

Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement  
Internal Quality Review Programme  
2020



Quality Improvement Plan  
(**DRAFT**)

**ADD**

*Insert date here*

## **Contents**

1. Introduction
2. Responses To Recommendations in the Peer Review Group Report
3. Summary of One-Year Plan
4. Summary of Three-Year Plan
  
5. Appendices
  - 5.1. Quality Committee (for the Self-Assessment Report)
  - 5.2. Peer Review Group members
  - 5.3. Quality Committee (for the Quality Improvement Plan)
  - 5.4. Prioritised Resource Requirements

*This document presents the format of the Area Quality Improvement Plan. Text in blue should be replaced by the corresponding Area response in black.*

## 1 Introduction

Please provide a brief introduction to the approach taken in the development of the Quality Improvement Plan (1-2 paragraphs).

## 2 Responses to the Recommendations in the Peer Review Group Report

(Use table on next page for response)

The Area must make a brief response to ALL the recommendations in the Report. The Area (and the University) are required, under the Universities Act (1997) and the QQAI Act (2012) to implement the recommendations of the Report, unless they are unreasonable or impractical.

Please outline the Area's response to the recommendations in the PRG Report using the table on the following page. It would be helpful to identify any areas where similar recommendations arose from both the Self-Assessment Report and the Peer Review Group Report.

Within the table the Area should also provide the status of any actions arising out of the recommendations indicating one of the following:

- Recommendations that have already been implemented
- Recommendation that will be implemented within 1 year (these should then be included as part of the one-year plan).
- Recommendations that will be implemented within 3 years (these should then be included as part of the three-year plan)
- Recommendations that may not be implemented as they can be demonstrated to be unreasonable or impractical.

The following notation is used in the recommendations for improvement.

**P1:** A recommendation that is important *and* requires urgent action.

**P2:** A recommendation that is important, but can (or perhaps must) be addressed on a more extended time scale.

**P3:** A recommendation which merits serious consideration but which is not considered to be critical to the quality of the ongoing activities in the Area.

Additionally, the PRG indicate the level(s) of the University where action is required: A: Area under review U: University Senior Management

Recommendation Number	Priority	Adresse	PRG Recommendation	add Response	University Response
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					

### 3 Summary of the One Year Plan

The one-year plan should contain actions and timelines in response to PRG findings and recommendations. It should also assign responsibility for the actions to named persons, or roles, or parts of the organisation.

### 4 Summary of the Three Year Plan

The three-year plan should contain actions and timelines in response to PRG findings and recommendations. It should also assign responsibility for the actions to named persons, or roles, or parts of the organisation.

## 5 Appendices

### 5.1 Quality Committee (for the Self-Assessment Report)

### 5.2 Peer Review Group members

(ADD)

### 5.3 Quality Committee (for the Quality Improvement Plan)

(ADD)

## 5.4 Prioritised Resource Requirements

See document- “DCU- Quality Improvement Planning Prioritised Resource Proposals” to complete this section

**Guidelines for Prioritised Resource Requirements:** *Prioritised resource requirements are funded through the University’s Quality Improvement Fund which is administered by the Quality Promotion Committee (QPC). The Quality Improvement Fund is limited, therefore funding proposals should be confined to once-off, short term projects. Proposals that contain large capital expenditure (e.g. new buildings) or long term commitments (e.g. staffing) go through the University’s Budget Committee.*

*Areas can propose more than one project as long as the above criteria are fulfilled for*

Title of project	
Reference to Peer Review Group Report	
Aim of project	
High Level Summary of Activities/ Milestones	
Expected impact on quality improvement in Area and University	
Amount requested and financial summary	

Title of project	
Reference to Peer Review Group Report	
Aim of project	
High Level Summary of Activities/ Milestones	
Expected impact on quality improvement in Area and University	
Amount requested and financial summary	

Title of project	
Reference to Peer Review Group Report	
Aim of project	
High Level Summary of Activities/ Milestones	
Expected impact on quality improvement in Area and University	
Amount requested and financial summary	