

PROCEDURES FOR FOLLOW UP (SEPTEMBER 2010)

In view of some difficulties in carrying out the procedures of Section 1.3 in *Quality Review Guidelines (Revised September 2009)*, particularly in obtaining a Quality Implementation Plan (QIP) for publication on the web, the following clarification was accepted by the Quality Promotion Sub-Committee (QPSC) at meetings on 4 June and 3 September 2010.

When the Peer Review Report (PRR) is sent to the Head in charge of the unit under review, a request will be made that the unit start preparing a draft QIP by grouping the recommendations of the PRR under three main headings:

- i. Recommendations which the unit could implement unaided
- ii. Recommendations which the unit could implement only with assistance from other bodies within the University and without cost implications
- iii. Recommendations which the unit could implement only if additional resources are provided by the University

In the case of each recommendation, the unit should make a response to include statements concerning some or all of the following:

1. whether or not the recommendation has already been implemented since the Peer Review Visit;
2. if the recommendation has been implemented, what actions were taken by the unit or other bodies to achieve implementation, and what resources and costs were involved;
3. if the recommendation has not been implemented, whether or not it has been decided to try to implement the recommendation;
4. in the case of a recommendations which it is hoped will be implemented
 - i. what actions are required, by the unit or other bodies, in order that the recommendation be implemented;
 - ii. what resources might be required, including an indication of the level of capital or recurrent expenditure involved;
 - iii. what the proposed timeframe is for the actions required to implement the recommendation;
5. if it has been decided not to implement the recommendation, what the reasons are for this decision.

It is intended that many of the recommendations which require significant additional resources should be listed in the Annual Report of the QPSC and referred to the Planning, Development and Finance Committee for consideration on an annual basis.

In addition to the detailed responses to each recommendation, the unit may, if it so wishes, make a general response to the Peer Review Report, for inclusion as an Appendix to the draft QIP.

The draft QIP will be submitted to the QPSC by the Head of the unit within one month of receiving the PRR. All members of the QPSC will be invited to submit comments on the draft QIP within one week to the Secretary of the QPSC. The comments will be reviewed and collated by a sub-committee of the QPSC consisting of the Internal Reviewer(s) and the Director of Quality. The Director of Quality, on behalf of the sub-committee, may liaise with the Head of the unit concerning the appropriateness of some of the unit's responses to the recommendations in the PRR.

The original or amended draft QIP along with the comments of the sub-committee will then be sent by the Director of Quality to (a) the QPSC members, for noting, and (b) the President and Head of the unit. The Head of the unit will contact the President's Office to arrange a meeting with the President, within a period of three weeks, to discuss the draft QIP. This meeting will result in an agreed and co-signed document, which will be known as the QIP. This document will be forwarded by the President's Office to the Secretary of the QPSC for publication on the web, along with the PRR, and for noting by the QPSC as the formal end of the participation by the QPSC in the quality review process.

The Director of Quality will collate the recommendations which can be implemented only with assistance from other bodies in the University whether or not they have direct cost implications for the University (the second and third of the groupings of the recommendations as described above). These recommendations, along with the responses of the unit as they appear in the document agreed with the President, will then be forwarded to the Senior Officers and any other relevant bodies that are not directly represented in the Senior Officers group, so that the recommendations can be given due consideration by the appropriate body of the University. If it is possible to forward at the same time the recommendations and responses relating to several units without causing undue delays, then

the Director will do so, but in any case the Director will keep the Head of the unit informed at all stages of the process.

The QPSC Annual Report to the Planning, Development and Finance Committee and the Governing Authority will note the Reviews that have been formally closed off, and list the recommendations which require significant additional resources.