

Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement
Internal Quality Review Programme
2010-2016



Quality Improvement Plan
(FINAL)

Faculty of Science & Health

18 July 2013

Contents

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

1 INTRODUCTION

The Faculty of Science and Health (FSH) at DCU is home to approximately 3,500 students and 400 staff spread across six Schools, three National Research Centres and a number of large scale research programmes. It spans a continuum of disciplines from Mathematics to Nursing, and from Psychotherapy to Sports Science. Its research portfolio stretches from fundamental research in quantum gravity to the understanding of the onset and progression of dementia, and has a particular emphasis on translation. Its service activities bring it into significant engagement with both civic and professional societies and enterprises. In these, and all of its teaching, research and service activities, the Faculty seeks to infuse a quality culture. Faculty staff members embrace the University's quality processes and seek to deploy them in the most effective ways possible at individual, School, Centre and Faculty level.

In keeping with the University's Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement process, the Faculty engaged in a substantive self-assessment exercise in 2012, producing a Self-Assessment Report (SAR) for the period 2007-2011, which reviewed and assessed the state of the Faculty with respect to quality in teaching, research and service, and the systems that support these. Following its submission to the Director of Quality Promotion, the SAR formed the basis for a subsequent Peer Review Group (PRG) site visit that took place in November 2012. On foot of that site visit, the PRG in turn submitted its report to the University in December 2012.

The PRG Report was circulated to all members of staff within the Faculty and the Dean established a Quality Improvement Committee (QIC), to draft the Faculty's response to the Report, and the associated Faculty Quality Improvement Plan (QuIP). The Quality Improvement Committee comprised the Dean, the Associate Deans for Research and Teaching and Learning, the Faculty Manager, the Manager of Facilities and Associated Services, the Assistant Faculty Manager, and the Faculty Quality Review Group Chair. In drafting the Faculty Quality Improvement Plan, members of the Quality Improvement Group focused particularly on the findings and recommendation of the PRG, but also considered the findings of the SAR, and the context – institutional, sectoral and national – in which the objectives of the Plan must be progressed.

Consistent with the methodology employed in drafting the SAR, a draft Quality Improvement Plan was circulated to Faculty Quality Review Group (FQRG), Faculty Teaching Committee (FTC) and Faculty Research Committee (FRC) for consideration and feedback. The resultant, final draft Quality Improvement Plan was then referred to Faculty Management Board for approval.

2 RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT

Indication of Priority as assigned by the PRG:

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.

P 3: A recommendation which merits serious consideration but which is not considered to be critical to the quality of the ongoing activities.

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

A: Area under review (Faculty of Science & Health) U: University Senior Management

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
1	P1	A / U	<p>Develop and establish a Faculty wide strategy and process for the succession for the Head of School role including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the process by which a successor is selected clarity on the expectations of an individual in the role the way in which the successor can be kept abreast of current and ongoing issues the provision of adequate time and mentoring support prior to taking up appointment, to allow the new Head to start work in the role quickly and with no loss of impetus, when the previous incumbent steps down 	<p>The issue highlighted is one that is critical, but not exclusive, to the Faculty. Hence it should be addressed in collaboration with the University. Consequently, Faculty Management Board will articulate a Faculty position on the matter before the end of 2013 and will actively input to the university-wide institutional Process Review in this regard. The Dean will work closely with the relevant members of the University Senior Management Group on the establishment of a clear process, which addresses the core elements of this recommendation.</p>	<p>There is a current university process for selection of Heads of Schools and a <i>Job Description</i> that clearly articulates the <i>Role and Responsibilities of a Head of School</i>. These are under review as part of a university-wide Institutional Process Review, examining all such processes and procedures in the University with the aims of enhancement and efficiency. The University is also in the process of developing its detailed strategy for Operational Excellence, which is one of the articulated foundations of the DCU strategy 2012-2017: <i>Transforming Lives and Societies</i>.</p> <p>The University will work closely with the Faculty in this matter in order to commence a clear succession planning process within a year.</p>

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
2	P1	U	<p>Prioritize the establishment of a fit-for-purpose facility for the School of Health and Human Performance, which will allow the School to operate on as few sites as possible. Given the timescale involved in securing capital investment, it is also recommended that an interim contingency plan be drawn up that will improve the situation as much as possible in the short term.</p>	<p>Faculty note: Two recommendations are subsumed under this one heading. In relation to the first recommendation on the establishment of a fit-for-purpose facility for the School of Health and Human Performance, this objective is a core part of the Healthy Citizen 21 initiative in the Educational Trust Campaign for DCU.</p> <p>In relation to the second recommendation, the Faculty will work with the University on an interim contingency plan during the academic year 2013-14.</p>	<p>Currently, there is no capital funding for the development of the type of facility recommended and DCU does not foresee any government funding for capital projects in the near future. It is hoped that the DCU Educational Trust fund-raising campaign may be successful under the Healthy Citizen 21 initiative but such success would only address some of the facility issues referred to here.</p> <p>The University will work closely with the Faculty in attempting to meet some of the requirements in the short-term through space management and other mechanisms. In the medium—longterm the new campus Development Plan will incorporate plans for the provision of facilities for the School of Health and Human Performance during the academic year 2013/2014.</p>

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
3	P1	A	<p>Establish a time limited working group involving the Sports Centre Management, the School of Health and Human performance and other relevant functions. Include in the aims of the group the development of an agreed approach on the use of the sports facilities, which both balances the Sports Centre's need for financial support from external users, as well as the needs of the School of Health and Human Performance with respect to teaching and learning. It is also recommended that facility usage is agreed at the beginning of the academic year with those involved.</p>	<p>A Service Level Agreement (SLA) detailing the services and facilities that DCU Sport provides to the School of Health and Human Performance, how communication is carried out between the two parties and how the School is provided with the services and utilities it requires has been in place since October 2012.</p> <p>Since the PRG site visit, and following on from discussions between the Head of the School of Health and Human Performance and the Manager of the Sports Centre, that SLA has been further revised to address particular issues of concern for the School that were raised with the PRG, namely provision for ad hoc or occasional access to the Centre for the purpose of conducting research (particularly in relation to fourth year student projects, and postgraduate research), and extended class delivery or rescheduling.</p> <p>The School has indicated that the revised SLA addresses the issues raised with the PRG. Operation of the SLA will be monitored, and any deviation from it recorded by the School on an on-going basis. Any issues arising in this regard that cannot be resolved between the School and the Centre will be escalated to the Dean, as appropriate. Operation of the revised SLA will be subject to review before the end of the academic year 2013-14.</p>	

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
4	P1	A / U	Develop and implement a space reallocation strategy to allow the Faculty to prioritise the needs of strategic growth areas in its teaching portfolio and to ensure parity in the quality of the learning experience. It is also recommended that the strategy is periodically reviewed as part of the annual planning process.	The Faculty, working with the Chief Operations Officer (COO) and the DCU Space Management Group, will develop a Faculty space allocation/reallocation policy that is consistent with University policy in this regard during the academic year 2013-14.	<p>The University, through the COO and the Space Management Group, will work closely with the Faculty in attempting to assess its space requirements and devise and implement a space allocation strategy during 2013/2014.</p> <p>It is worth noting that, with space at a premium within the University, allocation and re-allocation is always a current concern. Within the new Campus Development Plan, it is envisaged that additional teaching space will be developed to address short-term space pressures across the university.</p>

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
5	P1	U	<p>Address the shortcomings of the current ITS system as a matter of urgency in the short term and as a priority within the longer-term digital campus / flexible learning strategy for the University. The quality of the ITS System represents a significant risk to the reputation of the University particularly in the context of the management of examination results.</p>	<p>Faculty note: The Faculty, together with relevant University officers, will assess the feasibility of effecting Faculty-specific improvements to the Student Database (ITS) System during the academic year 2013-14.</p>	<p>Developments at University level since the PRG site visit have seen the approval by the University's Executive of a project to develop and implement an additional <i>Calculate</i> programme on the ITS system which will facilitate the calculation of students' final marks on continuous and part time programmes. This project was led by the Registry, with substantial input from Faculty administrative and ISS staff.</p> <p>The University recognizes the need to invest significantly in its IT infrastructure. Planning for this work has already commenced through a tender for a Strategic Dialogue Partner and the establishment of an IS Governance Committee. The needs of all Faculties will form a significant part of this review/upgrade.</p> <p>A full review of the current student records system will be completed over the summer of 2013 with a view to determining whether a new Student Records System will be included in the IT investment Programme. The needs of all Faculties will be fully recognised in this process and Faculty management will be invited to participate in the relevant discussions. Additions to the existing systems are, as noted, in train.</p>

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
6	P1	A	<p>Develop and establish more effective communication processes to ensure the smooth flow of information between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All administrative functions (internal and external to the Faculty) • The full gamut of postgraduate / postdoctoral communities across Schools • Senior management and Faculty staff regarding university policy 	<p>A number of steps will be taken to improve communication within the Faculty, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Faculty Committee structures will be reviewed during the academic year 2013-14 in order to ensure their continued fitness for purpose and their efficacy as a conduit for both input to and the communication of decision making, as well as establishing mechanisms to better enable representatives on committees to routinely provide feedback and updates to colleagues. -The Faculty intranet will be employed more routinely and effectively as a means of disseminating information to colleagues, employing process flow diagrams and graphics, where feasible, rather than text only - A regular cycle of Faculty meetings will be established which all members of Faculty will be invited to attend -Mechanisms to improve the communication of information to and within the Faculty's postgraduate research and postdoctoral communities will be explored in conjunction with Schools and Centres. <p>In addition, the Faculty will continue to work with DCU senior officers, committees and central units to enhance the communication to and from Faculty communities, contributing, as appropriate, to the internal communications strategy that is to be developed. As such, and in reference to communications channels that are not within the Faculty's control, it is proposed that responsibility for this implementation aspect would be shared between the Faculty and the University.</p>	<p>University note: The University is continuously endeavouring to improve communications both internally and externally and welcomes the Faculty's plans. It will provide any possible assistance (technological, training, advice etc.) and will cooperate with Faculty management and staff.</p>

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
7	P1	A	Faculty Teaching Committee: Co-ordinate the development of innovation in teaching and learning within the Faculty, and engage and communicate with relevant staff.	The Faculty Teaching Committee (FTC) will continue to liaise with the University's Learning Innovation Unit and relevant stakeholders within the Faculty to disseminate good practice and to support teaching and learning innovations within Schools. The FTC will revise the Faculty Teaching and Learning Strategy to ensure it supports and underpins the recently launched DCU Strategic Plan and the forthcoming DCU Teaching and Learning Strategy. As with all other Faculty Committees (see recommendation number 6 above) the operation and remit of the Faculty Teaching Committee will be subject to review during the academic year 2013-14.	
8	P1	A	Embed an effective teaching evaluation mechanism, critical for quality improvement, into the operation and culture of the Faculty. It is further recommended that teaching evaluation within the Faculty be established in the context of University wide activity in this area, and that the Faculty Management Board, along with the Faculty Committee for Teaching and Learning, take an active role in developing and monitoring the effectiveness of this mechanism.	The Faculty will continue to work with the University to embed, implement and act on outcomes from the University's teaching evaluation mechanism at a module level, QuEST (Quality Enhancement and Survey of Teaching).	<p>University note: The University is committed to ensuring that the main QuEST outcomes from all Faculties are monitored and acted upon. QuEST, the recently introduced Periodic Programme Review Policy (PPR) for all academic programmes and other related policies are the basis of assuring the quality of teaching in DCU.</p> <p>A new DCU Teaching and Learning strategy is currently in development which will help to further advance the work being undertaken on teaching quality evaluation. DCU will continue to work with all faculties to assist them in meeting the requirements of all quality assurance mechanisms in this area.</p>

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
9	P1	A	Establish Enterprise advisory boards (or equivalent) to elicit input into programme development as well as refresh and strengthen the Faculty's engagement with industry. DCU has the track record and the potential to develop best practice in industry interaction across a wide range of areas including research, programme design, skills requirements and INTRA.	The Dean will work with the Heads of School and Centre Directors to establish Enterprise or Industrial (as appropriate) Advisory Panels including representatives from relevant professions during the academic year 2013-14 , in order to elicit input into programme development as well as refresh and strengthen the Faculty's engagement with industry.	University note: Two years ago the DCU re-established its Enterprise Advisory Board and has already benefitted greatly from its input. Some other faculties have followed this lead and therefore the University welcomes the Faculty's plans.
10	P1	A	Establish a knowledge retention strategy to ensure that highly specialised knowledge developed by researchers is retained within the Faculty and more generally within DCU when they leave.	The Faculty will work with HR to explore inclusion in post descriptors for research positions (research engineers, post-doctorate researchers) a requirement for knowledge transfer by means of training colleagues and technical officers, maintaining application notes and standard operating procedures.	University Note: The University has a Research Career Framework that is currently operational in one faculty. HR has arranged with the Faculty of Science and Health briefing sessions to update senior faculty members on the framework and discuss approaches to its implementation into the faculty. The first of these briefing sessions is scheduled to take place on 28th June. Also, the Training & Development Manager will work with senior technical staff to assist in the introduction of <i>best practice</i> in relation to knowledge transfer and the establishment of Standard Operating Procedures (S.O.P).

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
11	P2	A	Develop a plan to ensure the embedding of career planning and development mechanisms, including PMDS, at all levels. It is further recommended that the Faculty Management Board monitors participation of activity in this area across the Faculty on an annual basis.	The issue highlighted is one that is not exclusive to the Faculty. Hence it should be addressed in collaboration with the University. The Dean will work with relevant members of University Senior Management Group on a plan for the rollout of PMDS throughout the Faculty. Progress at Faculty level will be reported periodically to Faculty Management Board as recommended. The Researcher Career Framework, developed by DCU Human Resources will be rolled out during 2013/2014.	University note: As the Faculty has noted, it will be included in the review and implementation of a revised performance scheme, which is currently underway. The revised scheme will address issues of career and professional development. Also, as part of the Research Career Framework, researchers will be part of a performance management process.
12	P2	A	Undertake a review of the current workload allocation processes across the Faculty and follow this by a proposal from the Faculty Management Board on common workload principles to be implemented by the Schools. This recommendation is being made as it is important that the Dean has oversight of clear and transparent workload allocation strategies within and across Schools.	The issue highlighted is one that is critical, but not exclusive, to the Faculty. It is also related to recommendation 11 above on PMDS. Hence it should be addressed in collaboration with the University. The workload allocation models currently in operation in each School will be reviewed periodically. The Faculty developed a principles based workload allocation framework in 2004. In the period since the PRG site visit, this Framework has been reviewed and revised by Faculty Management Board. The revised Faculty Framework continues to recognise the individual needs of each School while maintaining consistency with University Principles for Academic Workload Allocation. In addition, the workload allocation models in operation in each School will be subject to on-going periodic review by the Dean and Heads of School.	University note: The University welcomes the Faculty's plans and its contribution to further development of the University's position on workload allocation models and processes, building on University's current Principles for academic workload allocation. The current Government's strategy for reform of Higher Education in Ireland speaks to the need for transparency on this issue.

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
13	P2	U / A	<p>Routinely review Faculty-level administrative processes, including those that involve interfacing externally, to ensure they continue to be fit for purpose. Also develop and establish a regular review process involving relevant staff, with a focus on bringing forward innovative approaches to administrative tasks with the intention of saving time and resources.</p>	<p>The Faculty will proactively engage with and, where appropriate, lobby for the continuing refinement and enhancement of processes. This recommendation makes reference specifically to processes that include interfacing externally, which, in the context of the Faculty review, is understood to mean University-wide processes. Certainly, references were made both in the SAR and during the course of the site visit to the processes associated with PGR forms and staff requests. It is understood that the University's Chief Operations Officer is to initiate a review of large scale University processes with a view to streamlining and greater efficiency. The Faculty will work with relevant stakeholders to contribute to this review as appropriate.</p> <p>The review of Faculty administrative processes to ensure that they continue to be fit for purpose has been and will continue to be integral to the operation of the Faculty administration team. As well as solicitation of informal feedback on completion of large scale processes and the conduct of periodic large scale reviews, the team has committed to the development of formal mechanisms for the solicitation of annual stakeholder feedback. Improvements to the Student Database (ITS) System referred to in Rec. 5 above will produce efficiencies and will enhance the quality of the examinations process. In addition, the team will also assess the feasibility of conducting a fundamental review of the allocations process during 2013-14 to improve efficiency.</p>	<p>As part of wider strategic initiatives, including the Operational Excellence pillar of the university Strategic Plan, a review of internal processes and systems will be carried out to identify opportunities for the streamlining of administration systems and processes.</p>

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
14	P2	A	<p>Arrange for a small budget to be annually retained by the Dean during the process of allocating resources across the Faculty, to fund initiatives in support of the implementation of the University's Strategic Plan, particularly those which focus on improving the quality of the student experience.</p>	<p>The current provision for the support of strategic initiatives will be reviewed by the Dean in the context of the Faculty's budget allocation for 2013-14, when confirmed.</p>	
15	P2	A	<p>Encourage the development of, and strengthen where possible, active discipline relevant societies to facilitate and support the interaction of undergraduates, postgraduates and staff in an informal learning environment.</p>	<p>The Faculty will discuss with Schools possible mechanisms by which the emergence and sustainability of cross-disciplinary as well as discipline-relevant societies might be encouraged.</p>	

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
16	P2	A	<p>Faculty Research Committee: Co-ordinate the identification of a set of external, preferably external to Ireland, institutions/centres/schools against which the individual parts of the Faculty research community might be benchmarked.</p>	<p>The Associate Dean for Research will, within the current calendar year (2013), raise this issue at FRC and agree a suitable process by which each School and Centre will be made aware of the recommendation and the necessity to identify a suitable set of comparator institutions/centres/schools/departments (or groupings of same) for their unit, and the desirability to have this in place for future reviews of units in the Faculty.</p> <p>The Research and Innovation Support Office will then be asked by FRC to liaise with each of the Schools/Centres to advise on availability (and ease of access, usage and content extraction/manipulation) of reports/databases of other institutions' institutional and unit research performance metrics relevant to the various DCU units. The Research and Innovation Support Office will also be asked to inform units of DCU of institutional views and plans on the matter, to enable Schools/Centres to make best use of DCU efforts in terms of similar benchmarking exercises.</p> <p>Following this, by mid-2014, each School and Centre will be asked to report back to FRC on the comparator institutions/ centres/ schools/ departments (or groupings of same) decided upon by that unit, with a brief overview of the rationale behind same, and the main metrics against which comparisons will be made. It is intended that the process will be completed and the comparator entities and main metrics for each School and Centre will be in place by the end of 2014.</p>	<p>University Note: The University is committed to working with the Faculty on this recommendation within the context of the DCU research strategy currently in development.</p>

No	P1, P2, P3	U, A	Recommendation	Faculty Response	University Response
17	P2	A	Conduct an audit of Health & Safety standards across all Schools and Research Centres, and ensure consistency in the implementation of common policies and procedures.	The Faculty will continue to review and audit Health and Safety standards through the Faculty Health and Safety Committee and the Biological Safety Committee. It will also continue to work with the University Safety Officer to implement new policies and recommendations from regulatory authorities (HSA, EPA, IMB1). School and Centre safety statements are and will continue to be updated annually to reflect implementation of consistent and appropriate procedures across the Faculty. For example, a new risk assessment for chemical agents (hazardous substances assessment form) was implemented throughout the Faculty on the recommendation of the HSA following an inspection. The Faculty will continue to provide a Health and Safety training module "Safelab" for all Faculty staff and researchers. In addition, the carrying out of periodic 'spot checks' will be initiated in 2013-14.	University Note: Compliance with internal and external Health and Safety standards is an important aspect of University policies. The university will assist the Faculty where needed to address this recommendation.

¹ Health and Safety Authority (HSA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Irish Medicines Board (IMB)

3 SUMMARY ONE-YEAR PLAN

Within the year the Faculty of Science and Health will:

- Work closely with the relevant members of the University Senior Management Group on the establishment of a clear process with respect to succession for the Head of School role including:
 - the process by which a successor is identified
 - clarity on the expectations of an individual in the role
 - the provision of mentoring prior to taking up appointment and appropriate mechanisms for handover
- Continue to work with the University to ensure, in so far as possible, that the medium-term space needs of the School of Health and Human Performance can be met, developing a contingency plan for the School in conjunction with relevant University officers during 2013-14
- Work with the Chief Operations Officer and the DCU Space Management Group to develop a Faculty space allocation/re-allocation policy that is consistent with University policy in this regard
- Provide Faculty administrative representation on to the University working group that has been charged with the development and implementation of improvements to the Student Database (ITS) System that will facilitate the calculation of students' final marks on continuous and part-time programmes; the timeline for completion of the project is June 2013
- Review Faculty Committee structures in order to ensure their continued fitness for purpose and their efficacy as a conduit for both input to and the communication of decision making, as well as establishing mechanisms to better enable representatives on committees to routinely provide feedback and updates to colleagues, the review to be completed during 2013-14 and resultant changes to structures to be implemented in 2014-15
- Establish a regular cycle of Faculty meetings which all members of Faculty will be invited to attend
- Implement and embed the University-approved **Quality Enhancement and Survey of Teaching (QuEST)** in line with University requirements and timelines in this regard
- Continue to liaise with the Learning Innovation Unit and relevant stakeholders within the Faculty to work to disseminate good practice and to support teaching and learning innovations within Schools
- Revise the Faculty Teaching and Learning Strategy to ensure it supports and underpins the recently launched DCU Strategic Plan and the forthcoming DCU Teaching and Learning Strategy
- Implement PMDS throughout the Faculty in line with University requirements and timelines in this regard
- Implement the Researcher Career Framework, developed by DCU Human Resources, within the Faculty

- Develop formal mechanisms for the solicitation of stakeholder feedback in relation to Faculty administrative processes on an annual basis
- Investigate the feasibility of conducting a fundamental review of the allocations process with a view to achieving greater efficiencies
- Establish an Enterprise or Industrial (as appropriate) Advisory Panel including members from professions including Nursing, Health and Human performance and others, to elicit input into, *inter alia*, Faculty strategic planning, periodic programme reviews, programme development and horizon scanning
- Agree a suitable process by which each School and Centre will identify a suitable set of comparator institutions/centres/schools/departments (or groupings of same) for their unit, and the desirability to have this in place for future reviews of units in the Faculty, and thereafter liaise with the Research and Innovation Support Office regarding the availability (and ease of access, usage and content extraction/manipulation) of reports/databases of other institutions' institutional and unit research performance metrics of relevance to them, and regarding DCU institutional views and plans on the matter so that Schools and Centres can make best use of DCU efforts in terms of similar benchmarking exercises
- School and Centre safety statements will continue to be updated annually to reflect implementation of consistent and appropriate procedures across the Faculty. The carrying out of periodic spot checks will be initiated in 2013-14

4 SUMMARY THREE-YEAR PLAN

Within the coming three year period the Faculty of Science and Health will:

- Continue to work with University Senior Management towards the establishment of a fit-for-purpose facility for the School of Health and Human Performance, as part of the Healthy Citizen 21 initiative within the Educational Trust Campaign for DCU
- Contribute to any review of University systems (including ITS) that is undertaken by the University's IS Governance Committee, working with relevant stakeholders to ensure the University's (and Faculty's) strategic objectives can be supported by integrated, fit-for purpose systems, including a suitable student records system
- Explore mechanisms to improve the communication of information to and within the Faculty's postgraduate research and postdoctoral communities in conjunction with Schools and Centres
- Work with HR to explore inclusion in post descriptors for research positions (research engineers, post-doctorate researchers) a requirement for knowledge transfer by means of training colleagues and technical officers, maintaining application notes and standard operating procedures
- Contribute to the review of large scale University processes that is to be initiated under the auspices of the University's Chief Operations Officer with a view to streamlining and greater efficiency
- In conjunction with Schools within the Faculty, explore possible mechanisms by which the emergence and sustainability of inter-disciplinary and discipline-relevant Student Societies might be encouraged
- Solicit detailed input and recommendations from each School and Centre on the comparator institutions/ centres /schools/ departments (or groupings of same) decided upon by them (following both internal consultation and consultation with the Research and Innovation Support Office), and the main metrics against which comparisons can be made, with a view to having comparator entities and main metrics for each FSH School and Centre in place by the end of 2014

5 APPENDICES

I FACULTY QUALITY REVIEW GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Members of Faculty of Science & Health Quality Review Group	
Sandra O'Neill	Chair of FQRG
Bernadette Dowling	Assistant Faculty Manager
Enda McGlynn	Associate Dean for Research
Sheelagh Wickham	Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning
Conor Long	School of Chemical Sciences
Jean-Paul Mosnier	School of Physical Sciences
Bernard Keville	National Centre for Plasma Science Technology
Anne Marie Larkin	National Institute for Cellular Biotechnology
Padraig Doolan	National Institute for Cellular Biotechnology
Denise Proudfoot	School of Nursing and Human Sciences
Davide Susta	School of Health and Human Performance
Declan Moran	National Centre for Sensor Research
Deirdre Donnelly	School Secretarial Staff Representative
Ciaran McKenna	FQRG Administrative Support
Michael Burke	Facilities and Associated Services Manager
Phil Cummins	School of Biotechnology
Sarah Flanagan	Student Representative
Gary O'Donoghue	Student Representative
Turlough Downes	School of Mathematical Sciences
Veronica Dobbyn	School Technical Staff Representative

II PEER REVIEW GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Professor Kieran Hodnett, Dean, Faculty of Science & Engineering, University of Limerick (Chair)

Professor Valerie Maehle, Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Care, Robert Gordon University, Scotland

Dr Martin Lyes, (former) Divisional Manager, Research & Innovation, Enterprise Ireland

Professor Noel O'Connor, School of Electronic Engineering, Principal Investigator, CLARITY, DCU

Dr Claire Bohan, Director, Student Support & Development, DCU (Rapporteur)

III AREA QUALITY IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE

Professor John Costello, Dean, Faculty of Science and Health, DCU (Chair)

Mr Michael Burke, Facilities & Associated Services Manager, Faculty of Science and Health, DCU

Ms Bernadette Dowling, Assistant Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science and Health, DCU

Dr Enda McGlynn, Associate Dean for Research, Faculty of Science and Health, DCU

Ms Pauline Mooney, Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science and Health, DCU

Dr Sandra O'Neill, Chair, Faculty Quality Review Group, Faculty of Science and Health, DCU

Ms Emma Theron, Faculty Administrator, Faculty of Science and Health, DCU (Secretary)

Dr Sheelagh Wickham, Associate Dean for Teaching & Learning, Faculty of Science and Health, DCU

IV PRIORITISED RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

The Faculty seeks funding in respect of the following projects summarised in the table below:

Project	Project outline	Reference to Peer Review Group Report	Amount requested
A	Painting and decoration of corridors and entrance in the School of Health and Human Performance (Science Building).	Recommendation No. 2	€11,000
B	To develop and implement a BSc in Nursing <i>calculate</i> programme, which is not accommodated within the additional <i>calculate</i> programme that is being progressed at University level.	Recommendation No. 5	€10,000
C	Web based system for "Out-of-Hours Access" documentation.	Recommendation No. 17	€4,000
		Total Funding Requested	€25,000