UCD research agenda.
- 5.11 Further develop supports and services to Schools and Colleges that ensure UCD R&I is recognised as relevant to areas such as Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. While this is addressed in the SAR, there is significant on-the-ground concern around the relevance and support of UCD R&I in these areas.
- 5.12 Attention should be given to enabling UCD/external clients access the most appropriate member(s) of staff at UCD R&I, to ensure good levels of customer care and experience. While members of staff at UCD R&I were viewed as professional and helpful, many customers were unaware of whom to contact in the first instance.

- 5.13 As the recent re-structuring at UCD R&I beds-down, attention should be given to further integration of what still feels to users, like two separate entities (UCD Research and NovaUCD). The integration of separate functions in areas such as communications may benefit from further integration, to present UCD R&I as a single entity.

6. SWOT Analysis

Commendations

- 6.3 The Review Group commends the Sample Standard Operating Procedures in operation within UCD R&I.
- 6.4 The SWOT analysis appears to have identified the key high level strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats facing UCD R&I. The SWOT wasn't particularly self-critical and would have benefited from deeper analysis.

Recommendations

- 6.5 The analysis does not include a plan of action for each item identified. The SWOT analysis should be extended to include this.
- 6.6 UCD R&I have identified the strategic role that it plays in furthering research and innovation activity across the University. It is, however, dependant on having working relationships with the academic communities and other professional units. UCD R&I would benefit is working with these areas to build and implement a more structured and co-ordinated service delivery as well as agreeing targets with academic units.
- 6.7 In order to address the impact of potential internal and external threats to the Unit, UCD R&I should put in place a risk register.

UCD Research and Innovation

Response to Review Group Report

UCD Research and Innovation (UCD R&I) is a relatively new unit of the University in its current form, following the merger in 2014 of UCD Research and UCD Innovation. A significant reorganisation was undertaken immediately following the merger, which was nearing completion at the time of the self-assessment exercise.

The task of developing the self-assessment report was a valuable reflective exercise following that time of change. The visit of the Review Group was a further positive experience. UCD R&I wishes to thank the members of the Group for their time, expertise and constructive comments, both during the site visit and in their very helpful report.

The Review Group had a substantial number of commendations for the unit. We welcome all of these, noting in particular the ones that reflect positive feedback from the UCD community and external stakeholders.

We also welcome the recommendations of the Group, which align with the observations that arose from the self-assessment. These will be addressed during the Quality Improvement phase.

With specific reference to the priority recommendations identified by the Review Group, the unit's initial responses are as follows:

Recommendation 1: Take a lead in a review of requirements by stakeholders in post-award support provision, with fit-for-purpose structural and process changes implemented to support Finance, HR, grant tracking and administrative requirements, together with Technology Transfer as necessary.

This is a very clear and important recommendation, and is wholeheartedly supported by UCD R&I. The provision of post-award support is a major area of dissatisfaction for the research community in UCD, and attracts occasional negative feedback from partners. This support is delivered by several units and by administrative staff in Schools, Colleges and Institutes across the University, with only a relatively minor portion within the current remit of UCD R&I. Addressing this recommendation will require substantial cross-university commitment, and UCD R&I will be happy to take a leading role in this. While improvements are both possible and necessary, it is important to point out that the funding envelope will continue to limit our ability to deliver the post-award support at individual PI level that applies in our leading international competitors.

Recommendation 2: UCD R&I should continue to build on its initial reorganisation, particularly in improving its internal R&I integration and communication.

The unit has already put in place measures aimed at improving internal integration and communication, and this will be addressed further in the Quality Improvement Plan.

Recommendation 3: Establish closer links with Schools and Colleges; clarify the role of the College VPRIs; and increase support for non-major grant funding and research scholarship and non-STEM activity.

We will seek to improve the links, information flow and co-operation between UCD R&I and the academic units. One step in this regard has been the recent series of meetings between UCD R&I leadership and School leadership, held on an individual School basis. An exercise is underway to clarify the role of the College VPRIs. Specific supports and special internal funding schemes have been introduced that benefit in particular researchers without major funding and those outside STEM, and many of the new self-support mechanisms for researchers will also benefit that community. Further targeted supports are also planned. We note however, that the demands on the unit associated with major funded programmes are increasing considerably as the nature of those programmes evolves, and that continuing success will call on more support there also.

Recommendation 4: Signposting of ‘who to contact’ requires improvement; the role, focus and mode of engagement of Research Partners needs to be clarified; and the UCD R&I physical environment should be reviewed with regard to facilitating engagement and communication.

Much work has already been conducted on signposting, and more is planned. This is a shared consideration for all support units, and we are currently working collaboratively on a university service catalogue including “where to go for what” across all staff services. The Partners team was established approximately a year ago and a review of year one lessons learned and opportunities for change is planned. Within this we will work with the Colleges to review and clarify the role and expectations of the Research Partners. We have made some minor initial improvements to our physical space, and will consult the community for further ideas on this.



UCD Research and Innovation

Quality Review Site Visit 18-21 April 2016

TIMETABLE

Pre-Visit Briefing Prior to Site Visit – Monday, April 18	
17.00-19.15	RG meet to review preliminary issues and to confirm work schedule and assignment of tasks for the site visit – <u>RG and UCD Quality Office only</u>
19.30	Dinner for the RG hosted by the Registrar and Deputy President

Day 1:	Tuesday, April 19
Venue:	Morning – UCD Research Boardroom Afternoon - NovaUCD
08.45 - 09.15	Private meeting of Review Group
09.15 - 09.45	Meeting with Deputy President and Registrar
10.00 – 10.30	Meeting with Vice-President for Research and Innovation
10.30-11.15	Meeting with Research and Innovation management team
11.15-11.30	Break
11.30-12.15	Meeting with Self-Assessment Co-ordinating Committee
12.15-13.00	Guided tour of UCD Research and Innovation facilities
13.00-13.45	Review Group Lunch
14.00-18.00	Individual overview meetings with 6 reporting teams
18.00-18.30	Review Group only – review meeting

Day 2:	Wednesday, April 20
Venue:	UCD Research Boardroom
08.30	Review Group Meet
08.45-9.30	Review Group meet with College Principals
9.30-10.15	Review Group meet with Vice-Principals for Research & Innovation
10.30-11.30	Review Group meet with Research Institute & Centres Directors / personnel
11.30-11.45	Refreshments
11.45-12.45	Meeting with academic staff
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch with external stakeholders
14.15-15.15	Meeting with Directors/Heads of Support Units
15.15-15.30	Break and meeting with Bursar

15.30-15.45	Meeting with HR Partner and Finance Partner
15.45-16.00	Refreshments
16.00-16.30	Meeting with School Heads
16.15-	Private meetings with UCD Research and Innovation staff

Day 3:	Thursday, April 21
Venue:	UCD Research Impact Room
09.00 – 12.45	Preparation of draft report and exit presentation
12.45 – 13.45	Working lunch for Review Group
14.00-14.30	Meeting with VP for Research and Innovation to feedback initial outline recommendations
15.00 – 16.00	Exit presentation to UCD Research and Innovation Staff