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1. INTRODUCTION

Give a very brief introduction to the approach taken in the development of the Quality Improvement Plan

- The Peer Review Group Report (PRGR) was circulated to all School Staff.
- Quality Committee met to following receipt of PRGR.
- Recommendations were considered under three headings, i.e.
  - School Recommendations,
  - School/Faculty Recommendations,
  - School/Faculty/University Recommendations.

The Peer Review Group Report was received in May 2005. Once received it was circulated by e-mail to all staff members. The Report was put on the agenda for the staff meeting on May 22nd and presented there. Staff were asked for comments and suggestions for the Quality Implementation Plan. The School of Nursing, Quality Committee met to discuss and using the Quality Promotion Unit template started to draw up a School Quality Improvement Plan. Various committees within the School of Nursing were asked to respond to individual recommendations in the Peer Review Group Report e.g. School Research Committee. The initial draft Quality Improvement Plan was circulated to the School Quality Committee and Head of School for comment. The Quality Improvement Plan was again circulated to the staff for comment and suggestion in September. Some responses require capital outlay but some can and will be activated by the School through reorganisation and developments.

The Quality Improvement Plan was discussed at a follow-on meeting with the following participants:

- Dr Heinz Lechleiter representing the Quality Promotion Unit
- Prof Anne Scott, Head of School
  Dr Sandra O’Neill, Chair of School Quality Committee
- Prof Malcolm Smyth, Dean of Faculty
- Prof Albert Pratt Representing Senior Management
- Prof Joe Morris (Peer Group, Senior DCU Academic)
  Mr Gerry O’Donnell (Peer Group, Rapporteur)
## 2. RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE PEER REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### Recommendations for and *Responses to* Quality Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Response</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1-S</strong> The School should implement a new committee structure for the organisation, management and development of the School as soon as possible. Staff should be involved in the design of the new structure and the structures developed should maximise the involvement of staff in making and developing policy.</td>
<td>The number of committees on the BNS, BSc and the Postgraduate programmes should be discussed at individual programme team level, and to see how many committees there are with the involvement of Partner Services. It was suggested, if possible, that numbers of committee members be reduced to improve efficiency and ensure tasks are completed in a more-timely manner. Each committee will have to review its Terms of References before making</td>
<td>It was agreed that the amount of committees on the BNS, BSc and the Postgraduate programmes should be discussed at individual programme team level. Each committee will review its Terms of References with a view to rationalisation and improved efficiency. The management structure review will also contribute to the outcome. <strong>NB.</strong> The involvement of Partner Services in committees is of benefit to all concerned and care must be taken to ensure</td>
<td>A reduction in the number of committees by 30% within one year.</td>
<td>The university strongly supports the actions taken by the School.</td>
<td>Management consultant employed to facilitate staff in the evolution of new School structures</td>
<td>Cost € 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Management Response</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1-S</strong> The School should review the assignment of the administrative responsibilities of existing staff in the light of the imminent academic appointments and the recommendation that senior administrative staff be assigned to the School.</td>
<td>This item to be addressed by School of Nursing Management. A meeting with Senior Faculty Administrative staff, School Management and the Dean should review the current structure and a response generated from there. The issue identified by the PRG related to the number of administrative staff not reporting directly to the Head of School.</td>
<td>Faculty Administration has recently completed an extensive review culminating in a report with 86 recommendations. An integrated School/Faculty Administration will be piloted for a year. To ensure full cognisance is taken of School of Nursing issues, the Senior Faculty Administrator shall have a monthly meeting with the Head of School/Asst. Head of School. Senior Faculty Administration staff will also have direct input to the SoN Senior Management Team attending meetings as required.</td>
<td>Senior Faculty Administration representation at School of Nursing Management meetings.</td>
<td>The issue is under consideration and will be addressed in co-operation with the School and the Faculty.</td>
<td>Cost-n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.8</strong> School should continue to prioritise its relationships with the service partners and the good working relationship be deepened at all levels between the School and</td>
<td>The Quality Committee believes the School of Nursing has a good relationship with Partner Services and this is complemented within the PRG Report. The School</td>
<td>Document all current and planned involvement between School and Partner Services at all levels. A directory of Partner Services and an annual publication/report</td>
<td>Annual publication documenting the involvement of Partner Health Services with the School of Nursing. The publication would be circulated among the</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Initial cost of developing template and ongoing staff costs. If published on the web, cost could be considerable reduced. Minimum cost € 1,500 to establish with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Management Response</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the partners.</td>
<td>already has numerous Committees with the involvement of Partner Services. Service Level Agreement (SLA) agreements are another link between the School and Partner Services. The commissioning of the Healthy Living Centre will involve the SoN links with the partner services and external bodies. Other examples of involvement include the Clinical Link Role, Seminars, etc. The Committee felt that the PRG did not probe into the day-to-day links with the Partner Services i.e. CPC’s, NPDC’s, Preceptorship etc and this needs to be highlighted more. It needs to be identified, on each programme, where the involvement of Partner Services comes in regarding clinical links, research etc.</td>
<td>involving input of the Partner Services to highlight/publicise the joint working between the School and Partner Services. The publication would be available to the SoN, staff, and all staff in the Partner Services. A template would need to be drawn up and clear lines of responsibility for both content and cost established.</td>
<td>School of Nursing, Faculty and wider University and the Partner Services. T/F -5 years</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ongoing updating costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programmes and Instruction**

<p>| P1-S. The School should simplify the system of documenting student | While not clearly identified within the report, It was felt at the PRG oral review that | A B.Sc Committee has been established and the process of review of | Completed review and implement findings. T/F 1 year | n/a | Cost n/a |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Management Response</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>competence.</td>
<td>this item was specific to the BSc programme.</td>
<td>student documentation has commenced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1-S.</strong> The School needs to operationalise the link lecturer role urgently.</td>
<td>The Clinical Link Role has evolved and grown from the early days of the BSc.</td>
<td>Operationalise the Clinical Link Role for all nurse lecturers.</td>
<td>25 Service Level Agreements with Partner Health Services active</td>
<td>Travel expenses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2-S.</strong> The School should review the timing and volume of student assessments with the aim that assessments are phased and equitable throughout the programme.</td>
<td>There are now 3 Exams Officers in place who will oversee the timing and volume of student assessments with the aim that assessments are phased and equitable. The exams officers will liaise with the relevant staff to ensure this happens.</td>
<td>Course Exam Officers in place who will oversee the timing and volume of student assessments.</td>
<td>Demonstrate the phased and equitable nature of student assessments.</td>
<td>It is noted with approval that the rationalisation process is under way.</td>
<td>Cost n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2-SF.</strong> The School/Faculty should develop a mechanism for dealing with students’ issues in a timely way.</td>
<td>It was unclear if the recommendation referred to undergraduate, post-graduate or all students. Also “timely” is a vague term. There is a clear mechanism for dealing with students in the BSc programme with the modular route, personal tutors, staff-student liaison meetings, CPC representation at meetings etc. This is considered an important issue within the School and an area which improvements are always needed.</td>
<td>Year and branch co-ordinators are in place to identify and continue to document the pathways for dealing with student issues so that it is clearly visible to all, e.g. student handbooks, web etc.</td>
<td>Clear evidence of mechanism for dealing with student issues. This is now available in students handbooks, allocation handbooks and also on the web.</td>
<td>The university commends the School for putting the co-ordinators in place.</td>
<td>Cost n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Management Response</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2-S. The School should ensure that students receive appropriate preparation prior to the first clinical placement to enable them to participate in direct care during that placement.</td>
<td>being sought. Similarly the BNS and Post Graduate Framework students also have the opportunity to meet with staff at staff/student liaison meetings, programme boards etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This issue was discussed at length at the BSc Management team meeting on foot of the Quality review and An Bord Altranais Report. The aim of the aims and objectives of the module is to orientate the student to the clinical setting. It was felt that this educationally sound and very important. students should not be practicing nursing at this early stage of their studies. It was however felt that the length of the orientation placement could be again reviewed with a view to making it shorter once the aim of the placement is not comprised.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scholarship and Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Management Response</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2-S. The School should encourage staff to present</td>
<td>Through the School Research Committee, the</td>
<td>The plan is to build on this solid foundation and</td>
<td>The DCU Research Support System is an</td>
<td>The university sees the PG recommendation as a</td>
<td>Funding to allow staff to present at international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Management Response</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research work in international fora and journals.</td>
<td>SoN has a transparent and equitable funding structure in place to support the attendance by staff at international conferences and workshops. Staff intending to undertake research travel are requested to complete a funding request form and to submit it for review to the School Research Committee. This scheme has been in place since September 2004 and to date (July 2005) has awarded travel funding to the value of €11,718 across 21 members of staff. A number of staff have also been supported through successful applications to the bi-annual DCU Research Advisory Panel travel scheme. In the most recent DCU RAP call, one member of staff received funding to the value of €4,500 to attend the 27th Triennial Congress of the International Confederation of Midwives Congress in July 2005 in Brisbane, Australia.</td>
<td>continue to encourage and support staff in presenting their research work at international fora. In particular, a member of staff with a remit for Staff Development (Dr. Dónal O’Mathuna) has been identified to guide and facilitate the completion of applications for travel funding for members of staff early in their research career. Part of the role of the Staff Development person is to encourage and assist staff early in their research career in preparing manuscripts for publication in peer reviewed international journals. Consequently, seven members of staff have received direct support in the preparation of their first publication. Concomitantly, research active staff have continued to publish in international peer reviewed journals.</td>
<td>excellent way of collating information on conferences attended and publications. The staff development officer, Dr. Donal O’Mathuna will continue to play an important role in facilitating staff to maintain and update their Research Support System (Genius) profiles. The Research Support System is also linked in with Expertise Ireland, which is a gateway to Ireland’s knowledge base. Research outputs from the School of Nursing for 2004: 12 peer-reviewed journal articles 1 book 3 reports 6 chapters in books 7 non-peer-reviewed journal articles</td>
<td>positive reflection on the ongoing actions taken by the School on this issue.</td>
<td>conferences, average cost €800 per person per international conference. 58 academic staff equals € 46,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## School of Nursing Quality Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Management Response</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2-S.</strong> The School should further encourage attendance at international conferences and summer schools for staff who are developing their research.</td>
<td>This is already in place with the School Research Committee and Dr Donal O’Mathuna. Professor George Casteldine (details) will visit the School for two weeks in September to meet with staff and run workshops. Professor Chris Stevenson is also joining the staff at the end of May. Professor Rosemary Crow (details) also visits the School to meet with staff and run workshops two times per year.</td>
<td>Monitor the attendance at international conferences and summer schools for staff who are developing their research. (Provide lists to date)</td>
<td>Increasing attendance at international conferences and summer schools for staff who are developing their research. Two staff members attended European Academy of Nursing Sciences Summer School in Manchester this year. There were 47 conference presentations by School of Nursing in 2004</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>Funding to allow staff to attend international conferences and summer schools average cost €800 per person per conference. € 46,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P3-S.</strong> The School should identify and develop a number of focussed research groupings</td>
<td>The School of Nursing Strategy ‘Leading Practice’ emphasises the importance of developing focussed research groupings. It has also been identified as a key area in the accompanying strategy 3-year action plan.</td>
<td>To implement this, two School Research Development days have taken place in August and October 2005. The focus was on mapping existing activity and interests and developing an internal research structure that supports collaboration external to the school and external to the university, particularly with partner services. The planning days were an opportunity to identify ‘clusters’ of staff</td>
<td>Development of research themes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hosting of research development day, including attendance of visiting professor: € 500. This development has occurred in August 2005. Another day is planned before the end of the year. Cost € 500 Total cost € 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Response</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2-S. The School should seek out opportunities to engage in joint research with outside bodies, in particular with its partner services.</td>
<td>Current research collaborators on active joint research projects include: School of Nursing and Midwifery, University College Dublin School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Dublin, Trinity College School of Psychology, University of Dublin, Trinity College Dept. of Psychology, National University of Ireland Maynooth Dept of Psychology, National University of Ireland</td>
<td>The School will build on the existing collaboration and will also continue to look for partners with whom high quality output will be achieved. The School is currently pursuing collaboration opportunities with Professor Tracey Howe and Health Qwest – a collaborative of 6 western Scottish Universities where there is already collaboration in relation to decision-making and human function and</td>
<td>The School action plan requires that staff increase their participation on local, national and international research and policy-making committees and boards. This will allow early identification of research priorities and funding streams to support research partnerships. The School action plan defines activity in relation to the promotion of evidence-based practice and in relation to strengthening research capacity of health care</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Response</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland Galway Veterinary Department, University College Dublin Department of Parasitology, Trinity College Dublin Genomics Policy Unit, University of Glamorgan, UK Institute for the Biotechnology of Infectious Diseases, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia. A recent EU grant to Dr. Sandra O’Neill includes collaborators with universities in Bulgaria, Netherlands, Greece, Poland, Spain, UK, Argentina, Brazil and Peru. Statutory organisations: Department of Health and Children Non-statutory organisations: Institute for Mental Health Research The Dartington Social Research Unit, UK Health Research Board Action Breast Cancer / Irish Cancer Society The Adelaide and Meath disability, the University of Salford (Dr Tony Long), and the University of Ulster (Professor Hugh McKenna) organisations (both having the potential for research with partner services). In addition, the School action plan identifies activity to encourage service user ‘voice’ in research, including supporting user lead research. Three joint research projects are in place, a fourth one is in the pipeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Response</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2-S. The School should develop a policy for structured tutoring of new Ph.D. students in the skills of conducting and presenting research, in line with recommendations from the Irish Universities Quality Board.</td>
<td>Hospital, Dublin incorporating The National Children’s Hospital, Tallaght, Dublin Our Lady’s Hospital for Sick Children, Crumlin Daughters of Charity, Navan Rd., Dublin Mater Misercordiae University Hospital Irish Patients’ Association</td>
<td>The recommendations of the Irish Universities Quality Board are partially addressed through developing research infrastructure, as described above and below in order to engender ‘a culture of creativity, innovation, scholarship and research in the student’s environment’ (Good Practice in the Organisation of PhD Programmes). The School will continue to implement policies and documentation in line with the recommendations of the IUQB. This item is also being addressed by the Faculty.</td>
<td>The Postgraduate Research Tutor in conjunction with the School Research Committee will also develop a guide for supervisors (Dr. Pamela Gallagher) that will collate existing policies for supervisors and ensure that key areas identified by the IUQB are addressed and included (e.g. supervisor capacity and suitability, sabbatical/retirement policy, criteria and suitability for co-supervision, supervisory records, appeals etc). However, it is important to note that the development of such documentation and policy will need to take place.</td>
<td>Ph.D. students are trained in the skills of conducting and presenting research, in line with recommendations from the Irish Universities Quality Board (See Appendix 1) Hold training day for PhD supervisors. Hold two workshops per year for PhD students. A pilot programme has been completed on Faculty level.</td>
<td>Efforts are under way to enhance the PG experience university-wide in order to supplement actions initiated on School and Faculty level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School of Nursing Quality Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Management</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1-S. The School should develop policies on work allocation that encourages and supports research.</td>
<td>The School is currently developing a workload allocation tool which will facilitate this. Also The School 3 year action plan commits to providing funding and protected time for staff undertaking PhDs and Professional doctorates. Staff are actively supported in sabbatical leave application to further their research careers.</td>
<td>Implementation of workload tool and Over the past year, the School Research Committee has implemented an internal seed-funding scheme (value €12,000) to encourage research activity. Furthermore, the School Research Committee introduced a studentship scheme where members of staff could apply to have a student employed to work with them. These studentships could relate to research work.</td>
<td>Workload tool in use. By September 2005. This scheme ran as a pilot in the 2004/2005 academic year where five studentships were awarded and both students and lecturers evaluated the scheme positively. Consequently, it will be implemented in the coming academic year. Taking into account the Faculty Research Strategy, the School is formulating a workload document that will encourage and support research as an important activity within the School.</td>
<td>There is a nation wide project under way (under the auspices of the IUQB) to establish best practice in relation to academic workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2-S. The School should</td>
<td>This will be reviewed under</td>
<td>The School action plan</td>
<td>Minimum of ten staff with</td>
<td>The university agrees with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Management Response</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>continue to develop policy initiatives that support staff who engage in research, such as short-term relief from admin or teaching duties, research seminars, and research mentoring.</td>
<td>the school’s workload tool. Sabbaticals are agreed by University Management, and not just at local level. However the School actively supports staff applying for sabbatical leave where possible. The School offered seed funding of €12,000 this year to encourage early career researchers. The School action plan states that a proportion of the School budget will be committed to seed funding over the next 3 years. This funding can be used by successful applicants to gain short-term relief from administration and teaching duties by buying themselves out of these responsibilities for a period of time. The School action plan also commits to the building of research infrastructure, for example, establishing a research information area, and the support of research workshops and seminars, the hosting of visiting academics (see above), the states that joint publications with staff members are desirable and this will help to build capability of individual staff members and in relation to dissemination. The School also actively encourages and supports the participation of staff early in their research career in ongoing research projects being led by established researchers within the School. Human Resources have appointed an individual to provide additional support to the DCU research community, which is being funded through the SFI Annual Overheads Investment Plan. Areas covered will include support and advice for researchers ranging from recruitment planning and management to advice on employment contracts (including work permits), procedures and rights; a comprehensive researcher training programme; a HR website specifically for one day per week protected for research purposes. Minimum of one staff member on sabbatical to for research purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>member on doctoral studies one day per week per person, i.e. 15 days, costing salary, below bar equals € 138,321 pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Response</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2-S. The School should engage staff in developing research policies, and ensure policies are widely disseminated.</td>
<td>The School action plan commits to a policy of making research output visible. It is the remit of the School Research Committee to develop policy and ensure its dissemination. Two School Research Development Day took place in August and October 2005. In addition to discussing research themes (see 18 P3-S above), this event was particularly useful in disseminating research policies. The School also has an IT system (Research Support System) to enable a current database of research activity (publications, conference attendances, research grants etc) to be in the public domain.</td>
<td>The School will develop a research governance framework which will address ethical approval, data protection, conflict of interests, sponsorship, etc. The research governance framework will be informed by the ‘Research Governance for Health and Social Care’ document published in 2001 by the Department of Health, UK. The research governance standards, policies and protocols will ensure accountability, transparency and auditability of the research process for each project undertaken by the School.</td>
<td>Research governance framework for School of Nursing by end of 2005.</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td>Cost n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staffing, Accommodation and Resources : Staffing Recommendations:**

<p>| P1-S. The School should | Currently 8 staff at doctoral | The university recognises | The School of Nursing |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Management Response</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| develop a proposal for staff development that takes into account the need for research, teaching, practice and administration including a timetable for individuals and groups of academic staff to complete doctoral and postdoctoral research. | addressed under the School workload document. | level and 15 staff receiving PhD support. Continue to support and monitor the number of staff undertaking doctoral and post doctoral studies | post doctoral level by 2010. and acknowledges the strides taken by the School in a very short time frame and will try to support the School in staying on course with its aims. | actively supports staff to complete doctoral work. Currently there are 15 staff members registered for PhD programmes. Support with fees for this is considerable, average € 3289 (in 04/05) fees per year equals € 45,000. Cost will depend on the system of recognition agreed upon. Cost of sabbaticals are similar to the costs of sabbaticals for research or doctoral studies and will depend on the level of the staff member taking leave. Approx. € 32,093 per P1-S. |}

P1-S. To meet the established, ambitious and multiple goals, the School, Faculty and University / Senior Management should determine a plan to completely resource the staff development. This will require that recurring financial resources be made available over the next 5-10 years.

Manpower planning is in place in the School at present. However more sophisticated models of manpower planning are being investigated that will help deal effectively with the multiple issues confronting the SoN: development of staff research capacity, maternity leave (mainly young female staff in School), parental leave and so on. The Meet with relevant Senior Management in Faculty and University to bring this forward. Clear plan to meet goals, i.e. Strategy Implementation Plan, with evidence of support from relevant sources, e.g. Training and Development. PMDS The School is encouraged to process this through the Faculty and University, as planned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Response</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recommendation must be followed in conjunction with the Faculty and University. The School currently has some funding from the Department of Health up to 2006. The funding model for the School will have to take cognisance of the ongoing extensive staff development needs over the next 10 - 15 year period at least.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2-S. The School should work towards a system of metrics for staff achievements that include innovation in teaching, innovations in practice, innovation in administration as well as research.</td>
<td>This is in place and ongoing. Chasetown (VLE developed by SoN staff) is very innovative, as is Moodle and Genius. A member of staff won the President’s Teaching award last year and another two members of staff have been nominated for this year’s round. The School is very innovative in practice and skills teaching. The University Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning are currently exploring innovative ways of further development and recognition in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Some of this may be measured under the workload but the School should consider other options in this area. Sabbaticals to support teaching and practice developments.</td>
<td>Clear system of metrics for staff achievements. Sabbaticals to support teaching and practice developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similarly pre and post-doctoral research is supported by giving sabbaticals, average cost €128,372 per pa (assuming 2 members of staff per semester on sabbatical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Response</td>
<td>Management Response</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-S. The School should establish workload allocation that includes a balance of teaching, research, practice and administration.</td>
<td>The School is currently developing a workload allocation tool that will facilitate this.</td>
<td>Implementation of workload tool.</td>
<td>Workload tool in use by end of 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-S. The School should have a clear plan as to the number and expertise of staff required to meet the nursing and other disciplinary needs of the School, i.e. nursing speciality, psychology, sociology.</td>
<td>There is manpower planning in place in the School. Various models are being explored in order to select the most effective model which will take account of the SoN’s factors which include; School activity Staff Development Needs Staff Profile, (maternity and parental leave requirements)</td>
<td>Manpower planning and development of plan to meet School needs.</td>
<td>Appointment of relevant staff in under way, e.g. sociologist is taking up post in January 2006.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accommodation and Resource Recommendations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Response</th>
<th>Management Response</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2-SU. The School should consider a number of specific requests by students, such as that canteen or vending services offering coffee and healthy food be available after 4 pm for the evening students at reasonable cost. Staff should work with students to minimise out-of-pocket costs such as parking in some clinical sites, access</td>
<td>There are accommodation services and canteen facilities available after 4:00pm in place, as well as parking facilities and online resources for students. Some of these factors, e.g. parking at clinical sites, is outside the School remit.</td>
<td>Continue to liaise with students and monitor the situation.</td>
<td>A vending machine is now installed in the School. A survey of non-traditional student numbers and their needs is planned to be carried out in co-operation between the OVPLI and Institutional Analysis Officer and arrangements will be adopted in accordance with the outcomes of the survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This machine will be self funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Management Response</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to on-line resources, and extra copies of required readings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1-SU.</strong> The School / University should train staff in how to adjust individual air conditioning controls to avoid cool drafts etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange training of staff to adjust controls.</td>
<td>With input from the Estates Office, School of Nursing staff shall be trained to adjust controls by June 2006. A Manager of Facilities and Associated Services will be appointed within the Faculty of Science &amp; Health who shall assist in building matters.</td>
<td>The training is under way through the Estates Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1-SU.</strong> The School/University should investigate the widely reported problems with computers and printers not working in the DCU Library, and printer problems in the School.</td>
<td>An IT core group has been established in the School to address these problems. Problems arising in the Library are dealt with between the Library and CSD.</td>
<td>The School with the help of CSD shall monitor the problem. A Service Level Agreement shall be developed between the School of Nursing and the Computer Services Department to further improve and monitor the IT services within the School. The University has responsibility for monitoring of IT facilities on a broader scale, e.g. library IT services.</td>
<td>Service Level Agreement with the Computer Services Department in place by end of 2005</td>
<td>The university is working towards a policy to have computers replaced at regular intervals.</td>
<td>Cost n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Response</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-SU. The School / University should test evacuation procedures in the School computer room as students perceive a potential problem with desks being too close.</td>
<td>Discussions with Health and Safety Officer to ensure adequate evacuation procedures are in place.</td>
<td>Health and Safety Officer has reviewed the Computer Laboratory and does not see a problem for evacuation. The situation will continue to be monitored by the Health and Safety Officer, especially during evacuation drills.</td>
<td>Cost n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Recommendations**

| P1-FU. Senior administrative support should be transferred from Faculty level, reporting to the Head of School | This item shall be addressed by Head of School and School Management team in conjunction with and the Dean to review the current structure. | The recent Faculty Administration review and the implementation of recommendations arising from it, may impact on this recommendation. It allows for a more integrated model to be explored. With the involvement of the Senior Administrator attending School Management meetings and monthly meetings between the Senior Administrator and the Head of School, it should allow for streamlining of reporting. The situation shall be reviewed in a year. | The university recommends that the discussion should be continued at School and Faculty level and envisages that the issue will be resolved on University level. |

**University Recommendations**

<p>| P1-U. The University Executive / Senior | The School of Nursing is a young and expanding | This issue will be considered further by the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Response</th>
<th>Management Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management should give serious consideration to migrating this large and ambitious school to independent status as a separate faculty or place it in a special relationship within a suitable faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>school. There are synergies between the School of Nursing and other Schools within the Faculty that are mutually beneficial. However there may be good reasons for the School of Nursing to obtain more autonomous status within the University in the future – for example with the development of the Health Living Centre and further planned growth within the School</td>
<td>university Senior Management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation and Management of the School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P2-U. The University Executive / Senior Management and the Faculty should develop a more transparent method of funding the School.</th>
<th>The transition to Faculty structure is still ongoing within the University. This matter shall be brought to University Executive and Faculty Executive for discussion.</th>
<th>Develop a more transparent method of funding the School.</th>
<th>The university agrees with this recommendation.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations in PRG</td>
<td>School Response</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>University Management Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2-U.</strong> The University Executive / Senior Management and Faculty should recognise the distinctive history, expertise and organisation of the School in the introduction of a University–wide system of performance management and development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PMDS is currently being put in place and staff trained</td>
<td>All staff to have completed their first PMDS by March 2006.</td>
<td>The university acknowledges that good progress has been made in the implementation of the PMDS by the School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P1-U.</strong> The University Executive / Senior Management should appoint additional senior academic and administrative staff to the School as a matter of urgency.</td>
<td>It was agreed that this is an urgent matter and opportunity to review and assess staff posts.</td>
<td>Increased number of senior posts filled within the School At time of Quality Review there was one professor and one senior lecturer. In September 2005 there is another professor and another senior lecturer in post in the School of Nursing. A third Chair / Associate Chair is being interviewed for in October 2005</td>
<td>Additional senior academic staff has been appointed.</td>
<td>Cost will depend on the number of senior staff appointed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P2U</strong> The University Executive / Senior Management should consider whether the strategic aims of the School might be better met by the establishment of the School as a separate faculty.</td>
<td>As before</td>
<td>(See P1 U page 22)</td>
<td>See recommendations above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School of Nursing Quality Improvement Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations in PRG</th>
<th>School Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>University Management Response</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Resource Recommendations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3-U. The University Executive / Senior Management should include specific building maintenance, heating and cooling in future budgets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific building maintenance, heating and cooling need to be clearly outlined in future budgets. This shall be done in conjunction with the Estates Office. A Manager of Facilities and Associated Services will be appointed within the Faculty of Science &amp; Health who shall assist in liaising with the Estates Office.</td>
<td>The university agrees, however severe budgetary restrictions limit possible action on this issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-U. The University should investigate further the heating requirement for the building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>The problem has been solved through the Estates Office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-U. The University should examine ways to reduce the problem of a low ceiling in part of the building near the entrance by perhaps roping off the area to prevent accidents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions with Health and Safety to review this situation.</td>
<td>Positioning of plants to seal off the area with a low ceiling by end of 2005.</td>
<td>The university agrees with the solution suggested by the School.</td>
<td>Cost of plants € 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2-U. The University should erect more prominent external professional signs showing that the building is the “School of Nursing / Scoil Altranais”.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liaise with Building to ensure the sign is put in place.</td>
<td>Prominent external professional signs showing that the building is the “School of Nursing / Scoil Altranais” in place by end of 2005.</td>
<td>Agreement has been reached on this point but realisation of plans are on hold due to introduction of new Irish-Language Act.</td>
<td>€ 12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, recommendations fall into three categories

- Recommendation concerning shortcomings in services, procedures and facilities which are within the control of the School
- Recommendations concerning shortcoming in services, procedures and facilities which are outside the control of the School
- Recommendations concerning inadequate staffing, facilities which require capital investment

The School should also indicate the timeline for implementation of the recommendations

- Recommendations that have already been implemented
- Recommendation that will be implemented within 1 year
- Recommendations that will be implementation within 5 years
- Recommendations that will not be implemented as they can be demonstrated to be unreasonable or impractical
3. PRIORITISED RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

This section should only contain a list, prioritised by the Quality Implementation Committee, of resource requirements necessary to implement the recommendations outlined in the Self-Assessment and Peer Review Group Reports. Estimates of the cost involved should also be included.

Resources for Quality Improvement will be allocated by the University under 2 separate funds:

A. The HEA Quality Assurance Programme (funded under the National Development Plan) has a sub measure for Quality Improvement following Quality Review. Each year, the HEA allocate a sum of money to the University to be used to fund some of the recommendations from Quality Review Reports. In total the University received €80K in 2002, 2003 and 2004 for this purpose.

B. In addition, the University sets aside a portion of its core Budget, under the sub-heading: Quality Promotion and Strategic Development Fund) to fund Quality Improvement measures arising from the recommendations in Quality Review Reports.

1. Management consultant Cost € 8,000
2. Development of research themes. Total cost € 1000
3. Costs of bringing international people over/ meeting with potential partners €3000
4. Cost of plants to screen low ceiling area € 2,000

University Response:
The resource requirements have to be detailed and argued to the University Budget Committee. The Funding available under the HEA Quality Assurance Fund and the University Quality Promotion and Strategic Development Fund is limited and funding requests should be able to demonstrate long-term effects, School-wide benefit and should be once-off expenditure.

Further funding requirements:
The School should encourage staff to present research work in international fora and journals. Funding to allow staff to present at international conferences, average cost €800 per person per international conference. 58 academic staff equals € 46,400

The School should further encourage attendance at international conferences and summer schools for staff that are developing their research. Funding to allow staff to
attend international conferences and summer schools average cost €800 per person per conference equals € 46,400

The School should develop a policy for structured tutoring of new Ph.D. students in the skills of conducting and presenting research, in line with recommendations from the Irish Universities Quality Board. Cost of tutoring new PhD students: €7000

The School is already contributing through research overheads and School contributions to Faculty led initiatives. Costing based on a staff member delivering a full module, and the cost for running for example 3 workshops with external experts inputting.

The School should continue to develop policy initiatives that support staff who engage in research, such as short-term relief from admin or teaching duties, research seminars, and research mentoring. Allowing each staff member on doctoral studies one day per week per person, i.e. 15 days, costing salary, point 5 above bar equals €192,558.00pa (Nursing staff transferred from Health service on point 3 or 4 above bar).

The School should develop a proposal for staff development that takes into account the need for research, teaching, practice and administration including a timetable for individuals and groups of academic staff to complete doctoral and postdoctoral research. The School of Nursing actively supports staff to complete doctoral work. Currently there are 15 staff members registered for PhD programmes. Support with fees for this is considerable, average €3289 (in 04/05) fees per year equals €45,000.

Similarly pre- and post-doctoral research is supported by giving sabbaticals, average cost €128,372 per pa (assuming 2 members of staff per semester on sabbatical)

The School should work towards a system of metrics for staff achievements that include innovation in teaching, innovations in practice, innovation in administration as well as research. Cost will depend on the system of recognition agreed upon. Cost of sabbaticals are similar to the costs of sabbaticals for research or doctoral studies and will depend on the level of the staff member taking leave. Approx. €32,093 per person per semester.
4. SUMMARY OF THE ONE-YEAR PLAN

At School Level:

25 Service Level Agreements for lecturing staff with Partner Services active by end of 2005

Demonstrate the phased and equitable nature of student assessments.

Development of research themes. (already commenced)


Installation of vending machine in School.

Service Level Agreement with Computer Services Department in place by end of 2005

All staff to have completed their first PMDS by end of 2005

Positioning of plants to seal off the area with a low ceiling by end of 2005.

Prominent external professional signs showing that the building is the “School of Nursing / Scoil Altranais” in place by end of 2005.
5. SUMMARY OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN

At School level

Annual publication documenting the involvement of School of Nursing with Partner Health Services

Ph.D. students are trained in the skills of conducting and presenting research, in line with recommendations from the Irish Universities Quality Research governance framework.

50% of staff at post-doctoral level by 2010

Clear system of metrics for staff achievements.

Sabbaticals to support teaching and practice developments.

Increased number of senior posts filled within the School At time of Quality Review there was one professor and one senior lecturer.
APPENDIX ONE

Please list the members of:

- **School Quality Committee (for the Self-Assessment Report)**

  Anne Walsh-Daneshmandi (Lecturer)
  Dara O’Connor (Administrator)
  Denise Proudfoot (Lecturer)
  Evelyn McElwain (Lecturer)
  Ger Cannon (Technical)
  Gerard Clinton (Lecturer)
  Mary Kirwan (Lecturer/Stand Alone Module Co-ordinator)
  Mary McGrath (Lecturer/Skills Centre Manager)
  Mel Duffy (Lecturer/Undergraduate Convenor)
  Michael McKeon (Lecturer/Allocations)
  Nora Kilcullen (Lecturer/Library)
  Pam Henry (Lecturer)
  Richard Jackson (Lecturer)
  Rufina Morgan (Assistant Head of School/Director Undergraduate Studies)
  Sheelagh Wickham, Assistant (Head of School/Post Graduate Convenor)
  Therese Danaher (Lecturer)

- **Peer Review Group**

  **Dr. Kathy Murphy** (Chairperson) Head, Centre for Nursing Studies, NUI (Galway)
  **Dr. Ruth Barrington** Chief Executive, Health Research Board, Dublin
  **Mr Gerry O’Donnell** Senior Administrator, DCU Buildings Office (Rapporteur)
  **Professor Norma Lang** School of Nursing, Univ. of Pennsylvania, USA
  **Professor Joe Morris** DCU School of Computing

- **School Quality Committee (for the Quality Improvement Plan)**

  Undergraduate Convenor
Appendix 1

An important element of the IUQB recommendations relate to PhD training. The Faculty of Science and Health of which the School of Nursing is a part are introducing a week-long induction programme for MSc/PhD research students. The content incorporates such aspects as overview of University and Faculty structures; advisor and mentor systems; health and safety; information management skills; negotiating and networking skills; project and experiment design; data analysis; communication (oral and written) skills; time management and record keeping. In addition, the Faculty of Science and Health, for the first time in the 2004-2005 academic year, introduced and piloted a Postgraduate Research Training Programme that offered postgraduate research students the opportunity to avail of a number of taught workshops in a range of generic, research related topics. The workshops are intended to provide graduate students with a range of skills, which will benefit them in progressing their research. Workshops on this programme, included:

- Designing a research project
- Basic Aspects of data handling and statistics for Science
- Ethics in research publication
- Intellectual Property and commercialisation,

In addition to being able to avail of these opportunities at a Faculty level, research postgraduates in the School of Nursing are encouraged to register for research modules on the taught postgraduate programmes in the School of Nursing. The School of Nursing also organise Postgraduate Research Workshops, for example, workshops on NVIVO, ENDNOTE, Writing Grant Proposals and Publishing have been run for postgraduate research students.