



**INTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW**  
**OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND INNOVATION**  
**2015**

RCSI DEVELOPING HEALTHCARE LEADERS WHO MAKE A DIFFERENCE WORLDWIDE

**Peer Review Group Report**  
**Office of Research and Innovation**

**DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET**

Name of Unit	Office of Research and Innovation					
Project Title	Internal Quality Review					
Document Title	Peer Review Group Report					
This Document Comprises	DCS	TOC	Text	List of Tables	List of Figures	No. of Appendices

Rev	Status	Author(s)	Reviewed By	Approved By	Office of Origin	Issue Date
1	Final	PRG			QEO	11 /12/ 2015

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1</b>	<b>CONTEXT FOR THE REVIEW OF THE RSCI OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND INNOVATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT OF THE UNIT .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>PLANNING, ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES AND PROCESSES.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>MANAGEMENT OF RESOURCES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>SERVICE USERS AND FEEDBACK.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
	<b>APPENDIX 1: SITE VISIT SCHEDULE.....</b>	<b>17</b>

## **1 Context for the Review of the RCSI Office of Research and Innovation**

The Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI) is an independent, health sciences Higher Education Institution encompassing Schools of Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Physiotherapy, Postgraduate Studies and Leadership. It is based in Ireland but has an international 'footprint' with overseas campuses in Bahrain, Dubai, Jordan and Malaysia. RCSI is a recognised college of the National University of Ireland and, in 2010, received independent degree-awarding powers by order of the Minister of Education and Skills. The advent of degree-awarding powers has brought RCSI into a national Quality Assurance/Quality Improvement (QA/QI) structure administered by Qualifications and Quality Ireland (QQI). In parallel with the requirement to undertake an overall institutional review on a regular cycle, RCSI is required to conduct internal reviews of all academic and support areas within the College on an on-going, periodic basis.

This report presents the findings of a quality review of the Office of Research and Innovation (ORI) at RCSI from 24<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015. The Review Group (PRG) met with faculty, staff, students and stakeholders of the ORI. All participants who met with the PRG were provided with an opportunity to contribute in a meaningful way to the discussions.

The PRG would like to thank the ORI for their very comprehensive Self-Assessment Report (SAR) and for their full engagement, open interactions and discussions during the review meetings which made for a very constructive and thorough review visit.

At the conclusion of the site visit, the Chair outlined a preliminary summary of principal findings, commendations and recommendations from the PRG. The final PRG report provided here is based on: an analysis of the SAR; interviews undertaken with staff, students and external stakeholders during the site visit; PRG discussions on site; and communication between PRG members following the site visit. Upon receipt of this report, the ORI will consider the recommendations, and in consultation with the RCSI Quality Enhancement Office, will develop a Quality Improvement Plan to address the stated recommendations.

### **1.1 Purpose of the Review**

The self-assessment exercise is a process by which a unit reflects on its mission and objectives, and analyses critically the activities it engages in to achieve these objectives. It provides for an evaluation of the unit's performance of its functions, its services and its administration. In line with the RCSI strategic plan 'Growth and Excellence' it provides assurance to the College of the quality of the unit's operations and facilitates a developmental process to effect improvement.

### **1.2 The Review Process**

The key stages in the internal review process were:

- i. Establishment of a Self-assessment Committee
- ii. Preparation of a SAR and supporting documentation

- iii. Site visit by a PRG that includes external experts both national and international
- iv. Preparation of a PRG report that is made public
- v. Development of a Quality Improvement Plan for implementation of the PRG's recommendations, which is made public
- vi. Follow up to appraise progress against the Quality Improvement Plan

### 1.3 Membership of the Peer Review Group

The PRG comprised of the following members:

- Ms. Kim O'Mahony. Quality Officer, Quality Support Unit, University of Limerick (Chair)
- Dr Paul Craven. Head of Clinical Research Operations, Imperial College London
- Ms. Jennifer Gilmartin. Assistant Director, Research Operations Office, University of Cambridge
- Ms. Tina Joyce. Programme Director, Institute of Leadership, Royal College of Surgeons Ireland

### 1.4 Terms of Reference for the Peer Review Group

The terms of reference of the PRG were to:

- Clarify and verify details in the SAR
- Verify how well the aims and objectives of the unit are being fulfilled, having regard to the available resources, and comment on the appropriateness of the unit's mission, objectives and strategic plan
- Evaluate the unit's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges as outlined in the SAR
- Discuss any perceived strengths and weaknesses not identified in the SAR
- Assess the suitability of the working environment(s)
- Comment on any recommendations proposed by the unit in its SAR
- Make appropriate recommendations for improvement, with due consideration of resource implications

## **2 Introduction and Context of the Unit**

### **2.1 Scope of the review**

The remit of the ORI is to plan, manage and support the implementation of the RCSI research strategy and research-related institutional resources, administration and operations.

The review covers the ORI activities that support researchers and the implementation of the research strategy. The assessment of RCSI research performance, research resources and operations of the RCSI Institute of Research will be subject to a separate review. As the ORI staff complement is diverse, membership of the SAR co-ordinating committee consisted of four members from various levels of seniority within the team but was also representative of both the Research and Technology Transfer aspects of the unit.

The team members were:

- Paola della Porta, Associate Director of Research (Chair)
- Fiona Manning, Senior Research Officer
- Clare Muckian, Research Officer
- Cathy O'Byrne, Assistant Research Officer

In the planning stage of the SAR, the committee met regularly to discuss the direction and progress of the report as well as ad hoc meetings. All staff members of the ORI were kept informed of the self-assessment process at weekly ORI meetings which provided a platform for feedback and contribution from all team members. There was evidence that this was an inclusive process where all members of staff were given the opportunity to contribute.

### **2.2 Introduction and Context of the Unit**

The first research management and support function at RCSI was established in 1998. Since then the unit has evolved and developed significantly in response to the evolution of institutional and national research strategies and the expansion and changing needs of RCSI research. The most significant changes in the management and organizational structure of the unit were driven by the Research Strategy 2014-2020. The Research Strategy led to the appointment of the Deputy Directors of Clinical and Applied Research and the Head of Innovation, who, along with the Director and the Associate Director of Research, form the Research Executive Management Team.

The Research Strategy also led to the establishment of the ORI. The ORI brings together functions, resources and expertise of the formerly separate Research and Technology Transfer offices to deliver a more efficient and functionally integrated service for research. The implementation of the Research Strategy has also led to a staffing increase from four to 12 people within the unit to strengthen its research support services. The ORI team, which now includes five Research Officers, an Industry Liaison Manager, a Case Manager and very soon an Institute of Research Support Officer and Contract Officer, now has the capability to deliver support and coordination in strategic planning, administration, reporting, contract negotiation,

intellectual property (IP) protection, commercialisation, support for collaboration with industry, planning and management of research infrastructure and communication.

### **3 Planning, Organisation and Management**

- 3.1 The PRG acknowledge the recent increase in staff in the ORI to support delivery of the RCSI Research Strategy. The ORI's role in supporting the strategy is clearly articulated and aligns resources to specific objectives. The RCSI's Strategic Academic Recruitment Programme (StAR) and Health Outcomes Research Centre (HORC) initiatives play a key role in delivering the increase in institutional ranking. However, the increase in highly research-active principal investigators (PIs) and their groups transferring to the College will create an extended peak in activity for the ORI for the period of the innovations and an on-going requirement for both high level and more basic administrative support, which is not yet resourced.
- 3.2 The staff of the ORI remain extremely busy with a very wide remit and expressed concern at their capacity to maintain a quality service. In particular they cited the high volume of email enquiries which prevented them from taking a more project-management approach when preparing for busy deadlines, which could ultimately reduce some of the volume of enquiries.
- 3.3 Throughout the review process the PRG often sensed a lack of clarity around the respective functions and boundaries of the Institute of Research with the ORI. As a major cost centre with a significant budget to grow, facilitate and support the RCSI research environment and infrastructure, the Institute of Research is key to delivering the RCSI strategy. Aligning the Institute of Research and the ORI (essentially strategy implementation and operational support) is a valuable model, but perhaps there is an opportunity to undertake a piece of communications work around the respective roles of each, the staff who support them, and also link in the role of the Research Committee to each. This exercise should also clarify how research space is allocated and managed. Clarity on the remit of the ORI and the roles of individuals in the office might reduce duplication of enquiry and manage expectations on delivery of service. Clarity between the roles and responsibilities of the Institute of Research and its staff would also help to differentiate it from the ORI and more clearly direct enquiries.
- 3.4 The ORI currently reviews resources on the Grant Application Impact Statement Forms (GAIS) including an assessment of space requirements and any health and safety risks. The scoping of the new IT Research System presents an opportunity to review exactly what such assessments involve and if they may be more appropriately managed by other central units or by the relevant Head of Department. The Director and Assistant Director of the ORI may wish to consider establishing closer working relationships with Heads of Department through regular visits.
- 3.5 As with all research offices, the ORI needs to strike a pragmatic balance between supporting research staff and their requirements in a flexible manner and ensuring compliance against policies and procedures which are designed to protect the organisation from financial or reputational risk. The PRG would suggest that duplicative or excessive bureaucracy should be questioned and reviewed where possible (instances of this were raised in our meetings), but equally the ORI must be supported in its compliance role. The Senior Management Team and the Research Committee could play a role in assessing whether this balance is being met, and in confirming which procedures are 'non-negotiable'. The PRG would suggest that escalation procedures are agreed for those rare cases where non-compliance becomes an issue. Staff within the ORI and other support units were unaware of the Research Committee's role in relation to research-related policy decisions, authorisation and ratification, and to which body they could refer any issues or challenges to the policies, as part of an escalation process.

Clarity in this area should help to empower staff in the ORI, redirect challenges and reduce any impression of the ORI 'over-policing' or being excessively bureaucratic.

- 3.6 Related to the above points, and to reflect the respective requirements of research staff and the ORI to achieve a common end, the PRG felt that the development of a 'Customer Charter' would be helpful. Such a Charter would encompass the fundamental objectives and values of the ORI, but would also clearly specify what is expected of research staff to assist in the delivery of these objectives. For example, early notification of intention to submit a grant whenever possible, adherence to organisational policies relating to financial management and cost recovery, protection and management of IP, etc.
- 3.7 The ORI is currently responsible for assessing the quality of applications for funding calls where only a limited number may be submitted from any one organisation. If the ORI's role involves assessment of the scientific content of the application, it may be more appropriate for a panel of academics to undertake at least some aspect of this process.
- 3.8 The departmental Research Managers' group enjoyed the opportunity to meet and discuss common issues. They felt it would be valuable to meet as a group every six months, facilitated by the ORI and held at alternating venues, and to work as a group to help resolve issues and share good practice.
- 3.9 The merger of the Technology Transfer Office with the Research Office to create the ORI and the additional resources to support the innovation agenda has been very well received and made an immediate impact. The PRG note the well-formulated plans of the team, including the development of the IP pipeline. The need for a pipeline of new IP was identified early in the review process - the PRG would like to endorse this to avoid a dip in potential 'commercialisable' technologies in the future. The Institute of Research could perhaps play a role in establishing incentives and schemes to support this objective.

### **Commendations**

The PRG commends the following:

- 3.10 The highly professional and skilled ORI staff with roles and responsibilities aligned to support the RCSI's research strategy
- 3.11 The recent growth in staff numbers and merger of the two separate support units to create a more holistic approach to research support
- 3.12 The project management skills of staff who support researchers with projects 'from cradle to cradle'
- 3.13 The customer-focussed workshops and their learning outcomes
- 3.14 The inherent connection of the ORI with the Senior Management Team through the Director of Research which enables rapid escalation of issues, information and decision making



## **Recommendations**

The PRG recommends the following:

- 3.15 Commission and deliver a communications plan clarifying the ORI and the Institute of Research boundaries and the functions of each
- 3.16 Clarify and communicate the role of the ORI in the allocation and management of research space
- 3.17 Review the process of policy development approval and implementation and how these are monitored for compliance
- 3.18 At an institutional level consider more frequent meetings of the Research Committee and communicate the terms of reference
- 3.19 Develop a Customer Charter to be approved by the Research Committee
- 3.20 Clarify the decision making process for ranking grant applications in the case of restricted calls
- 3.21 Facilitate a network of research support personnel throughout RCSI
- 3.22 Endorse the intention of the Innovations Team to develop a pipeline of new IP with support from RCSI

#### **4 Functions, Activities and Processes**

- 4.1 The ORI has already undertaken a significant piece of work in reviewing its activities and service in preparation for the SAR. However, in light of the imminent scoping for the new IT Research System, it would be timely to build on their recent review by undertaking an end-to-end business process review (BPR) and gap analysis. The BPR and gap analysis should ensure that the business needs of support for the full grant lifecycle are met and different processes and functions are undertaken by staff at the appropriate level. The outcome of the BPR and gap analysis would ensure highly qualified, skilled and experienced staff were not deployed on, or their impact diluted by tasks that could be undertaken by a more cost-effective resource.
- 4.2 The ORI staff plan to further develop their range of templates, standard texts and stock of information to proactively enhance support. Unfortunately the volume of higher priority activities had delayed progress on developing these resources which would help to alleviate some of the pressures relating to the urgent priorities.
- 4.3 The SAR highlighted the need for an effective communication strategy. During interviews, some interviewees expressed concern that emails sent from the ORI were not being read by some recipients. However, the PRG found evidence that emails were being read, but time was a particular constraint for busy academics and clinicians who could not always reply, act on the information or attend events. A communications plan should include more than one method of communicating, and where possible include timely, face-to-face meetings at appropriate locations. Communication could also be improved in disseminating the outcomes of meetings and initiatives down the chain of command and conveying relevant information between support offices.
- 4.4 There was strong support from across all stakeholder groups located at Beaumont Hospital for members of the ORI team to spend time at the hospital. Currently a member of the Finance Office spends one day per month there, but a more regular presence would enable clinicians with unpredictable schedules to avail of support at short notice.
- 4.5 Some of the Early Career Researcher group explained that they did not often attend events and training held in the College's St Stephen's Green site due to the time commitment to travel across the city as it interfered with their busy schedules and limited time. They were very keen that training and events should also take place at different locations to facilitate attendance with minimum impact on their other activities. The request for multi-site or rotating-venue events was echoed by other stakeholder groups.
- 4.6 A common theme for most groups, and one which was clearly articulated in the SAR, was the lack of resources in the Finance Office leading to unanswered emails, delays in allocation of codes to enable employment of staff, delays in budget approvals and a general lack of timely support. The ratio of research finance staff to the volume of activity should be benchmarked to ensure that adequate investment and forward planning has been made, especially in light of the anticipated and significant increase in research-active staff through the StAR and HORC initiatives.
- 4.7 The Research Managers' group requested that 'crib sheets' be developed containing key administrative information, distilled from call guidance notes and including time frames, to

reduce duplication of effort by the managers and the PIs without administrative support, and to reduce the volume of enquiries.

- 4.8 The Early Career Researchers discussed the need for a repository of successful grant applications that could provide PIs with exemplars on style and quality, where templates are not appropriate. They also expressed support for the development of training materials to increase commercial awareness and contractual matters.
- 4.9 Not all stakeholders were clear on the different stages of the grant application process, at what point responsibility and support passed from one department to another and who to contact at each stage. A single page flowchart including the names of contacts would go some way to address the issue and will ensure enquiries are directed to the appropriate office.

### **Commendations**

The PRG commends the following:

- 4.10 The level of support and engagement of the ORI team which is extremely good
- 4.11 The positive changes such as the merger of Technology Transfer into the ORI
- 4.12 The support for EU and National grants which is very positive

### **Recommendations**

The PRG recommends the following:

- 4.13 Consider conducting a gap analysis as part of the new research system scoping
- 4.14 Develop a repository of information to increase office efficiencies
- 4.15 Develop a two-way communications plan for the ORI which incorporates both internal and external communication
- 4.16 The ORI establish a presence at Beaumont Hospital based on existing good practice
- 4.17 Develop and implement a training strategy for multi-site delivery
- 4.18 At an institutional level review the post-award research finance capacity to meet demand, including benchmarking
- 4.19 Develop 'crib sheets' to capture generic information on specific calls which can be accessed by researchers

- 4.20 Create a repository of successful applications for use as exemplars
- 4.21 Clarify and communicate ORI's role in each stage of the grant-application approval process; define this in a flowchart
- 4.22 The Innovations Team develop a suite of training materials to support early career researchers in technology transfer and commercialisation

## 5 Management of Resources

- 5.1 Once again, it should be emphasised that the ORI is currently providing a knowledgeable and professional service, which is noted as being very supportive of academics, clinicians, research support staff in other departments, and staff in other administrative units. The PRG would also like to commend the efficiency and productivity of the ORI. Although full benchmarking and comparison with other organisations is difficult, the ORI would appear to be delivering a high quantity and quality of service with relatively limited resources, especially in view of the planned growth of the RCSI's research activity. The ORI has taken a pragmatic and rational approach to the organisation of its resources, sharing staff between the Research Operations, Support and Infrastructures Team (ROSIT) and Innovations Team where possible, and clarifying roles.
- 5.2 In view of this and of the need to maintain the current excellent level of service, the PRG would like to endorse the existing plans for additional resources to support the functions of the ORI. Further resources for the ORI (both ROSIT and Innovations) should be considered and planned by the Senior Management Team in line with the recruitment of academic individuals and teams through the StAR and HARC initiatives.
- 5.3 There may be predictable 'peaks and troughs' or cycles of activity in demand from researchers throughout the year in line with national and international grant calls. The ORI should aim to predict and plan proactively for these peaks in demand in their communications with research staff, in terms of dedicated training and information workshops, and via one-to-one meetings with potential applicants. Similarly, 'troughs' in demand could be used to plan some of the more cross-cutting and strategic activities that the ORI needs to deliver.
- 5.4 From conversations with a number of stakeholders, the PRG received positive feedback in relation to the research support functions that were currently available at the Rotunda Hospital site. Although acknowledging the difficulties and expense of replicating full-time and comprehensive support at each geographical location, the ORI should consider how to establish a formal 'satellite presence' in Beaumont Hospital. This should meet the broad needs of clinical and academic staff, in terms of pre-award grant application and budgeting, financial management of awards, general clinical research administration and tech transfer. This presence may not be full-time in the first instance, but regular planned days and times would be helpful. Those present at the site should have a broad knowledge of all the various issues that may be raised, and know at least who to approach for advice and support (i.e. sign-posting and problem-solving).
- 5.5 In scoping the requirements for a new IT Research System, the PRG would like to recommend that the project consider incorporating relevant information relating to clinical trials such as set-up and delivery times, number and type of trial, and patient recruitment to target. These metrics are increasingly being used to assess levels of activity and to determine support funding.
- 5.6 The PRG would like to emphasise the important role played by the Finance Office in supporting post-award financial management, reporting and audits. The burden on post-award resources is ever increasing, as funders require more and more evidence and assurance of value for money. The Finance Office play a key role in relieving the academic staff of this burden but it would appear the current level of resource is not sustainable given the imminent growth of research activity. This was an issue made by all stakeholder groups in meetings with the PRG.

This point is also made in section three but it is worth considering in this section also as it covers the management of resources.

### **Commendations**

The PRG commends the following:

- 5.7 The provision of additional resources to support the functions of the newly restructured unit
- 5.8 The extremely supportive and professional office
- 5.9 The efficient use of resources in delivering current levels of activity

### **Recommendations**

The PRG recommends the following:

- 5.10 Plan additional resources for anticipated growth through StAR and HORC and whether such resources should be central or devolved
- 5.11 Plan for 'peaks and troughs' for cycles of activity in demand
- 5.12 Establish and promote a satellite presence in Beaumont Hospital (on a similar model to the Rotunda) to provide services in:
  - Grants applications and budgeting
  - Financial management of projects
  - Clinical research support and administration
  - Technology transfer support and industry liaison
  - Consider the incorporation of clinical trials data / outputs into new IT Research System

## 6 Service Users and Feedback

- 6.1 The PRG met with members of the ORI unit and over 60 people from eight different service user groups. These groups represent the diverse range of research and innovation interests and demands across the RCSI. A common theme, expressed by all service user groups, was the positive level of engagement and support they receive on an ongoing basis from the ORI. These examples included *'responsive'* *'very helpful'*, *'personable and approachable'*, *'totally lost without them'* and *'fantastic support'*.
- 6.2 The support ranges from general support for grant writing to more specialised services such as advice relating to regulatory affairs, finance and commercialisation. The ORI acknowledges it offers a demand-led service, delivered to people through people. The planned growth of research capability through initiatives such as the StAR and HORC programmes will increase demand further. In responding to this challenge the ORI will need to consider how it safeguards the valuable customer-centric brand it has developed over the past number of years whilst proactively responding to existing and emerging needs.
- 6.3 The ORI has conducted three service-user surveys, the latest of which was in March 2014 with a relatively low response rate of 11%. It raises questions of how the ORI could optimise feedback and evidence for quality-improvement including qualitative methodologies (e.g. focus groups and interviews); timing of evaluation to reflect the periodicity and complexity of activity amongst different groups; and determining what feedback is ultimately relevant and actionable.
- 6.4 A number of service user groups e.g. the PI's and Academics, Research Managers and Administration and Early Career Researchers stated that they did not meet regularly with other members of their own group. They confirmed that the PRG process was useful in so far as it enabled them to listen and share knowledge of common problems with each other. The ORI may wish to consider alternative ways of engaging service users e.g., acting as catalysts by establishing *'communities of practice'* for the different service user groups thereby enabling peer-to-peer learning, networking and information sharing. Such networks can further assist the development of a research culture and capability within the RCSI by assimilating and orientating incoming researchers.
- 6.5 The ORI, in conjunction with the HR Department, has developed a Human Resources Strategy for Researchers which sets out a broad agenda for development of research talent. As part of the implementation of this strategy the ORI can consider focused mentoring interventions or a *'buddy'* system particularly for Early Career Researchers that recognises their immediate and longer term career development needs.
- 6.6 In recent times the ORI has expanded and now includes the Innovation Unit. This strengthening of organisational structures and expansion of services has been well received by service users and establishes a strong platform to support the ORI's growth and development. The Innovation Unit has had early successes including policy development, rationalisation of patents, industry engagement and identification of the need for the development of an innovation pipeline. The ORI is itself supported by other departments primarily Finance, Human Resources and Estates and Support Services; it could consider adopting a Lean methodology approach to manage these interfaces to ensure processes and communications are more streamlined and reduce duplication.

- 6.7 The ORI has many examples of good practice engaging stakeholders and service users which can be replicated and celebrated.

### **Commendations**

The PRG commends the following:

- 6.8 The establishment and maintenance of excellent and supportive relationships across all stakeholders groups
- 6.9 The customer-focussed approach to service delivery as evidenced by stakeholder comments such as: *'responsive'*, *'very helpful'*, *'personable and approachable'*, *'totally lost without them'* and *'fantastic support'*
- 6.10 The diverse range of support offered by the ORI from general grant-writing training to highly specialised advice delivered in a timely manner
- 6.11 The Innovation Team who have quickly established themselves in terms of policy development, support, industry engagement and contracts, patenting and technology transfer

### **Recommendations**

The PRG recommends the following:

- 6.12 Consider alternative ways of collecting customer satisfaction metrics reflecting different stakeholder groups at appropriate times
- 6.13 Implement a mentoring and 'buddy' system as part of the HR Strategy for Researchers focusing initially on Early Career Researchers and support talent management initiatives
- 6.14 Establish researched-based communities of practice to support the implementation of the overall RCSI strategic plan
- 6.15 Ensure the safeguarding of the value-added service and customer-focussed ORI brand during the imminent growth phase
- 6.16 Consider a Lean methodology review of the interface and interdependent processes and functions across support units



## 7 Analysis and Recommendations for Improvement

- 7.1 The ORI prepared a SAR which contained much relevant and useful information. The report covered all the required areas set out in the review guidelines. This facilitated constructive discussion during the various meetings in the course of the site visit. The unit's SWOT analysis covers all the main areas of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Gaps and challenges were identified in each section of the SAR with clear recommendations for improvement. The PRG considered all the recommendations made by the unit and our comments appear in the relevant sections of this report.
- 7.2 The recommendations identified by the ORI were substantiated by the various stakeholder groups that the PRG met during the site visit.
- 7.3 Finally, the PRG would like to commend the unit for the forthright manner in which they engaged in the review process. There was clear evidence of self-criticism and self-reflection in the SAR. This is a well-managed unit with a high-performing team. The recommendations made throughout this report are given in this context.
- 7.4 Without exception, every stakeholder group were highly commendable of the services provided by the ORI. Sample commendations include the following:
- 'Fantastic expertise and support'
  - 'ORI staff are very personable and approachable'
  - 'ORI is very valuable and essential to us'
  - 'Collaboration on innovations works very well'
  - 'Industry liaison section very helpful which has resulted in enhanced collaborations with industry'
  - 'A totally different unit to what it was two years ago'

APPENDIX 1: SITE VISIT SCHEDULE

**Evening prior to site visit: Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2015**

Dur. mins	Time	Meeting Theme	Attendees	Venue
30	1700 – 1730	Welcome & Introduction for PRG Director of Quality and members of Senior Management Team		Robert Smith Room
90	1730 – 1900	Private planning meeting for members of the Peer Review Group		Robert Smith Room
	1915 – 2100	Dinner	PRG, Director of Quality Enhancement; Review Lead	

**Day 1: Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> November 2015**

Dur. mins	Time	Meeting Theme	Attendees	Venue
	0830	Review of preparatory work		Robert Smith Room
15	09.00 – 09.15	<b>Meeting with Head of Unit; Associate Director of Research; Head of Innovation</b>		Robert Smith Room
30	09.20 – 09.50	<b>Meeting with Head of Unit</b>		Robert Smith Room
30	09.55 – 10.25	<b>Meeting with Associate Director of Research</b>		Robert Smith Room
30	10.30 – 11.00	<b>Meeting with Head of Innovation</b>		Robert Smith Room
35	11.05 – 11.40	Tea / coffee. Private meeting time for PRG		Robert Smith Room
40	11.45 – 12.25	<b>Meeting with ORI Research Operations, Support and Infrastructures Team (ROSIT)</b>		Robert Smith Room
30	12.30 – 13.00	<b>Meeting with ORI Innovation Team (IT)</b>		Robert Smith Room

65	13.00 – 13.50	Lunch & private meeting time for PRG		Robert Smith Room
45	14.00– 14.45	<b>Review Defined Meeting Group 1: Executive Research Management Team</b>		Robert Smith Room
45	14.55 – 15.40	<b>Review Defined Meeting Group 2: Research Committee Members</b>	See Stakeholder List	Robert Smith Room
25	15.45 – 16.10	Tea/coffee Private meeting time for PRG		Robert Smith Room
45	16.15 – 17.00	<b>Review Defined Meeting Group 3: PIs/Academics</b>	See Stakeholder List	Robert Smith Room
50	17.10 – 18.00	Review of afternoon's meetings.		Robert Smith Room
	19.00 – 21.00	PRG Dinner	PRG	Hotel

## Day 2: **Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> November 2015**

Dur. mins	Time	Meeting Theme	Attendees	Venue
30	08.30 - 09.00	<b>Hold for Video Conference meeting with the CEO and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine &amp; Health Sciences</b>		Presidents Meeting Room
20	09.10 – 09.30	Private Meeting time for PRG		Robert Smith Room
45	09.35 – 10.20	<b>Review Defined Meeting Group 4: Research Management &amp; Administration</b>	See Stakeholder List	Robert Smith Room
45	10.30 – 11.15	<b>Review Defined Meeting Group 5: Early Career Researchers</b>	See Stakeholder List	Robert Smith Room
30	11.15 – 11.45	Tea / coffee. Private meeting time for PRG.		Robert Smith Room
45	11.50 – 12.35	<b>Review Defined Meeting Group 6: Leads of Other Research Services</b>	See Stakeholder List	Robert Smith Room
20	12.40 – 13.00	Tour of Unit Facilities		
95	13.10 – 14.10	Lunch & private meeting time for PRG		Robert Smith Room
40	14.20 – 15.00	<b>Review Defined Meeting Group 7: Stakeholders in research processes and systems development</b>	See Stakeholder List	Robert Smith Room
40	15.10 – 15.50	<b>Review Defined Meeting Group 8: Clinicians</b>	See Stakeholder List	Robert Smith Room

70	15.50 – 17.00	Tea-coffee Private meeting time for PRG members to finalise draft commendations and recommendations		Robert Smith Room
	19.00 – 21.00	PRG Dinner and a chance to discuss key issues	PRG	Hotel

### Day 3: Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2015

Dur. mins	Time	Meeting Theme	Attendees	Venue
30	08.30 – 09.00	<b>Hold for Video Conference meeting with the CEO and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine &amp; Health Sciences</b>		Presidents Meeting Room
180	09.00 – 12.00	Private meeting time for PRG – discussion and finalisation of Commendations and Recommendations for all sections.		Robert Smith Room
	10.30	Tea / coffee.		Robert Smith Room
	09.00 – 12.00	Private meeting time for PRG – discussion and finalisation of Commendations and Recommendations for all sections.		Robert Smith Room
15	12.00 – 12.15	Private meeting with QEO		Robert Smith Room
15	12.15 – 12.30	<b>Briefing meeting with Head of Unit; Associate Director or Research; Head of Innovation &amp; QEO</b>		Robert Smith Room
25	12.35 – 13.00	<b>Exit presentation to all Unit Staff</b>	All ORI Staff	VC Room
60	13.00 – 14.00	Light Lunch and Private meeting with QEO	PRG QEO Staff	Robert Smith Room
	14.00	Review ends.		