PRG Report

Quality Review Institute of Leadership

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Name of Unit	Institute of Leadership					
Project Title						
Document Title	PRG Report on Quality Review of Institute of Leadership					
Document No.						
This Document Comprises	DCS	TOC	Text	List of Tables	List of Figures	No. of Appendices
	√	√	√	0	0	2

Rev	Status	Author(s)	Reviewed By	Approved By	Office of Origin	Issue Date
1	Final Draft	Dr. N. Ryan	PRG members	PRG Members	QEO	17 July 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

APPENDICES

1   Introduction and overview of Institute of Leadership

The Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI) Institute of Leadership (IoL) was established in 2005 and is responsible for providing leadership and management training for health professionals in Ireland and internationally. The Institute brought together various activities in this area into a single integrated provider of aligned programmes in healthcare management. Since its establishment the Institute has grown rapidly, with over 500 students currently registered on postgraduate programmes in leadership, management, quality, patient safety, education and organisational development, and a similar number taking short courses. The Institute is also engaged in consultancy and research in healthcare leadership and management, higher education and cognate fields.

1.1   Overview

The Mission Statement of the Institute of Leadership is as follows:

> *"We will improve human health by optimising patient-centered care through the development of the leadership, managerial and educational capacity of health professionals and their organisations. We will achieve this through education, training, research and consultancy"*

This derives from the Mission Statement (Noble Purpose) of the RCSI as a whole which is:

> "*Building on our heritage in surgery, we will enhance human health through endeavour, innovation and collaboration in education, research and service*"

The Institute's portfolio of activities consists of:

- Education to Certificate, Diploma, Postgraduate Diploma and Master's Degree in leadership, healthcare management, quality, patient safety, education and professional development.

- Short tailored programmes and workshops in such areas as healthcare leadership, management, communication, coaching, quality management, risk management, project management, incident management, audit management, information and knowledge management and professional development.

- Consultancy services in healthcare quality, risk, incident, audit, and knowledge & information management (*including solutions*).

- Applied research, using both qualitative and quantitative methodology, in management, leadership, patient safety, education, behavioural escalation and quality of life.

2 Context for Review

RCSI is an independent health sciences Higher Education Institution headquartered in Ireland encompassing Schools of Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Physiotherapy, Postgraduate Studies and Leadership with an international 'foot-print' in Ireland, Bahrain, Dubai, Jordan & Malaysia. RCSI is a Recognised College of the National University of Ireland and received independent degree warding powers in 2010 by order of the Minister of Education and Skills of Ireland. The advent of degree warding powers has brought RCSI into a national Quality Assurance / Quality Improvement structure administered by the National Qualifications Authority of Ireland (NQAI). In parallel with Institutional Reviews managed by NQAI on a four-year cycle, RCSI is required to conduct internal reviews of Schools and non-academic units on an on-going basis. This report is on the internal review of the Institute of Leadership.

2.1 Membership of the Review Group

Professor John Burgoyne, Professor of Management & Leadership, University of Lancaster, UK

Professor Niamh Moran, Molecular and Cellular Therapeutics, RCSI

Mr. Paul Murphy, Deputy Librarian, RCSI

Dr. Norma Ryan, Director Quality Promotion, University College Cork (Chair)

2.2 Terms of reference of the Review Group

The PRG was asked to review the Institute of Leadership under the following headings:

(a) Organisation and management of the School

- The activities within the School and how these are organised.
- Are appropriate and effective committee structures in place to support the School's activities?
- Are the aims and objectives of the School clearly articulated with agreed strategic goals?

(b) Staff and facilities

- Staff and qualifications
- Are academic and non-academic staff levels sufficient to execute the activities of the School?
- Is there a satisfactory balance between the teaching and research activities of staff within the School?
- Professional development and review: how are the professional needs of staff and the skill needs of the School identified?

 (c) Quality assurance

- Plans for improving the quality of all activities of the School.
- Strategies for achieving the aims of the School.

- The School's proposals for measuring its success in achieving its aims, with special reference to improving the quality of teaching and learning and enhancing the quality of research.

(d) Teaching, learning and feedback from stakeholders

- Are mechanisms in place for evaluation and feedback effective?
- Is there evidence to suggest that the School has responded to feedback?
- Are students represented on committees within the School?

(e) Curriculum development and review.

- Are there systems in place by which the curricula of programmes are developed and reviewed on a periodic basis? If so, are these systems adequate?
- Is there evidence to suggest that curriculum content is benchmarked against recent developments in teaching and learning, and research?
- Is there evidence of stakeholder (internal and external) involvement in the curriculum development and review process?

(f) Research Activity

(g) External Relations

2.3 CONDUCT OF THE REVIEW BY THE PRG

Prior to the Site Visit, members of the PRG were supplied with a Self-Assessment Report (SAR), together with Appendices, documenting a self-assessment by members of the IoL conducted prior to April 2012.

This document constitutes the Report of the PRG. A list of abbreviations is in Appendix 1. The PRG visited RCSI from 13 – 15 June 2012. During the site visit interviews were conducted with various Stakeholders; the schedule of meetings is provided in Appendix 2. In addition, additional information, not included in the SAR, was requested and supplied to the PRG. At the conclusion of the site visit, the Chair presented an oral report on the key commendations and principal recommendations for improvement, based on analysis of the SAR and the discussions held with stakeholders during the site visit.. This Report was not for discussion at that time and it was indicated that the final report would be more detailed.

The Review Report of the PRG was drafted during the site visit and finalised subsequent to the site visit by the PRG via email communications. All members of the PRG agreed the report before its submission.

3   Organisation and Management of the Unit

The PRG considered:

- The activities within the unit and how these are organised.

- Are there appropriate and effective committee structures in place to support the units' activities?

- Are the aims and objectives of the unit clearly articulated with agreed strategic goals?

- How well the unit fits with the strategic plans for the College as a whole

- Evidence of succession planning for the unit, where appropriate

3.1   Findings of the PRG

The SAR presented the activities of the IoL in a clear and concise manner.

The Institute's portfolio consists of:

- Education to Certificate, Diploma, Postgraduate Diploma and Master's Degree in leadership, healthcare management, quality, patient safety, education and professional development.

- Short tailored programmes and workshops in such areas as healthcare leadership, management, communication, coaching, quality management, risk management, project management, incident management, audit management, information and knowledge management and professional development.

- Consultancy services in healthcare quality, risk, incident, audit, and knowledge & information management (*including solutions*).

- Applied research, using both qualitative and quantitative methodology, in management, leadership, patient safety, education, behavioural escalation and quality of life.

The IoL clearly indicated the position of IoL within the organisational structure of RCSI. The Director of the IoL reports directly to the CEO of RCSI, unlike other Heads of academic units in RCSI who report to the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Life Sciences. The activities of the Institute are varied and diverse, in addition to being delivered in three countries with very different systems and cultures in place.

The IoL has put in place an efficient management system which ensures that all staff are both informed on and engaged with the activities of the Institute. This is not over burdensome on staff in that there are few committees – principally an academic affairs committee and an operations committee – which manage and oversee the delivery of the work of the IoL. There is a very significant

workload involved in the preparation of documents for accreditation bodies, both in Ireland and in countries overseas where IoL programmes are offered. This appears to be managed efficiently and the IoL is advised to continue to ensure that this aspect of work is appropriately recognised and accounted for in staff workload allocations.

A serious gap in the management and committee structures within the Institute is the lack of a research development strategy and a research committee. Research is fundamental to any academic unit in a modern higher education institution and the PRG recommends that all staff should be supported in undertaking research and that the Institute should develop a coherent research development plan aligned to the RCSI's research plan. This was a recommendation of the IoL in its SAR and the PRG endorses this. This will enable a more strategic approach to research, in line with that of the host institution, which should be encouraged to add research in leadership and healthcare management to the hard medical science ones they already have. It will need appropriate leadership, probably from one of the new appointments in prospect. It should build around the existing interests and activities of staff, probably to include health leadership, pedagogical issues associated with both face-to-face and virtual means of communication, and evaluation. In addition to the provision of support for staff studying for a PhD and for PhD students in general, the new appointments should be used in a balanced way to moderate the teaching load and create space for research time for all.

The aims and objectives of IoL are clearly articulated with agreed strategic goals in relation to identified students and needs. RCSI and IoL need to develop strategic goals around the overseas provision and, in addition, there is a need to articulate strategic goals in relation to research and knowledge dissemination.

The PRG was informed that RCSI has not published its strategy and PRG was not provided with a copy of the RCSI Strategic Plan. The PRG was informed that a new strategy is in the process of being agreed within the College. The initial strategy for the IoL was formulated to be aligned with the RCSI's Noble Purpose and with the conclusion of Project Catalyst. The PRG was strongly of the opinion that the Institute needs to develop a strategic plan following the development of the RSCI Plan and that research development should be included as a major activity in the plan.

The PRG noted that there is no evidence of succession planning. This is not in itself unusual in a higher education institution but it can leave an academic unit in a vulnerable position under certain circumstances.

The PRG considered the issue of workloads for academic staff members and considered that there is a need to put in place a workload distribution model. It is evident that there is none in place at the moment. The PRG requested and received details of the teaching load for each staff member. However all workload must be accounted for, especially if all staff are to be encouraged to undertake research activity.

The PRG found that the IoL keeps its own student records and that, while registration information on students is transferred to the central College system, there is no transfer of records with respect to completion of studies, level of grades, etc. The PRG deemed this to be a serious shortcoming and recommends that there is an urgent need to establish a system for the recording and transferring data to RCSI central record keeping systems, especially in relation to student results, retention, progression rates etc. Fees and registration data are correctly registered on QUERCUS but the final outcome for the student is not nor are graduates captured in any alumni databases. The PRG understood that this is an issue for the central management in RCSI and recommends that this is addressed as soon as is possible.

3.2   Commendations

The PRG observed and confirmed in meetings with stakeholders that the Institute continues to perform its activities efficiently when the Director is not on campus in Dublin.

Every module has a clearly defined coordinator and leaders on modules appear well–trained and aware of their responsibilities.

The efficient management system in place in IoL is efficient, with few committees and clear communications to all staff.

Academic committee and operations committees are in place and the evidence is that these are working well. Staff are well-informed of activities and there appears to be open communication among all staff.

3.3   Recommendations

1.   That RCSI and the IoL establish clear and efficient systems for transfer of all student data to the central administration system within RCSI.

2.   That IoL establishes a Research Committee as proposed in SAR.

3.   That IoL establishes and implements a workload distribution model

4.   Develop and agree a research strategy for IoL

5.   That RCSI review the structures of the reporting relationships of the IoL to RSCI and consider embedding the Institute within the Faculty of Medicine and Life Sciences as is the case for all other academic units in RCSI.

6.   That the workload in preparing documentation for the accreditations is appropriately recognised and accounted for in staff workload allocations.

4   Staff and Facilities

The PRG considered:

- Staff and Qualifications

- Are academic and non academic staff levels sufficient to execute the activities of the unit?

- Is there a satisfactory balance between the teaching and research activities of staff within the unit?

- Professional Development and Review. How are the professional needs of staff and the skill needs of the unit identified?

4.1   Findings of the PRG

The PRG was provided with evidence that many of the staff appear to be recruited and trained in house. A shift towards the hiring for new staff should include some with existing qualifications, as already planned and stated in the SAR.

All staff of the Institute are an outstanding resource. Their enthusiasm and commitment to the IoL is evident in their course design and delivery and supports offered to students. This was attested to by both students and clients alike. Most deliver courses across 3 campuses. They are using new platforms /technologies in addition to face to face activity to deliver their programmes. They make good use of peer mentoring. Their content is current. Action learning projects are examples of how they adopt new approaches to teaching. All stakeholders speak highly of the courses.

All staff are multi-skilled and independent with respect to technical abilities for online course delivery. Many staff are trained in-house. Additional needs are sourced in the form of associate staff. Approximately one-third of all modules are delivered by associate staff.

The PRG did hear some evidence that perhaps more opportunities could be provided for all academic staff to contribute to the overall activities and direction of the IoL in terms of planning for the future.

The administrative staff providing IT support, help-desk, registration, personal interaction with students, etc provide an integrated hub for IoL students and the quality of their work is very well appreciated and valued by the IoL.

Evidence was provided to the PRG that there is no strategic purpose or mapping behind the existing happenings in terms of the balance between teaching and research for academic staff. This needs to change and be developed. Staff appear to be have a heavy workload (though none specifically articulated this) and a re-balancing of load between teaching, research and administration needs to be done to ensure all staff have access to promotional opportunities etc. The PRG would suggest that the proposed research should allow them to excel and innovate in their teaching. Open competition for the appointment of new staff in appropriate areas should enhance this activity.

A workload modelling approach is needed to allow protected research time for all academic staff. Training and facilitation will be required to help those who have not been actively involved in research for some time.

There was some lack of evidence of professional development, although staff said that they were self trained in areas where they needed to develop course work. There seemed to be a lack of awareness by staff of promotional requirements or opportunities. There seems to be a lack of awareness of the need for staff development to a higher level. The PRG observed no sense of directional leadership for early career staff, who need to be engaged in research activity to facilitate their growth.

The PRG also considered what is / is not in place for staff development for associate faculty. It is clear that there is a lack of formal processes to support Teaching & Learning in RCSI in general, not just in IoL. However it was very evident to the PRG that students are very appreciative of the teaching and learning support offered by academic staff and, while it would be valuable to establish more formal supports for teaching and learning in RCSI, this does not appear to be an issue of concern for staff in IoL.

The standard of the facilities of IoL is good, but staff commented on the fact that the quality of the facilities was not quite of a standard that would encourage "top-end" applicants for their courses. In addition, they felt they needed additional classroom facilities. The location in Sandyford, and its relative isolation, allowed for the class-groups to build relationships that helped them work well together. The PRG found no serious shortcomings nor did students or clients comment negatively on the facilities.

4.2 Commendations

The staff are an outstanding resource. Their enthusiasm and commitment to excellence in all activities, including the overseas campuses and programmes, is evident in their course design and delivery. This was attested to by both students and clients alike.

The PRG commends the plans of the IoL to develop a targeted research strategy as detailed in the SAR pg 32.

4.3 Recommendations

1. That IoL should target future hires towards needs in specified existing programmes before extending expertise in new areas.

2. That IoL should campaign to make their research interests more evident in the RCSI research strategy. In addition IoL needs to strategically map its proposed research to support and innovate in the areas of teaching in which it is involved.

3. That RCSI should consider the establishment of a central support structure to support discussions in pedagogy, in curriculum design, in assessment, etc. serving all academic staff of the College.

4. That IoL should use a workload modelling approach which will allow protected research time for staff.

5. That IoL consider the training and facilitation that will be required to help those members of staff who have not been actively involved in research for some time.

5   Quality Assurance

The PRG considered:

- The plans for improving the quality of all activities of the unit.

- The strategies for achieving these aims.

- The units proposals for measuring its success in achieving its aims with special reference to improving the quality of teaching and learning and enhancing the quality of research.

5.1   Findings of the PRG

The RCSI has adopted and embedded the approach to quality assurance of all its activities in line with the Irish Universities and as mandated by the *Irish Universities Act 1997*. The Institute of Leadership has embraced the principles and has fully engaged with them in their practices. The PRG welcomed the evidence of the commitment to improvement of quality in all activities.

It is notable that most of the programmes and courses offered by the IoL in both Ireland and in overseas locations (principally Bahrain, Dubai), require external accreditation by the relevant bodies in the jurisdictions. The Institute has been successful in achieving the accreditations and the process of doing so has contributed to very specific and integrated quality assurance processes operational in the IoL. It is evident that there are continuous cycles of reflection on teaching and learning activities across all aspects of the IoL's delivery and that amendments and improvements to curricula and delivery occur as a consequence. The PRG commends this approach and evidence of commitment to enhancement of all activities.

All staff of the institute are aware of their responsibilities in this regard and work actively to implement the procedures. It is notable that the unit is actively considering the implementation of the EFQM framework[1] which would include the integration of Institute staff performance management systems.

An area of activity which could be improved within the Institute is the collection and recording of data on the students, their records of achievements and the outcomes of their periods of study. This was discussed earlier in this Report. The PRG was informed that the RCSI student record system, QUERCUS, was not updated with information on the results of the IoL students' achievements in their programmes. Nor was data available on the retention and progression data for IoL students. This is a significant gap that must be closed. Students taking IoL courses are entered onto the QUERCUS system but the data is not updated as students progress so the RCSI is not able to incorporate the data into institution-wide analysis. Lack of availability of this data at the central level within RCSI further hinders the building of a College database with details of alumni. There is a risk in the absence of such data available to the institution of the student record being lost over time.

---

[1] EFQM: WWW.EFQM.org

5.2   Commendations

The PRG commends the IoL for the very systematic and effective feedback systems used to gather views from students on the quality and efficacy of courses. The PRG received evidence of the embedded nature of this activity across all modules and courses delivered. The consideration of and incorporation of the feedback into planning for future courses was very evident and an example of good practice that provides a model for other units within and external to RCSI.

The PRG observed many instances of good/best practice in IoL that could/should be mirrored in RCSI.

5.3   Recommendations

1. That IoL implements the recommendation in the SAR to appoint a Director of Quality and Accreditation to coordinate all quality and accreditation issues across all bases of Institute activity and to liaise with the Director QE and the QE Office on an on-going basis.

2. That the Institute undertake a formal SWOT analysis of all its activities.

3. That RCSI ensure that the student record for all students, including those taking programmes and short courses offered by IoL is complete and correct.

6   Teaching, Learning and Feedback from Stakeholders

The PRG considered:

- Are the mechanisms in place for evaluation and feedback effective?

- Is there evidence to suggest that the unit has responded to feedback?

- Are students represented on committees within the unit?

6.1   Findings of the PRG

The PRG was provided with evidence that mechanisms are in place for evaluation and feedback and that these appear to be effective. That PRG commented that these mechanisms appear to be from reaction data, and this could be taken further down the Kirkpatrick[2] chain with additional benefit to IoL. The Kirkpatrick chain deals with a chain of effect levels from a learning event: reaction (enjoyment etc.), learning, behaviour change, and organisational or other performance benefit. Evaluating further down the chain is increasingly difficult but more worthwhile.

There is clear evidence that IoL has responded to feedback received with good effect. The PRG found that this is very systematic and were provided with evidence that all feedback is formally considered within IoL and that actions are taken to deliver improvement on any weaknesses discovered.   Examples were given demonstrating rapid responses and actions taken as a consequence of receiving feedback indicating an issue to be addressed.

Students are represented on some committees within IoL. However the generality and coverage of this should be reviewed, including the involvement of overseas students using appropriate virtual mechanisms.

6.2   Commendations

The PRG commends highly the very effective and thorough consideration and review of all feedback provided by students and external stakeholders. There was significant evidence of a willingness and ability of IoL to respond effectively to feedback from learners and other stakeholders and to adapt accordingly. Examples of this include the DCU/RCSI partnership with Beaumont Hospital; and the delivery of training the trainers type programmes to consultants in UCD.

The PRG commends the quality of teaching and the attention to the quality of the student experience.

---

[2] Kirkpatrick D L (1996), 'Great ideas revisited: revisiting Kirkpatrick's four-level model', *Training and Development*, Vol. 50 (1), January, pp. 54-57

6.3   Recommendations

1. That IoL formalises the involvement of students, including students located in overseas campuses, in the committees of IoL, as appropriate.

7   Curriculum Development and Review

The PRG considered:

- Are there systems in place by which the curricula of programmes are developed and reviewed on a periodic basis? Are these systems adequate?

- Is there evidence to suggest that curriculum content is benchmarked against recent developments in teaching and learning, and research?

- Is there evidence of stakeholder (internal and external) involvement in the curriculum development and review process?

7.1   Findings of the PRG

IoL provided evidence of systematic review and development of curricula on an on-going basis. Curricula are considered on a very regular basis and usually as issues arise and/or feedback is received. The consideration of the feedback received from students is a core part of this on-going review and is to be commended. This feedback is used both in correction of immediate difficulties arising during a programme and for planning for the future. As and if the unit grows it will need to systemise its good practice and align these/lead good practice in RCSI.

There is evidence to suggest that curriculum content is benchmarked against recent developments in teaching and learning, and research. The action learning engaged in by IoL provides a mechanism for increasing the level of research activity by staff and students. Participants in action-learning projects have the potential to serve as a rich data bank for research. The IoL has the potential and opportunity to push the frontiers from research-led teaching to teaching-led research, with significant opportunities for publication in international journals.

The PRG noted that curriculum descriptions should include pedagogy as well as content. Strictly speaking curriculum means this. The self assessment document is pretty well entirely syllabus in terms of a description of contents rather than a comprehensive discussion of curriculum.

As written in the SAR there is a lot of material on content rather than on pedagogical processes. The IoL is to be commended for the mix of use of new technologies, including virtual learning environments, action learning, group and team work. The Institute is using modern and up to date information and techniques and this should be reflected in descriptions of programmes.

The IoL need to take a more rounded view of stakeholders than the ones the PRG was introduced to, good and appropriate as they were. Stakeholders should include competitors, clients, corporate and individual, suppliers (associate teachers for instance), the host organisation, national and international institutions, the broader institutional context, etc.

PRG noted a lot of the short courses offered by IoL are bespoke. This is an issue for the Institute with small staff numbers and a large number of offerings. The approach is largely Montague Burton, i.e. perming existing modules rather than Saville Row, uniquely constructed in each case. This is good

and to be commended. The modules have been field tested and this is more resource efficient. Saville Row should be use for high price projects that generate new modules for future use, thus the initial clients fund the Research and Development.

7.2 Commendations

The efficient use of resources, including teachers and course provision, in the delivery of courses.

7.3 Recommendations

1. That IoL continue to monitor closely the provision of additional courses, and in particular, bespoke courses, to ensure that staff are not over-stretched.

2. That IoL ensure all course descriptions for all courses provided, including short courses, are detailed and available to all potential learners in an easily accessible form such as the internet.

8   Research Activity

There is evidence of some research activity, inspired by local experiences. Past rather than current interests appear to have had an influence on development of research in some areas, not all of which are related to current activity.

The PRG observed the opportunity for the IoL in the potential for development of research into pedagogies, into new and existing teaching areas. This possibility has already been discussed earlier.

There is a need to identify new prioritisation areas for research, for example, healthcare management in Ireland, evaluation down the Kirkpatrick chain and for more stakeholders. References to further evaluation models can be found in Appendix B. IoL recognises the need to align research output with the strategic aims of the Institute.

Research, to date, in the Institute, has largely been as a result of the interests of the individual members of staff who have been research active and this is summarised in the SAR. While this research output has been broadly aligned with the strategic aims of the Institute, the PRG was informed that IoL plans that future research will be based on a more coherent strategic approach. Notwithstanding this, research funding in the area of leadership, management and education in healthcare is sparse and the Institute has been focused on tendering for work that involves primarily the delivery of services but which might also be structured in such a manner as to generate research outcomes.

Despite the challenges, however, most Institute staff have been active in generating research to some degree. The policy within IoL is that teaching staff are expected to undertake research except where it is agreed with the Director of the Institute that their other contributions are more important in advancing the Mission of the Institute. This approach is highly commended by the PRG.

IoL plans to establish a Research Committee with the following goals:

1. To develop the structures, policies and procedures to support and collate research in the Institute.
2. To develop expertise in obtaining research funding.
3. To formulate a programme of research in a number of key areas: patient safety, quality and risk, evaluation of education and training in healthcare, academic entrepreneurship, cyber psychology, psychological capital and organisational development.
4. To ensure that the outcomes of all research activities contribute to strengthening the educational activities of the Institute.
5. To demonstrate public accountability and transparency by ensuring that the Institute's services continue to be evidence-based and in line with current best practices.

The goals of the research Committee will be as follows:

1. To develop a culture of research in the Institute and to develop a research strategy.
2. To profile and record research and evaluation activities across the Institute.
3. To promote research publication among students and staff.
4. To ensure research and evaluation outcomes permeate all functions of the Institute including, academic and training courses, psychometrics and consultancy.

5. To disseminate research findings.
6. To conduct an annual review and report of research activities.

8.1   Commendations

The PRG commends:

the extent to which staff are enabled and facilitated to study for PhD degrees. This is very positive and it is hoped that staff will continue the research following graduation with PhD.

the plans for development of research and focus as briefly outlined above and provided in some more detail in the SAR.

the inclusiveness of the activities detailed on page 32 of the SAR.

the campaign to have IoL areas of research interest more evident in the RCSI research strategy

8.2   Recommendations

1. That IoL establishes a Research Committee as proposed in SAR and indicated above.

2. That IoL develops a research strategy for the Institute aligned with the strategy of RCSI.

3. That IoL supports all academic staff in the development and enhancement of research activity, either in the discipline or in pedagogy.

9 External Relations

9.1 Findings of the PRG

The Institute's relations with external bodies are notable for the range and diversity of those external clients. IoL has delivered short course training and development programmes to a varied range of organizations in Ireland and overseas, including many outside the healthcare sector. Course offerings to Beaumont Hospital, the Irish Hospice Foundation, the Bahrain Defence Forces and the Supreme Council of Health in Qatar are well regarded by the commissioning clients.

Service teaching delivered within RCSI to the Schools of Pharmacy and Physiotherapy was also well regarded.

9.2 Commendations

There is a dedicated staff role committed to networking and building relationships with key players in the Irish healthcare sector.

Institute staff have established significant networks within healthcare bodies in the Gulf region and have collaborated in this endeavour with RCSI alumni.

Many clients commended the professionalism of the staff of the Institute in the design, customization and delivery of programmes.

There is an efficient use of limited resources in delivering a diversity of courses.

9.3 Recommendations

The strategic and market rationale behind the range of external clients evident was not clear and some relationships appear to be derived from legacy and opportunistic circumstances – some clarity and policy making is required.

10 Support Services

10.1 Findings of the PRG

The self-assessment review identified that the Institute's engagement with central support services occurred primary on a needs basis to date. It had been necessary to develop independent innovative solutions in situations where central RCSI services were not configured in the past to support the particular needs of the Institute. It is evident from the contributions of a range of central RCSI support services to the Project Review Group that there is a growing awareness of the needs of the Institute and that Institute's own innovative solutions to common operational issues can inform further improvement in central services.

In Finance matters, it is evident that the Institute is well aligned with central procedures and requirements in both expenditure and income, including fees handling. Human Resources now has the capacity to sustain the needs of the Institute with respect to both core staff and to adjunct faculty and occasional staff and also to support Performance Reviews. Estates have successfully provided various adaptations and upgrades to facilities. Both Information Technology and Library services are willing to explore greater degrees of collaboration. The restructuring of central Student Registry and Examinations will enable the Institute to align more closely with these services. The Institute has continually collaborated with RCSI Travel to optimize best value flexibilities for its increasing overseas travel needs. Communications has a continuing role in supporting the Institute's existing marketing and promotional strategies.

10.2 Commendations

The Institute has been innovative in developing its own support services to facilitate its rapid expansion.

The Institute's staff have upskilled themselves to facilitate new modalities of online teaching and support.

The Institute's team has successfully developed a culture of self-reliance in delivering a range of supports commensurate with its activities and operations to date.

The Institute has demonstrated a significant capacity to develop, implement and support digital learning environments and administrative applications successfully based on open source platforms.

There is a expressed perception among support staff that the Institute is very professional and focussed in operational matters.

Willingness was expressed by all in committing to improve the quality of collaboration between and within all support services interacting with the Institute.

10.3 Recommendations

1. That complete data from Institute students should populate the student records system, QUERCUS, to provide central access to data on examination performance, progression and retention and to provide the basis for improved analytics and reporting.

2. That progress towards a greater degree of convergence and alignment is desirable by leveraging the capacity of central services to better support Institute operations.

3. That flexibilities must be retained to enable the Institute to respond speedily to opportunities emerging in the areas of its activities.

11 Appendix A.

Peer Review Group Visit, Wednesday 13ᵗʰ June - Friday 15ᵗʰ June 2012

Evening prior to site visit 12ᵗʰ June 2012			
Time	Meeting	Venue	Attendees
18.30	Private planning meeting for members of the Peer Review Group (PRG)	RCSI	PRG
19.30	Dinner		PRG; Director of Quality

Day 1 Wednesday 13ᵗʰ June 2012				
Time	Meeting	Venue	Attendees	
09.00 - 09.30	Convening of PRG		PRG	
09.30 - 09.45	Meeting with Head of Unit	Sandyford	PRG; Head of Unit; QEO	
09.45 - 10.15	Meeting with Head of Unit and Unit Staff *(Photo of PRG and Unit Staff)*	Sandyford	PRG; Unit Staff	
10.15 - 10.45	Tea / coffee. Private meeting time for PRG.		PRG	
10.45 - 13.00	Time allowed for private meetings of members of the PRG with unit staff.	Sandyford (incl. GTM to overseas staff)	PRG; Parallel sessions with staff - Team 1 Dr. N Ryan Mr P Murphy	PRG; Parallel sessions with staff - Team 2 Professor J Burgoyne Professor N Moran
			Ciaran O'Boyle	Pauline Joyce
			Dermot O'Flynn	Luke Feeney

Day 1 Wednesday 13th June 2012				
Time	Meeting	Venue	Attendees	
			Ronald John	
			Suzanne Macleod	Niamh Carroll
			Theresa Keane	Steve Pitman
			Sibeal Carolan	Siobhan McCarthy
			Mylin Araujo	
13.00 - 14.30	Lunch and private meeting time for PRG	China Sichuan	PRG	
14.30 - 15.00	Visit to core facilities of the unit	Sandyford	PRG	
15.00 – 15.40	Meeting - Current Students based in Dublin	Sandyford	PRG; Ms. Zena Moore, LHPE; Ms Anne-Marie McQuillan, LMD; Mr. Paddy Clerkin, OCLD; Ms. Ciara Ryan, CEO IGSP; Mr. Michael Lally	
15.45 – 16.45	Meeting - Current Students based overseas (by teleconference)	Sandyford Teleconferences	PRG; Ms Hanadi Al Salmi, MSc Quality & Safety, Yr 1, Dubai; Ms Marie Ibrahim, MSc Healthcare Management, Yr 1, Dubai; Ms. Sara Farooq, MSc Quality & Safety, Yr 1, Bahrain;	

Day 1 Wednesday 13th June 2012			
Time	Meeting	Venue	Attendees
			Dr. Mohammed Almarri, MSc Healthcare Management, Yr 2, Bahrain
			Ms Hiba Sharif, MSc Heathcare Management, Yr 1, Bahrain
16.45 – 17.15	Private meeting time for PRG	Sandyford	PRG
17.15 – 17.45	Meeting with Head of Unit and Director of Quality Enhancement	Sandyford	PRG; Prof. Ciaran O'Boyle;

Day 2 Thursday 14th June 2012				
Time	Meeting	Venue	Attendees	
09.00 - 09.30	Private meeting time for PRG	Sir Thomas Myles Room	PRG	
09.30 - 10.30	Meeting - RCSI Support Services	Sir Thomas Myles Room & Robert Smith Room	PRG & RDM2A **Thomas Myles** Team 1 Dr. N Ryan Mr P Murphy	PRG & RDM2B **Robert Smith** Team 2 Prof J Burgoyne Prof N Moran
			Padraig Barry; Roisin Bradley; Niamh Burdett; John May; Clare Boyle; Tomas Zemko	Louise Sherwin; Kate Kelly; Judith Gilroy; Martin Barron; Prof Kevin Nolan
10.30 - 11.00	Meeting with Senior Management	Sir Thomas Myles Room	PRG; Terry McWade, Deputy CEO	

Day 2 Thursday 14th June 2012				
Time	Meeting	Venue	Attendees	
11.00 - 11.30	Tea / coffee. Private meeting time for PRG.	Sir Thomas Myles Room	PRG	
11.30 - 12.30	Meeting – External Clients	Sir Thomas Myles Room	PRG Mr. Fintan Foy. CEO, College of Anaesthetists in Ireland; Ms. Anne McNeely. Deputy CEO, Beaumont Hospital	
12.30 – 12.45	Meeting – External Clients	RCSI Teleconference	Ms. Huda Al Katheeri, Supreme Council of Health, Qatar;	
12.45 – 13.00	Meeting – External Clients	RCSI Teleconference	Ms. Gada Amin, Consultancy & Training, Bahrain Defence Forces, Bahrain	
12.30 - 14.00	Lunch and private meeting time for PRG	Sir Thomas Myles Room	PRG	
14.00 - 15.15	Meeting – Academic Staff RCSI/ Associate Faculty	Sir Thomas Myles Room	**Sir Thomas Myles Room** PRG Team 1 Dr. N Ryan Mr P Murphy Dr James Barlow, RCSI School of Pharmacy; Ms Orla Keegan, Irish Hospice Foundation; Dr. Helen French, Physiotherapy	**Robert Smith Room** PRG Team 2 Prof J Burgoyne Prof N Moran Dr. John MacMackin, DCU; Denis Murphy, Dublin Dental University Hospital; Colm Foster, UCD
15.15 - 16.30	Private meeting time for PRG	Sir Thomas Myles Room	PRG	
16.30 - 17.00	Meeting with Head of Unit	Sir Thomas Myles Room	PRG; Prof C. O'Boyle;	

Day 3 Friday 15th June 2012			
Time	Meeting	Venue	Attendees
08.45 - 09.15	Private meeting time for PRG		PRG
09.15 - 09.45	Private meeting of members of the PRG with unit staff	Sandyford	PRG; Dearbhla Casey; Seamus O'Boyle
09.45 - 10.00	Meeting – Alumni	Sandyford (Video conference)	Dr. Sawson Al Mahdi, Healthcare Management, Dubai Sehar Shah, Quality & Safety, Dubai
10.00 – 10.30	Meeting – Alumni	Sandyford	Vincent McDonagh, Dept of Anatomy, RCSI Emeka Okereke, Mgr in Dept of Surgical Affairs, College of Surgeons, Ireland
10.30 - 11.45	Tea / coffee. Private meeting time for PRG. Preparation of exit presentation.		PRG
11.45 - 12.00	Private meeting with QEO	Sandyford	PRG; QEO
12.00 - 12.20	Meeting with Head of Unit	Sandyford	PRG; Head of Unit
12.20 - 12.40	Exit presentation to all unit staff made by chair of PRG, Dr. N. Ryan	Sandyford	PRG; Unit Staff, QEO
12.40	Review ends.	Sandyford	PRG

12 **Appendix B**

<u>Evaluation Models</u>

1. Kirkpatrick D L (1996), 'Great ideas revisited: revisiting Kirkpatrick's four-level model', *Training and Development*, Vol. 50 (1), January, pp. 54-57

2. Patton, M. Q. (1978). <u>Utilisation Focused Evaluation</u>. Beverly Hills, California, Sage. Presents evaluation as a client centred practice,

3. Burgoyne, J. G. (1994). Stakeholder Analysis. <u>Qualitative Methods in Organizational and Occupational Psychology</u>. C. Cassell, and Symon, G. London, Sage. Considers that there are multiple stakeholders that each have their Kirkpatrick chain, and desired outcomes that may be compatible or in conflict.

4. Burgoyne, J. G., & Jackson, B. (1997). The Arena Thesis. <u>Management Learning: Integrating Perspectives in Theory and Practice</u>. J. G. Burgoyne, & Reynolds, M. London, Sage. Presents development activities as arenas in which multiple stakeholder interests are sorted out.