

Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement Programme



REVIEW SCHOOL OF NURSING & HUMAN SCIENCES

Peer Review Group Report

Professor Lynn Kilbride Head of Department, Nursing & Community Health School of Health & Life Sciences Glasgow Caledonian University
Professor Tony Cassidy Professor of Child and Family Health Psychology School of Psychology University of Ulster
Mr Ray Bonar General Manager Cavan General Hospital
Professor Lisa Looney School of Mechanical Engineering Dublin City University
Mr Billy Kelly Deputy Registrar/Dean of Teaching & Learning Dublin City University

Date: April 2017

Introduction

This Quality review has been conducted in accordance with a framework model developed and agreed through the Irish Universities Association Quality Committee and complies with the provisions of Section 35 of the Universities Act (1997) and the 2012 Qualifications and Quality Assurance Act. The model consists of a number of basic steps.

1. An internal team in the School/Faculty/Office/Centre being reviewed completes a detailed self-assessment report (SAR). It should be noted that this document is confidential to the School/Faculty/Office/Centre as well as the Review Panel and senior officers of the University.
2. This report is sent to a team of peer assessors, the Peer Review Group (PRG) – composed of members from outside DCU and from other areas of DCU – who then visit DCU and conduct discussions with a range of relevant staff, students and other stakeholders.
3. The PRG then writes its own report. The School/Faculty/Office/Centre is given the chance to correct possible factual errors before the PRG report is finalised.
4. The School/Faculty/Office/Centre produces a draft Quality Improvement Plan (QuIP) in response to the various issues and findings of the SAR and PRG reports.
5. The PRG report and the draft QuIP are considered by the Quality Promotion Committee (QPC) and University Executive.
6. The draft QuIP is discussed in a meeting between the School/Faculty/Office/Centre, members of the PRG, the Director of Quality Promotion and members of Senior Management. The University's responses are written into the draft document and the result is the finalised QuIP.
7. The PRG Report and the QuIP including the University's response is sent to the Governing Authority of the University, who approves publication in a manner that it sees fit.

This document is the report referred to in Step 3 above.

Peer Review Group Report for School of Nursing & Human Sciences

1. Introduction and Overview

Location

The School of Nursing & Human Sciences is located within a purpose built facility opened in 2005, extended in 2012. Between 2013 and 2014 space has been configured variously to provide psychology testing laboratories, a psychology teaching laboratory, and postgraduate research rooms. In 2016, there was an upgrade of some areas to allow video streaming and recording of student activities and audiovisual facilities in a number of classrooms have been upgraded. The School has sufficient classrooms, laboratories, other learning spaces and offices for its current range of its teaching and research activities but has limited opportunity for further growth in its core activities.

Staff

Staffing in the School comprises 85 persons. The table below shows staffing by grade and FTE:

Staff group	Grade	FTE
Academic	Professor	3
	Associate Professor	2
	Senior Lecturer	5
	Lecturer	50
Clinical	Clinical Skills' Nurses (HLC)	2
Technical	Senior Technical Officer	2
Research	Post-Doctoral Researcher	4
	Research assistant	8
Administrative	Grade 3 Secretary (2 posts)	1.5
	Grade 2 Secretary (5 posts)	4.1 (3.4 currently)
Healthy Living Centre (HLC)	Grade 3 Secretary	0.8
	Grade 2 Secretary	0.8

Activities of the School

The School of Nursing & Human Sciences (SNHS) is a large academic School within the Faculty of Science & Health. It has over 1,500 registered students at all levels and across many disciplines, including nursing (general, children's, mental health and intellectual disability), psychology, health & society, homelessness prevention and intervention, sexuality studies, psychotherapy, dementia, recovery and many professional development areas. These programmes have been developed in collaboration with organisations in both the public and private sectors.

In the academic year 2016-2017 nine taught undergraduate programmes and eight taught postgraduate programmes are being delivered in DCU. A further Master's programme was developed and is jointly delivered with the School of Applied Languages and Intercultural Studies in DCU. Two NQF Level 8 Certificate programmes have been developed with

external agencies to meet their professional development needs. In addition, the School has developed a series of 'stand-alone' modules to meet the continuous professional development needs of professionals, principally in nursing.

The SNHS has a multidisciplinary research community incorporating academics from nursing, social sciences, psychology, health systems, nutrition, bioethics and psychotherapy. This enables the school as a whole to engage in scholarly discourse, innovative inquiry into the teaching and learning experience, the generation and application of knowledge, and the integration of these across the spectrum of human health and well-being. The School encourages both individual and collaborative research, given its commitment to create adequate space for academic freedom in the choice of research designs. This reflects the wide array of disciplinary research traditions to which its academics have recourse, from individually-focused research designs in anthropology to large collaborative ones in health studies and biomedicine.

Research support is provided in SNHS through the School Research Committee (SRC) which has developed a wide array of activities seeking to improve the main three key performance indicators of the School's research activity, post-graduate research students, publications in high impact journals and external funding. In 2015- 2016, for example, these included 39 research awards, 2 workshops and 11 research seminars.

From a position of virtually no research activity and no post-graduate research degree provision in September 2000, School research activity has grown very substantially over the past 16 years. At present, 56% of the School's academic staff can be considered research active using the definition of "research active" identified in the DCU Research and Innovation Strategy. In addition, many other staff, while not yet meeting the University definition of "research active", are involved in research projects and/or are undertaking PhD research. The SNHS now has an active graduate research student community, with 61 students registered for PhD degrees. A further 20 students are registered on the Doctorate in Psychotherapy programme, on which independent research is a key component. Research training now constitutes an integral part of all undergraduate and graduate programmes offered within the School and forms a central platform of its teaching and learning strategy

The SNHS incorporates the Healthy Living Centre (HLC), which was previously a campus company associated with the School until 2012, but now is integrated within the School. The HLC is a not-for-profit self-funding innovative health space within which SNHS staff contribute to advancing healthcare practice knowledge; it provides healthcare services to the public, both internal and external to DCU. The HLC is staffed by expert practitioners in health care provision from nursing, medicine, psychology and therapy backgrounds and offers a range of services that include counselling & psychotherapy, occupational health services, travel health services, and GP services. The HLC also hosts the Dublin North/ North East Recovery College where co-designed health and well-being programmes are offered to the public. Exwell Medical, a private company, is housed within the HLC, but is not within the SNHS remit.

2. The Self-Assessment Process

Co-ordinating Committee

A School coordinating committee was established in September 2016 comprising the following representative membership:

	Name	Role in School	Role in QR Committee
1	Anne Matthews	Head, Associate Professor	Chair
2	Pat Boylan	Senior Technical Officer	Technical staff representative
3	Robbie Egan	PhD student, PGR student representative on SRC	Postgraduate Research (PGR) student
4	Sharon Farrell	Administrator	Administrative team representative
5	Pamela Gallagher	Associate Professor of Psychology	Other senior academic
6	Veronica Lambert	Deputy Head, Senior Lecturer Children's Nursing	Quality Liaison Person
7	Liam MacGabhann	Director of the Healthy Living Centre, Senior Lecturer Mental Health	Practice
8	Catherine McGonagle	Undergraduate teaching convenor	Teaching & Learning
9	Caroline Rawdon	Post-doctoral researcher	Post-doctoral research staff
10	Sabina Stan	Research convenor	Research

Committee Methodology

The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) was developed according to the Quality Promotion Office template. It included sections on structure and staff, update since last Quality Review, context, organisation and management, teaching and learning, scholarship and research, community engagement, and a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Challenges (SWOC) analysis.

The SNHS coordinating committee was established in September 2016 and was followed by a presentation to staff at an all staff meeting by the Director of Quality Promotion. The committee met regularly and other meetings were held between sub-groups focused on particular areas, e.g., research and teaching and learning. At the first meeting, each member took responsibility for completing different activities and drafting sections, e.g., convenors for research and teaching & learning respectively. Staff and external stakeholders were made aware of the Quality Review process underway from September 2016. Collection of new data including key research publications and engagement data was planned and undertaken by different committee members. Online consultations were carried out with SNHS staff, postgraduate students and external stakeholders from November 2016 and focus group discussions were held with research staff and postgraduate students in January 2016. The Head of School updated staff by email and at staff meetings. A workshop to examine progress on commitments set out in the SNHS 2015 statement of purpose was held in December 2016 and discussions on the its emerging Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities

& Challenges (SWOC) analysis and the School improvement plan were held in all staff meetings in February 2017; this followed the sharing of a draft report and appendices with all staff in January 2017.

3. The Peer Review Group Process

Peer Review Group (PRG)

Professor Lynn Kilbride Head of Department, Nursing & Community Health School of Health & Life Sciences Glasgow Caledonian University
Professor Tony Cassidy Professor of Child and Family Health Psychology School of Psychology University of Ulster
Mr Ray Bonar General Manager Cavan General Hospital
Professor Lisa Looney School of Mechanical Engineering Dublin City University
Mr Billy Kelly Deputy Registrar/Dean of Teaching & Learning Dublin City University

Self-Assessment Report

The School's Self-Assessment Report (SAR) along with a very extensive set of supplementary appendices provided a comprehensive description of the work and management structures of the School of Nursing and Human Sciences and the development of the SAR itself. While the SAR and its appendices provided copious amounts of information, the SAR itself was not as reflective and self-critical as it might have been and was overly descriptive in style. For example, the key issues of identity and challenges in management of a School of its size were not examined in detail.

The then School of Nursing had its last Quality Review in 2005 but participated in the faculty-wide Quality Review of the Faculty of Science & Health in 2012. Updates on the actions that followed from the 2005 Quality review were clearly outlined and significant progress evidenced despite financial challenges; the progress on scholarship and research in these circumstances is to be commended.

The Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Challenges (SWOC) analysis identified many justifiable strengths; however, it was notable that the Weaknesses and Challenges identified were largely seen as external to the School, i.e., the responsibility for addressing these was seen to lie with the wider University.

Review Visit Programme

The Peer Review Group (PRG) met with School management and staff, students, Heads of other Schools in the Faculty, representatives of University Support and Service Units, external stakeholders, and University Senior Management. The full programme of the visit is shown below. A list of participants in meetings is shown in Appendix I.

Timetable Peer Review Group Visit

QUALITY REVIEW OF: School of Nursing & Human Sciences

DATE: 8-10 March 2017

Day	Time	Peer Review Group (PRG) Activity/Meeting	Venue	Meeting No.
Day 1 Wed	12.30-14.00	Lunch with Director of Quality Promotion and available PRG members	1838 DCU	Arranged by QPO
	14.00-15.00	Briefing by Director of Quality Promotion; Guidelines provided to assist PRG during the visit and in developing its report.	A204	Arranged by QPO
	15.00-15.45	PRG selects Chair. Discussion of main areas of interest and/or concern arising from the Self Assessment Report (SAR).	A204	Arranged by QPO
	15.45-16.00	<i>Coffee</i>	A204	Arranged by QPO
	16.00-17.15	Consideration of SAR with School Head & members of quality review committee. Short presentation by School followed by discussion of SAR. <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>	A204	Arranged by QPO
	17:15-17.55	PRG Private meeting	A204	
	18.00-19.00	Informal Reception – PRG, School Head, Members of Quality Review Committee (plus School Management Team/ Senior academics), Director of Quality Promotion	1838 DCU	Arranged by QPO
	19.00-20.30	PRG Private dinner	1838 DCU	Arranged by QPO
Day 2 Thurs	08.45– 09.00	PRG Private meeting	H306	
	09.00-09.25	School Head	H306	1
	09.30-09.55	Undergraduate teaching convenor and all undergraduate programme Chairs	H306	2
	10.00-10.25	Meetings with external stakeholders	H306	3
	10.30-11.00	<i>Coffee</i>	H306	

	11.00-11.25	Postgraduate/Professional development framework teaching convenor and all Postgraduate and Single module programme Chairs.	H306	4
	11.30-11.55	Representatives of students from various academic programmes. Mix of gender, undergrad, postgrad, access, traditional and others	H306	5
	12.00-12.25	Heads or Senior staff in Support / Service Offices working with School	H306	6
	12.30-12.55	Senior Staff representatives from Schools, Faculties or Research Centres	H306	7
	13.00-14:00	<i>Lunch</i>	H306	
	14.00-14.25	Tour of Facilities: HLC, CEC, Psychology labs	H306	
	14.30-14.55	Postgraduate research students and research staff	H306	8
	15.00-15.25	Open forum for any member of School staff		9
	15.30-15.55	Clinical, technical administrative staff grouping		10
	16.00-16.25	Research Convenor, Postgraduate Research Student Co-ordinator and members of SRC	H306	11
	16.30-16.50	Meeting with Head of International Office	H306	11a ¹
	16:30-16:50	<i>Coffee</i>	H306	
	17.00-17.55	School Head (update and clarifications if required)	H306	12
	18.00-18.55	PRG private meeting time	H306	
	19.30	PRG private dinner	Hotel	
Day 3 Fri	08.45– 09.00	PRG Private meeting	AG04	Meeting No.
	09.00-09.55	DCU Senior Management Group (SMG) <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>	AG01	13
	10.00–10.25	Area Reporting Head (Executive Dean, member of SMG)	AG01	14
	10.30-11.00	<i>Coffee</i>		
	11.00-12.00	Meeting with School staff		14a ²
	12.00-13.00	PRG private meeting time	H306	
	13.00-14:00	<i>Working Lunch</i>	H306	
	14.00-16.00	PRG Prepare Exit Presentation <i>(Coffee provided at 15.30)</i>	H306	
	16.00-16.30	Exit Presentation – by PRG to School Head and all members of School staff <i>(Director of Quality Promotion in attendance)</i>	HG23	15

¹ Additional meeting sought by PRG to discuss matters not covered in Meeting 6

² Additional meeting sought by PRG to consult with a cross-section of School staff

Methodology of Review Visit

Following a briefing by the Director of Quality Promotion, the Peer Review Group (PRG) met in private and chose Professor Lynn Kilbride as Chairperson of the PRG. In discussion, a number of key themes were identified and in advance of each individual meeting, particular issues to be explored were established and assigned to individual members of the Group to probe with participants. The PRG worked as a single group in all meetings with the sole exception of meetings with students and tours of the facilities where the PRG divided into sub-groups to ensure the widest possible level of consultation.

There was a high level of very positive engagement with the PRG by all participants and all requests for additional information were met promptly by the School and the Quality Promotion Office. The PRG was satisfied that it had all necessary inputs to complete its work.

With respect to the schedule of meetings set out, the PRG found that some meetings where there were large numbers of participants left limited scope to explore the full range of opinion. To address this, two additional meetings were added to the original schedule, a further meeting with the Head of International Office and a meeting with a representative group of School staff.

4. Findings of the Peer Review Group

4.1 Background, Overview, Strategy, Context

The School of Nursing and Human Sciences has grown significantly over the last 10 years, responding very actively to stakeholder need. It has a very distinctive profile in terms of nurse education, and it now also encompasses staff with a wide range of other specialisms. SNHS is part of a Faculty which includes a School of Health and Human Performance and, with the recent advent of the DCU Institute of Education, has interests in common with the School of Human Development. It also cooperates with DCU Business School on the psychology programme. The review takes place as a new institutional strategic plan is being designed, and at a time of unprecedented growth of the University into areas which share, with nursing in particular, an emphasis on professional practice, and a focus on research capacity development.

The School has a strategy and a mission statement which align with those of the University. The PRG found that there has been a collegial approach to co-development across the areas of specialism within the SNHS, within existing structures.

4.2 Organisation and Management.

The School is well organised and managed, within tight staffing constraints and the existing organisational structure. However it is not clear that the structure serves the varying needs of the constituent parts of the School. It is acknowledged that the substantial growth in the School has been organic. It has accommodated a significant change in focus for some academics (somewhat depleting core areas), and recruitment of new colleagues with a very diverse mix of interests. Diversity is considered a strength and, laudably, a lot of leadership energy has been exercised in trying to ensure all areas feel a similar sense of belonging.

The area acknowledges however that this diversity and scale is difficult to manage and support within the model of a single Head of School and limited dedicated administrative support. There is also frustration that the mixed composition of the School is not well recognised outside the School. The PRG found that the size and diversity of the School causes problems beyond these. It masks the distinctive identity and needs of constituent elements, particularly in relation to research, results in some individual academics and research students being isolated from their disciplinary peers, reduces visibility of, and hinders focus on specific sub-areas with potential to grow to significant scale and means that the workload allocation model being used is not optimum, in that it is a 'one size fits all', which does not allow variations in emphasis. The PRG have recommended that the School consider a radical restructure to achieve its full potential, and, in that context, review leadership and strategy addressing these issues of identity, focus and workload.

4.3 Staffing and Accommodation

The accommodation that is used for the teaching, learning and research of students within the School were found by the PRG to be excellent and comparable and in some areas exceeding those available in many other HEI's delivering similar programmes across Ireland and the UK.

The School is one of the largest in terms of staffing within the University. There are at the time of writing the report 60 academic staff, 2 clinical staff, 2 technical staff, 12 research staff, 5.6 administrative staff and 1.6 staff who work in the Health Living Centre. The PRG identified that the ratio of senior to junior staff amongst the academic staff, particularly in Nursing was less than other academic disciplines in the University and would advise that this is addressed through external competition and/or academic promotion policies within the University. Integral to restructuring, is the necessity for the School and University to consider the type, grade and remit of staff that are needed.

4.4 Management of Financial and other resources

The PRG identified that the School lacked expertise in longer term planning and, while this resides at Faculty level, the vision needs to come from the members of the School. They will need support to develop this vision into a plan and operationalise it. At a minimum the strategic plan should define the vision and mission for the restructured School(s) as well as core business and future direction, prioritise the financial allocation and physical resource based on the intended future direction, and identify the exit pathway for any areas considered non-core business.

To date, there has been minimal involvement in the development of international services. Opportunities in professional development, summer schools and external delivery streams

would exist for this School and it is recommended that the School identify a link person to work with the International Office to develop a plan for the growth in this area.

The PRG is of the view that the Healthy Living Centre (HLC) requires support to identify and secure a mandate. Currently it has a small staff with a Director (allocated from Academic staff). The therapeutic and health services operating out of it are predominantly external services provided through a booking system. The HLC had been established as a campus company in 2006 but was absorbed into the School in 2012. It is currently classed as a project without a project implementation plan. The School advised that it is covering some of the direct costs of the HLC but the PRG noted that this does not take into account utilities and associated running costs. The School indicated that it was unclear of the HLC's future due to its status; as a result the School has been managing it as a going concern.

On discussion with the Senior Management team (SMT), the PRG was advised that the SMT recognise the social benefit this facility provides the community and would welcome a development plan from the School. The PRG recommends that a review of the HLC take place and a comprehensive business plan is submitted to SMT for consideration as a priority.

4.5 External & Internal Relations

On consideration of the internal and external relations, the PRG identified a significant amount of good practice, both internally and externally as well as opportunities for development in this area. External stakeholders reported very positively on their relationships with the School, its staff and students and its programmes; they were extremely proud to be associated with the School. The School is open and respectful of the needs of its stakeholders and has a strong history of responsiveness to the needs of partner services and sponsors of programmes. The PRG met with a range of internal stakeholders and it was noted that the School was one of the most engaged across the University in terms of its interaction with support units, in particular, the Teaching Enhancement Unit and the Library.

Whilst the School was recognised for its involvement in social and community initiatives and with the University's Civic Engagement strategy, it was noted it was not represented as widely across campus committees as other Schools. It is recommended that the School identify key committees where it is not represented on and seek opportunities for greater representation and involvement.

4.6 Academic Programmes, Teaching & Learning

The School delivers a wide and diverse range of programmes and it is clear from the very positive feedback from stakeholders and high levels of student satisfaction that the programme teams are effective in delivering these programmes. However, it was also clear that there was no consistent strategy underlying the development of programmes. The core programmes in nursing and psychology were clearly well planned and devised to deliver set curricula specified by professional bodies. On the other hand, there are a number of programmes under the label human sciences which appear to have come about on a very ad hoc basis. Some were developed as a consequence of successful responses to tender but others reflect individual interests and expertise. Along the way time and effort has been expended on developing programmes which have not been sustained because demand was not sufficient. This occurred in the context of national and international financial austerity and

overall the result is a portfolio which lacks coherence, staff who are overstretched, and ultimately a School lacking a single coherent identity. To remedy this situation, it is recommended that in the context of restructuring a more formal approach is taken to programme planning and development involving a longer term (3-5 year) strategic plan with a comprehensive business plan to cover demand, staff resources, sustainability and alignment with School, Faculty and University mission.

There are existing examples of excellence in teaching and programme delivery and this excellence is commended. The PRG supports further innovation in virtual learning opportunities that build on this existing excellence where they can be demonstrated to add value to the enterprise. Through our discussions it emerged that there are opportunities for developments in postgraduate programmes and there are also staff willing and keen to lead and contribute. It is important that such developments are properly planned and resourced. Some discussion occurred around internationalisation and distance learning in relation to postgraduate programmes and it seems there is potential to attract international students both to courses delivered on campus in Dublin and through remote and online delivery to students in their own country. There was a sense from both students and staff that current postgraduate students often lack a sense of community and staff are to be commended on their efforts to address the problem. It is suggested that virtual learning platforms through discussion forums and online classrooms might help. In terms of student needs a common theme across the different programmes was a desire for more and earlier career advice and guidance. Psychology students, while valuing the placement opportunity and staff support generally, did identify an opportunity for a little more preparation for the practical aspects of the placement. In addition they felt there could be more information provided on their professional body and in particular on student societies and conferences nationally.

4.7 Research, Scholarship & Training

Our exploration of this area with staff and students exposed the fact that while some very good research is being undertaken it is largely concentrated in the small group of psychology staff. There is also some good research apparent in some of the staff who fall under the human sciences cluster but there is very little research activity within the nursing group. Most of the PhD supervision and research training is similarly concentrated within a small group of research active staff. There has been an investment within the nursing group to increase the number of staff with doctoral level qualifications and this has indeed been successful. However, it appears that the staff who benefited from this have not gone beyond the doctorate either in terms of publication or further research activity. In this sense the investment has been less successful. The School claims to have 10 research themes but on closer inspection these are not active, strategic themes; instead, they appear to be a list of the research areas or interests of individual staff. There was a lack of recognition of these themes among both research staff and students and there was no evidence of coordinated planning for the future. Research themes should be broader areas encompassing clusters of research staff who are undertaking research which has some common thread. In this way, groups can reach a critical mass enabling the development of a shared research culture wherein funding applications, research student training, and staff development can be more strategically planned. In addition, such broad themes can provide the opportunity for the appointment of senior experienced staff as research leads. On the other hand, it is important that this approach does not prevent, hinder or disrupt current quality research. Postgraduate research students and postdoctoral staff seemed to lack a sense of community or belonging

to any particular research group. This is clearly a symptom of the diversity of areas across this complex School and should become more manageable following restructuring. This diversity is identified as a difficulty in delivering research training and students identified a need to have more subject or discipline focus in some areas of training. Again staff should be commended on their efforts to enable the establishment of a sense of community through seminars and other activities.

4.8 Student and Staff Perspective

The perspectives of staff and students were collated via the Self Assessment Report and through face to face meetings. The students within the School were complimentary about the staff and their teaching experience. It was evident from students that the staff go above and beyond to support the students, listen to their concerns and ensure that they have a positive experience at DCU. The students welcomed the innovation in teaching and learning approaches that they were exposed to within certain modules and would like more opportunities to be involved in diverse activities and groups external to the University but within their own professional groups. Specific groups of students identified that placement management would be an area that they would like to see improved. Students felt that last minute allocation of placements and unpredictable placement areas throughout their period of study did not allow them to be adequately prepared for this important aspect of their academic programme.

The perspectives of staff were easily gathered as every staff member that the PRG met were open, transparent and collegiate throughout the review process. Many staff were enthusiastic about their role within the School and welcomed the fact that they had been supported to develop themselves professionally and personally. The majority of staff that the PRG met agreed that there had been an organic approach to growth within the School that had provided some positive outcomes for the staff, students and stakeholders. However, many went on to express that they now needed a strategy and structure for growth to ensure that the resources of the School could be capitalised upon. The staff indicated that the size of the School needed to be considered in terms of communication, professional identity and portfolio management and welcomed the opportunity to discuss this openly with each other.

4.9 Overall Analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Concerns

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links to professional practice in health sector including nursing, psychology, and psychotherapy • Well-respected undergraduate programmes with strong demand • Very positive student experience on taught programmes • Excellence of reputation with external partners • Internal partnerships and developments in teaching & learning • Very capable technical support • Extent of civic engagement activities by School staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of common identity internally and externally • Management challenges are complex and fragmented across sub-disciplines • Inefficient placement support/ allocation system for nursing students • Concentration of research activity in subsets of School disciplines • Workload allocation model not aligned with varied staff activity • Unclear succession plan for Head of School • School administration very stretched to support current activities and processes
Opportunities	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internationalisation of programme offerings through student recruitment and remote delivery • Development of new postgraduate programmes in areas of strong demand, e.g., psychology • Further development of current teaching & learning innovations • Build on existing positive track record of engagement with external agencies in development of programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forthcoming retirement of staff in key roles in nursing, i.e., planning for the next generation of teachers and researchers • Development of a new organisational structure for the School members • Development of a workload allocation model that reflects variability of staff activity • Building research capacity and funding of same

5. Recommendations for Improvement

Indication of Priority:

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

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

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

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

A: Area under review

U: University Senior Management

No.	Priority	Level	Recommendation
1	P1	A, U	It is essential that you restructure the organisation, leadership and strategy of the activities of the School, using the resources available to you within the University and external facilitation as appropriate.
1a	P1	A, U	The re-structuring should be radical and challenge the view that diversity has enhanced the School. It should facilitate the growth of the area of psychology, allow for the separate development of nursing, and identify the best environment for the other specialist areas.
1b	P1	A	Develop a workload allocation model that values the range of activities of academic staff and accommodates the diversity of profile of staff.
1c	P1	A, U	In the context of the new structure, capitalise on the investment you have had in terms of research and consider in line with University strategy how the expertise and effort within the School could be channelled into a smaller number of themes to enhance research output.
2	P2	A	Review and develop a proposal for the future of the Healthy Living Centre that addresses its sustainability within the University.
3	P2	A	Working with other relevant parts of the University, develop an internationalisation strategy.
4	P2	A	Develop the business case for the implementation of a placement management system.
5	P2	A, U	Put in place mechanisms to ensure that programme portfolio review is strategically driven and the process is explicit and actively managed at area and University levels.

Appendix 1

Meetings with Peer Review Group – Quality Review Visit

School of Nursing & Human Sciences, Dublin City University

Meeting No:	Name(s)	Position
1	Professor Anne Matthews	Head, School of Nursing and Human Sciences
2	Dr Briege Casey Dr Marcia Kirwan Ms Anne Kirwan Dr Lorraine Boran Dr Catherine McGonagle Dr Siobhan Russell Mr Michael McKeon Ms Yvonne Corcoran Ms Sara Raftery	Programme Chair, Certificate in Homeless Prevention and Intervention Programme Chair BSc Health & Society Programme Chair BSc General Nursing BSc Psychology Programme Co-ordinator Undergraduate School Teaching Convenor Programme Chair BSc Psychiatric/Mental Health Nursing Programme Chair BSc Intellectual Disability Higher Diploma Children's Nursing Co-ordinator Programme Chair BNS (Online) and BSc Nursing (Children's & General)
3	Ms Elizabeth McKeon Ms Grainne Bauer Ms Maria Fitzpatrick Ms Tess Brady	Nurse Practice Development Co-ordinator St Joseph's Intellectual Disability Services, Portrane Director of Nursing, Children's University Hospital, Temple Street, Dublin Training Co-ordinator, Dublin Region Homeless Executive, Dublin City Council Mymind
4	Dr Mary Kelly Dr Deirdre Corby Dr Mel Duffy Dr Aisling McMahon Dr Gemma Kiernan	Postgraduate & Professional Development School Teaching Convenor Programme Chair MSc Nursing/Healthcare Practice Programme Chair Graduate Certificate in Relationships and Sexuality for People with Intellectual Disability, Graduate Certificate in Sexuality and Sexual Health Education, MA in Sexuality Studies Doctorate in Psychotherapy programme MSc in Psychotherapy programme
5	Ms Sue Dunne Ms Katie Lynch Mr Shane Michael Fields Ms Brenda Lee O'Neill Mr David Ivers Ms Jessica Fenlon	Student 4 th year MSc in Psychotherapy Student 1 st Year BSc in Nursing (General) Student 2 nd Year BSc in Nursing (General) Student 3 rd Year BSc in Nursing (General) Student 4 th Year BSc in Nursing (General) Student 4 th Year BSc in Nursing (General)

	<p>Ms Aoife McKiernan Ms Ciara Rooney Ms Aoife Reilly Mr John Nolan Mr Jim Hickson Ms Katie Dawson Ms Eilis Mulligan Mr Dean O'Reilly Ms Orla Kelly</p>	<p>Student 1st Year BSc in Health & Society Student 3rd Year BSc in Health & Society Student 3rd Year BSc in Health & Society Student 4th Year BSc in Nursing (Intellectual Disability) Student 4th Year BSc Children's & General Nursing Student 3rd Year BSc Children's & General Nursing Student 2nd Year BSc Children's & General Nursing Student 1st Year BSc in Psychology Student 4th Year BSc in Psychology</p>
6	<p>Ms Alison Foran Dr Ana Terres Ms Carol Ellis Dr Mark Glynn Mr. Paul O'Connor Mr. Anthony Feighan Ms Phylomena McMorrow Prof Ronnie Munck Ms Deirdre Wynter Mr. Paul Smith Ms Ellen Breen</p>	<p>Human Resources Officer Director of Research Support, Research & Innovation Disability and Learning Support Service Head of Teaching Enhancement Unit (TEU) Information Systems and Support Finance Office Registry Head of Civic Engagement, DCU in the Community Marketing Manager, Communications and Marketing International Office Library</p>
7	<p>Ms Bernadette Dowling Dr David Reynolds Dr Sandra O'Neill Dr Kieran Nolan Prof Enda McGlynn Dr Anne Parle-McDermott Dr Kay Maunsell</p>	<p>Acting Faculty Manager, Faculty of Science & Health School of Mathematical Sciences Head of School of Biotechnology Head of School of Chemical Sciences Head of School of Physical Sciences Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning, FSH (rep) School of Human Development Institute of Education</p>
8	<p>Dr Louise Hopper Dr Caroline Rawdon Mr Robbie Egan Ms Paula Maguire Mr Conor Mahon Dr Ronda Barron Dr Unai Diaz-Orueta Ms Paula Maguire</p>	<p>Research Staff, Academic Staff, SNHS Research Staff, SNHS PhD Student, SNHS PhD Student, SNHS PhD Student, SNHS Research Staff, SNHS Research Staff, SNHS PhD Student, SNHS</p>
9	<p>Open Forum</p>	<p>Mr Patrick Boylan Dr Mary Kelly Ms Therese Leufer Dr Catherine Corrigan Dr Lorraine Boran Dr Liz McLoughlin Dr Deirdre Corby Ms Orla O'Reilly</p>
10	<p>Mr Patrick Boylan Ms Anna Kimmins Ms Adele Keough Mr Patrick Doyle Ms Catherine Timmins</p>	<p>Senior Technical Officer-Psychology, SNHS Clinical Skills Nurse, SNHS Clinical Skills Nurse, SNHS Senior Technical Officer, SNHS Administration, Healthy Living Centre, SNHS</p>

	Ms Karen O'Connor Ms Siobhan Doherty Ms Dawn Clark	Administration, SNHS Administration, SNHS Administration, SNHS
11	Professor Teresa Burke Dr Patricia Johnson Dr Mary Rose Sweeney	School Research Committee, Professor of Psychology Postgraduate Research Co-ordinator Associate Dean for Research, FSH
11a	Mr Paul Smith	Head, International Office
12	Professor Anne Matthews	Head of School of Nursing and Human Sciences
13	Professor Brian MacCraith Professor Daire Keogh Professor Eithne Guilfoyle Professor Greg Hughes Dr Declan Raftery Professor Michelle Butler Professor Barry McMullin Ms Marian Burns Mr Ciaran McGivern	DCU President Deputy President Vice-President Academic Affairs (Registrar) Vice-President Research and Innovation Chief Operations Officer Dean of Faculty of Science & Health Dean of Faculty of Engineering & Computing Director of Human Resources Director of Finance
14	Professor Michelle Butler	Executive Dean, Faculty of Science & Health
14a	Dr Paul Buchanan Ms Joanne Cleary-Holdforth Dr Deirdre Corby Dr Mel Duffy Dr Simon Dunne Ms Sharon Farrell Dr Mary Farrelly Dr Liz Hartnett Dr Gerry Moore Dr Carla O'Neill Dr Mark Philbin Dr Sinead Smyth Prof Anthony Staines Dr Stella Vlachou	Representative group of staff from the School of Nursing and Human Sciences
15	Exit Presentation in HG23	All staff invited