

Report Template to be considered in Conjunction with School Review Procedures

SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION REPORT [SERIAL NO.]

[NAME OF TU DUBLIN SCHOOL FOR REVIEW]

DATE OF PANEL VISIT: [MONTH/DATES/YEAR]

Approved by Academic Council

1 December 2021

Academic Affairs
[Location Address]
[Tel.:]
[Homepage on TU Website]
[Email Address]

Guidelines for using the SSER Template:

This template is to be used for School Self-Evaluation Report (SSER). The working template will be obtained at [Academic Quality Office Homepage].

The SER will typically consist of the following sections:

Preamble

(i) Membership of School Review Coordination Committee

[Listing of all committee members beginning with the Chair and Secretary/Rapporteur]

[Members in any other significant roles to the SSER may also be specifically highlighted]

(ii) Outline of Self-Evaluation Report Methodology

Abridged description of the process to SSER, including (among others):

- Key tasks and task allocations.
- Coordination meetings.
- Internal and external consultation processes.

Table of Contents

1. Background and context of the School in review.
2. Quality framework, supporting sustainable Quality Assurance, Quality Enhancement
3. Organisation and Management of School within the University Governance structure
4. Staff Profiles
5. Facilities and Services Appraisal
6. Teaching, Learning, and Assessment strategies including structured-learning and co-and extra curricula events contributing to *Transformative Student Experience*.

Student Experience¹ is primarily the nature of the engagement of students with learning and teaching and is fundamental to assessing quality in higher education. It encapsulates other aspects that impinge on learning such as (among others); student lifestyle and extracurricular activities, academic advice, support and mentoring, and work experiences. Embedding excellence in TU Dublin Quality Enhancement Framework is intended to establish a unique brand-identity for improvement of student experience and effectiveness of engagement towards *Service Excellence* as an operational standard.

7. Embedded research activity with focus on KPIs at Strategic Level in contribution to pan-University Research Excellence tracks.
8. Strategy for Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity (EDI).
9. Teaching and Learning Support Services.
10. Collaborative/Linked Educational Provisions.
11. External Partnerships (Industry links, civic and community engagement, Internationalisation).

¹ Harvey L. 2004–20. [Analytic Quality Glossary; Student Experience](#). (Quality Research International; Accessed February 7, 2021).

12. SWOT Analysis, Recommendations for Improvement and Quality Enhancement Plan.
13. Relevant Appendices.

Special Note:

A general guide is that sections 1-10 of the SSER shall not be more than 50 pages. Therefore, the detailed narratives and supporting contents must be succinct, but where necessary, provide pointers to any other supporting evidence/resources, e.g., on website or electronic document portfolios as appropriate. Specific content requirements to each of the above sections are summarised below.

1. Background and Context of the School in Review

This section should describe the School's position within the University, and its role and responsibilities in relation to achieving the University Vision, Mission and Strategic Plan, specifically in relation to Education (teaching, learning and curriculum development), Engagement, and the Research and Innovation. Contexts of the School in review to the overall University are drawn; viz., programmes on offer and research activity undertaken, any innovative teaching and learning processes deployed, key national system objectives addressed, highlights of key developmental milestones, etc. The School Strategy should be presented and alignment to the University and Faculty Strategies evidenced.

(Among others) Aims of this section are:

- 1.1 Highlighting how the School addresses and contributes to the current University Strategic Plan.
- 1.2 Evaluation of how school manages its portfolio of programmes.
- 1.3 Evaluation of the School's strategy and interlink between current position and future perspective.
- 1.4 Highlighting of any key characteristics, particularly any sectoral strengths that define the School or inherent discipline(s).
- 1.5 Identification of factors that may have restricted or are likely to restrict success within the School remit.
- 1.6 Highlighting and evaluating potential impacts of any contextual risks.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- Do the School strategies, policies and procedures align with the overall University strategic plan, policies and guidelines? For example, what is the scope of programmes on offer within the University programmes remit of NFQ Level 6 to Level 10?
- Do the School's underpinning strategies for teaching, learning and research complement each other?
- Are there any identified strengths and/or weaknesses that require remediation?

2. Quality Framework, supporting sustainable quality assurance and quality enhancement

This section should describe the School's approach to identifying and managing opportunities for quality enhancement pertaining to teaching and learning, and research activities within its remit.

(Among others) Aims of this section are to:

- 2.1 Articulate the School's approach to quality assurance matching the award standards of its programme delivery and research, e.g., internal governance committees such as the Discipline Programme Board, oversight of assessment and exam processes etc.
- 2.2 Evaluation of the effectiveness of current monitoring processes, e.g., from external examiners reports.
- 2.3 Articulate the School's approach to quality enhancement within its operations and also highlight any elements with potential for adoption/replication by other Schools in the University.
- 2.4 Outline the School's role/participation in both university-wide and School-specific quality enhancement initiatives.
- 2.5 Outline how the School manages requirements in programme/course in the overall TU Quality framework and provisions for quality enhancement.
- 2.6 Outline implementation and assurance of EDI in the school.
- 2.7 Identify any support roles that may be required from the AQO.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- Are the monitoring processes applied consistently across the School?
- Are external examiner reports adequately discussed and acted upon?
- Are the monitoring processes adequately supported at School level and AQO level?
- Are the quality assurance and quality enhancement policies and reports effective? Are there issues for their overall improvement or in the School contexts?

3. Organisation and Management of School

This section describes the School organisation and management of its designated programmes and functions, including their contribution to the Faculty and broader University system and provisions². Pertinent highlights shall include: workload assignment and performance metrics; oversight of adherence to QA-QE policy guidelines and procedures; communication with staff and between the staff and students; communication with Academic Affairs; intra and extra-Faculty functional relationships and relationship with other University administrative and service units.

(Among others) Aims of this section are:

- 3.1 Evaluating effectiveness of internal organisation and any formal and informal structures therein that could be enhanced.
- 3.2 Evaluating internal links and external interaction with similar Schools/Faculties and the supporting University Professional Services structures.
- 3.3 Assessing School performance in the context of its own School Strategic Plan and the contribution to Faculty Strategy and the overarching University Strategic Plan.
- 3.4 Evaluate compliance with Athena SWAN principles relating to organisation and management related to staff deployment and workload.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

² The organisation structure may be best described using clear organisational chart/organogram, indicating designated positions/roles within the School, reporting/responsibility arrangements and information sharing/flow.

- What is the organisation structure and are staff roles/functions clearly understood?
- Are structured information sharing/planning forums active or being implemented?
- Are there any overlapping roles? If so, are these complementary or competitive, therefore could incur oversight risk of any important School functions?
- Are there any roles and responsibility of students/student representatives in school management? If so, do they receive training to ensure effectiveness in such roles?
- Is there any identifiable scope for improvement?
- How are the [10 Athena SWAN Charter principles](#) being implemented or taken into consideration in the management of the School? Specifically how are Principles 2 (We commit to advancing gender equality in academia, in particular, addressing the loss of women across the career pipeline and the absence of women from senior academic, professional and support roles); and Principle 9 (We commit to making and mainstreaming sustainable structural and cultural changes to advance gender equality, recognising that initiatives and actions that support individuals alone will not sufficiently advance equality) being implemented and/or considered as part of the management of the School?
- Is the workload allocation fair and transparent and how is the potential for bias monitored and addressed within such models (e.g., discrimination that results from the skewed allocation of types of work not strongly associated with promotion)?

4. Staff Profiles

The SSER should contain synoptic profiles of academic, technical and administrative staff in the School under review³. It should define the School's strategy/approach to systematic identification and support of professional development needs of both technical and academic staff⁴.

(Among others) Aims of this section are:

- 4.1 To determine adequacy of staffing and resources to serve core School functions.
- 4.2 To determine the Schools contribution to TU Dublin Strategic Plan towards full transformation in the short-term and sustaining progress in the medium to long-term.
- 4.3 To determine availability and adequacy of staff training.
- 4.4 Review efficacy in resources allocation and use and identify any scope for improvement.
- 4.5 Explore ways in which staff development could be enhanced, especially considering any rapid changes in respect of technology enabled/enhanced teaching, learning and research, and requirement for EDI literacy.
- 4.6 To determine if there is a defined replacement policy for equipment.

³ Staff profiles may be in standard formats as an appendix or reference link to School/University website with standard staff profiles where appropriate.

⁴ Where PMDS is implemented, reference should be made to the appropriate guidelines and contextual use by the School detailed as appropriate, and within confines of GDPR.

- 4.7 To determine if staff/students receive instruction and safety training to a level commensurate with the works undertaken within the School.
- 4.8 To determine if staff are accorded training opportunities to ensure objective contribution to partnerships in School's quality assurance and quality enhancement plans.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- Do available staff resources and central supports meet all operational requirements of school including strategic planning?
- Does the school maintain a structured staff development strategy to cover current and also plan for potential programme diversification and/or growth?
- How is the EDI literacy of staff being developed? Do staff have a good understanding of how structural inequalities are reproduced (e.g., through development of their racial literacy, the development of critical thinking skills in relation to gendered and ableist norms, assumptions and stereotypes etc.).

5. Facility and Services Appraisal

This section covers the appraisal of facilities and services in the context of efficacy in supporting the delivery of academic programmes and the conduct of research within the School. The operations of such services/administrative units/departments within the Faculty/University impact on academic programmes and therefore are important aspects of the School's commitment to the quality of its educational provision and the overall learning experience for students in the School, including postgraduate research scholars.

Service units supporting School's programmes will include: Academic Affairs, IT Support (e.g., VLE, School/Programmes specific hardware/software supports, e-Portfolios etc.); Human Resources (e.g., for organisation structure and staff development records); Estates (Room allocations for academic and external engagement events, amenities for extra curriculum activity etc.); Library (e.g., for range of teaching and learning related records, aimed at enhancing overall learning experience); Innovation/Business Incubation Unit (e.g., record of supports for start-ups, entrepreneurs, students, industry and businesses related to School in review); Learning & Teaching Unit/Centre Support; Student Services and associated units (e.g., Student Retention Office, Access and Civic Engagement Office, Disability, Admissions, International Affairs).

Evaluation processes as part of School Review requires that these operation areas agree a *Mission*

Statement and/or a set of *Service Standards* (Service Level Agreement) with Schools, and against which effectiveness of service to the Schools can be measured (minimum expected service ensured or exceeded), and that feedback from the school is periodically collected, analysed and acted upon. The purposes of facility and service unit appraisal are to:

- Enhance the quality of the services provided specific to the School.
- Promote understanding of particular requirements of the School's user groups.
- Highlight areas that require improvement and/or further resourcing.

Physical facilities and recurrent budget(s) available to support the School's programmes and functions should be described. Infrastructure such as buildings, equipment, laboratories (including external demonstration and field practice sites) should be able to satisfactorily support the teaching and learning processes and the connected research.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- Is there unit plan/strategy for keeping pace with rapid technology changes supporting teaching and learning in specific context of the School in review? For example, this should give specific considerations where *Employability and Employment Statements/Criteria* for graduates consider prior experience with industry standard equipment, i.e., is exposure to industry standard hardware and/or software adequately provided for the School's programmes?
- What are the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) opportunities offered to the non-academic staff in the unit to provide adequate support to the School in review?
- Are the physical facilities adequate to support the level of admissions and pedagogy at designated NFQ Award Standards of programmes within the School?
- What are the identifiable resources-limitations to teaching, learning and research at the School and/or Faculty and possibly at University level?
- How do you rate the learning resources available to the School (Poor/Fair/Good)? Is there scope for achieving and maintaining excellence in the provisions?
- To what degree do the facilities, services and resources adhere to universal access principles?

6. Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy

This section should describe and analyse the School's Teaching, Learning, and Assessment strategies in both structured learning under designated discipline(s), and any co-and extra curricula events where such are adopted as contributing to Transformative Learning (and appropriately recognised). These are typically evaluated via periodic student feedback and programme outcomes/performance data.

The range of examples of data to be considered will include: access, transfer, progression criteria and statistics; performance in assessments; feedback from students; peer-review reports from external examiners and how any matters arising are closed; professional body accreditations (where applicable); external awards and distinctions attained by students and staff (covering both *Excellence in Teaching* and *Excellence in Research*); statistical data on student performance for all programmes delivered by the School; programme/course board minutes; work placement reports. Highlight any special provisions such as systems for regulated programmes that enhance quality/added value if adopted across other programmes.

(Among others) Aims of this section are:

- 6.1 Exploring ways of using student data to enhance quality of teaching and learning (including assessment of impacts of any purposeful interventions to enhance student retention)
- 6.2 Benchmarking against comparable Schools nationally and internationally.
- 6.3 Exploring means of objective assessment while maintaining academic integrity of the School's awards.
- 6.4 To ensure comprehensive programme management standard, including oversight provisions.
- 6.5 Monitor student recruitment, retention and class of degree award data for all students. Specifically, evaluate any inherent gaps/trends between different student cohorts (e.g., retention and/or achievement, including potential differential trends between White Irish and Black and Minority Ethnic students), reflect upon and implement appropriate measures to address any observed disparities.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- What are the evidences that the Schools approach to teaching and learning works?
- Do the student performance statistics match the School's criteria for access transfer and progression? How are any matters arising from this analysis acted upon and/or concluded?
- What mechanisms are used for collection and processing of student feedback? Do they comply with requirements in GDPR?
- For the same course, are similar standards achieved in the different modes of offering, e.g., Full-time vs Part-time vs Blended/Fully Online teaching and learning?
- How do the staff maintain academic integrity in the various modes of assessments administered at individual versus group-work versus teamwork assessment metrics?
- How is Academic Integrity nurtured as part of transformative learning experience for students?
- What type of resources are available to students to support learning?
- What type of resources are available to staff to support teaching?
- How is the Framework for Diversifying the Curriculum (in development by the EDI Directorate) being considered and/or implemented in the School?
- How are culturally sustaining curricula and pedagogy been developed and rolled out?
- How is EDI literacy nurtured as part of transformative learning experience for students?
- How have programmes attempted to implement Universal Design for Learning (UDL)?
- What strategies does the School apply across all its programmes to ensure inclusive learning environments?

7. Embedded Research Activity and Impacts

Research is a key remit of the designation to TU Dublin:

“The University shall (among others): provide teaching and facilitate learning that is informed by research; provide opportunity for staff and students to conduct research; collaborate on joint research projects with other institutions, and; support a body of research and pursue excellence in the conduct of such research⁵.”

In this section, the report should describe its internal research activities over the preceding 5 years (or since the last review for any reviews mandated outside of the expected cycle.

Ideally, the section should summarise ongoing research interests and activities, collectively and by individual staff. Useful data shall include, research publications (accurately distinguishing categories as peer-review journal, books, book chapters, conference papers etc.) research grants, both PhD and Masters research degrees awarded for the period (if any). A *Strategic Plan for Research for the School* (this may be part of the overall School Strategic Plan), including interlink to the overall TU Dublin and National Research Priority Areas, and the TU Strategic Plan are essential. An outline of relevant research impact metrics such as

⁵ Technological University Act. 2018. Functions of Technological University, Part 9(1).

number of publications, citations count, citation per publication, FWCI⁶, *h5-index*⁷ etc. are desirable.

(Among others) Aims of this section are, to:

- 7.1 Outline the range and coherence of the School's Research Strategy.
- 7.2 Discuss how ongoing and School's participation in research informs teaching and learning, and upon which staff may elect to become research-active without undermining the efficiency of our undergraduate programme provisions at NFQ Level 6 through Level 8⁸.
- 7.3 Discuss the School's approach to increasing the number of postgraduate students undertaking research at Masters and PhD Programmes.
- 7.4 Use relevant data to provide comprehensive evidence of areas for possible improvement in relation to research and scholarship. For example, aim excellence in research impacts through a range of outputs (i.e., short communication, conference papers, peer-reviewed journal papers, books etc.).
- 7.5 Discuss any inherent strengths and challenges to the School's research output and overall impacts.
- 7.6 Comment on research supports available to new research-active staff and specifically to any early career researchers in the School (including appropriate mentorships).
- 7.7 Outline any commercialisation and knowledge transfer and any relevant research spin-offs.
- 7.8 Provide detailed appraisal of the fit of the adopted QA-QE protocol for monitoring of research capability and capacity within the school, including any areas requiring improvement.
- 7.9 Outline how a gender dimension which ensures that researchers question gender norms and stereotypes and address the evolving needs and social roles of women, men and trans people is included in research and innovation in the School. Critical norms and needs associated with race, sexuality and disability should also be considered through the whole research process in a manner that ensures equitable outcomes (i.e., when developing concepts and theories, formulating research questions, collecting and analysing data and using the analytical tools that are specific to each scientific area).

Note that not all the areas outlined above are relevant to all Schools. Also, any other considerations relevant to quality, and/or unique to the School in review shall be considered.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- Does the School have a comprehensive *Research Strategy*?
- What is the current staff to postgraduate research student ratio? How does this compare with similar Schools in Technological Universities elsewhere?

⁶ Field Weighted Citation Impact. This data is sourced from [SciVal](#) and explains how the number of citations compares with the average number of citations received by all other similar publications indexed in the Scopus database. FWCI of 1.00 indicates world average for similar publications. The FWCI 1.6 indicates that publications have been cited 60% more than the world average for similar publications.

⁷ *h5-index* is the *h-index* for articles published in the last 5 complete years. *h-index* is an author-level metric defining both the productivity and citation impact of the author/scholar.

⁸ IOTI. 2013. A strategic position paper development by Heads of Research Group. Institutes of Technology Ireland (IOTI), now Technological Higher Education Associations (THEA), 13 pp.

- What is the postgraduate research student to undergraduate student ratios for the School, and if applicable, does this meet or exceed the quota specified in the HEA Compact?
- How does the School monitor quality of research supervision within its domains?
- Is the School's research portfolio aligned to the Faculty and the University's Strategic Plans and the *National Research Priority Areas*?
- How are students supported to ensure timely completion of research programmes?
- Are the support services provided for research adequate?
- Does the School have strategy towards achieving high research impacts through publications, innovations and patents, and other research spin-offs?
- Does the School already have a focused research infrastructure that can coordinate its distinct research themes? If not, what are the plans for capacity building?
- How is the gender dimension in research and innovation content accounted for through the whole research process? (Please note - this is not the same as the gender balance in research teams).
- How are other key dimensions of discrimination (e.g., related to race, sexuality and disability) taken into account through the whole research process such that equitable outcomes are achieved?

8. Contextual Strategy for Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity (EDI)

Objective 3.1 in the People Pillar in the TU Dublin Strategic Plan states that, '*We will be recognised as an exemplar in equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) where people are proud to be part of a connected community and their talents, aptitude and agility will create real impact on the global stage*'. Embedding a culture of inclusion has specific KPIs to measure progress at the University level, hence, School's must make proactive contribution towards meeting the associated metrics.

(Among others) Aims of this section are to reflect and report on:

- 8.1 How the School has contextualised the university EDI agenda fitting programmes and operations.
- 8.2 Th School's contribution to institutional monitoring initiatives such as data gathering on staff and student experiences (quantitative and qualitative) for the purposes of ensuring effective implementation of the TU Dublin Strategic Plan.
- 8.3 Processes for ongoing EDI oversight and accountability specific to the School, and effectiveness of the same.
- 8.4 The School's approach to educating its staff and students in promotion of EDI within its programmes and operations, e.g., provisions for gender and persons with disabilities, ensuring race equity, and recognising and responding appropriately to any noted deficits in access equipment or infringements such as sexist bias, racist abuse, etc.
- 8.5 The School's development of a culture of belonging and inclusivity where a sense of belonging is not the same as 'just fitting in'. The former requires critical understanding of the manifestation of dominant norms and stereotypes (i.e., who and how they advantage/disadvantage), initiating appropriate structural change for correction where necessary, and being curious about and valuing our differences.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- Does the School have/maintain high visibility for practices, behaviours and role models promoting equality culture?
- How are the Athena SWAN charter principles considered and/or implemented?
- What targeted supports does the School offer to marginalized students?
- How does the School educate students on dynamics of both privilege and marginalisation (e.g. do students understand that achieving gender equality for example is the responsibility of everyone and a critical understanding of gender norms and stereotypes is necessary to achieve this)?
- How does the School maintain confidential dedicated reporting mechanism, with appropriate and constructive response processes to infringement?
- Does the School have adequate resources for supporting students and staff who report incidents of discrimination or harassment?
- What strategies does the School have for ensuring that it meets its quota (if applicable) in the related KPIs for EDI?
- Has the School enrolled any students in the International Protection system?

9. Teaching and Learning Support Services

This section should identify, describe and evaluate the available teaching and learning support service areas to meet the needs of School in review. Such services areas will include: infrastructure such as building and space (including open spaces and adaptability of all learning spaces to suit School functions), IT Services (hardware, software and personnel supports), pastoral care (availability and accessibility), library (physical and electronic resources, and personnel support), Student Information Desk and rapid communication pathways. Policies, procedures and guidelines supporting learner engagement (e.g., course handbook, course contacts information, feedback mechanisms etc.).

(Among others) Aims of this section are to:

- 9.1 Evaluate how the independent support services meet the requirements of the School under review.
- 9.2 Evaluates how the School under review utilises the synergies between teaching and learning resources located in-house and as resources shared with other academic units.
- 9.3 Evaluate how any provisions catering for special category of learners (e.g., learners with disabilities) have been provided, and where such could be factored as standard requirement in Universal Design for Learning and Teaching.
- 9.4 Evaluate implementation and scope for enhancement.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- How are the library resources acquired in the first instance and updated periodically?
- What is the policy on periodic equipment renewal (e.g. computer, laboratory and workshop equipment)? Does this match technology change?
- How effective is each serviced to meet requirements of School, hence, is there scope for quality enhancement?
- How does the school support socially disadvantaged learner groups to access remote learning as part of Flexible/Blended Learning mode of delivery?
- How does the school ensure active and effective involvement of students in the design and delivery of its education programmes? For example, what is the level of

participation of student in the Quality Assurance training programmes, and how do these translate to actual participation in related events?

10. Collaborative Educational Provision

Definition of collaborative educational Provision is provided in the relevant [Collaborative Provision Approval Process](#).

This section is only relevant to Schools with active credit bearing collaborative/partnership provisions such as delivery of part of full TU Dublin Award, joint, dual/multiple award, and bespoke provision, periodic student exchanges, articulation agreements, etc.

(Among others) Aims of this section are to:

- 10.1 Contextualise the active collaborative provisions, clearly outlining fit to the School's Strategic Plan and the overall TU Dublin Strategic Plan.
- 10.2 Objectively evaluate performance of such provisions based on clear metrics.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- What is the type of collaboration?
- What programmes are offered, inward or outward?
- What oversight arrangements are in place to monitor quality of provision?
- Who are the target participants? What is the scale of participation? Is the whole operation financially viable (i.e., cost-neutral at minimum)?

11. External Partnerships (Industry and profession links, civic and community engagement)

This section shall describe the School's engagement with external stakeholders including industry (e.g., for work placement, CPD, tailored courses etc.) and the wider community (civic and community engagement), including internationalisation (e.g., staff exchange sabbaticals, summer schools, Erasmus+ etc.). Professional accreditations leading to mutual recognition of awards for graduate mobility in workplace is to be highlighted. External stakeholders should have input to the development of the Schools curricula.

Stakeholder feedback is an imperative part of quality assurance and quality enhancement processes. As part of the periodic School quality reviews, stakeholder views shall be proactively sought through objective methods/mechanisms, including but not limited to structured questionnaires, focus group sessions and peer-reviews. Analysis of this feedback will inform the School Self Evaluation Report (SSER). The Academic Quality Office may recommend appropriate mechanisms and where possible provide sample templates for use in the feedback consultations. However, it is recognised that there will be school-specific requirements that will need to be captured, therefore, the sample questionnaire(s) may be neither definitive nor exhaustive and shall be treated as guidelines only. Where they exist, such unique attributes will be noted as part of quality assurance and quality enhancement policy reviews.

Examples of prompting questions for consideration:

- Does industry and other social partners have input to development of the School's curricula?
- Is the School adequately engaged to guarantee high quality placements and learning experience for all students?

- Are there binding bilateral arrangements for staff/student participation in pertinent exchange programmes?

12. SWOT Analysis and Quality enhancement plan.

This section should provide a detailed understanding of the School’s operations that contribute to the overall mission of the Faculty and TU Dublin as a whole, and the inherent strengths and weaknesses, and the perceived opportunities and threats within the current operating environment. A comprehensive analysis of the four areas of a School’s performance enables the focus approach in deployment of resources to realise the necessary impacts. Examples of prompting questions requiring consideration in each grid are (Individual School lists shall be precise and prioritised):

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What advantages does the School have? • What does the School do better; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Than similar Schools in TU Dublin? Comparable Schools in HE sector? • What do stakeholders see as key strengths? 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What can the School improve upon? • What should the School avoid altogether? • What factors reduce School’s impacts in teaching, learning and research? • What do stakeholders see as weaknesses?
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the current/disruptive trends in the School’s domain? • What advantages might arise from: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Extending programme portfolio or remits of research? Enhanced technology use in teaching/assessment strategy • How can the School increase contribution to the HEA Key Systems Objectives? • What options do the School’s strengths open for possible exploitation? 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What internal obstacles is the School facing? • What external obstacles is the School facing (consider both Faculty and University issues)? • What are the competing Schools within and outside of TU Dublin? • What threats do the School’s weaknesses highlighted above expose it to?

This section should culminate in succinct recommendations for quality Improvement, and implementation plan that includes assigned action points.

13. Relevant Appendices

Supplementary documents to the SSER may include: Staff/Student consultation and feedback process; strategic plan for School (covering alignment to the overall strategic plan for the Faculty and University); peer-reviews/external examiner reports; professional bodies and statutory oversight reports (including reports on regulated programmes if any); student performance statistics, including demand forecasts, admission, progression and completion rates, award classifications, staff to student ratios; programme specification/award standard; teaching/learning/research strategy; illustration of research KPIs; exemplar prospectus and student handbooks.