A meeting of the University Council was held on Wednesday 13 February 2008 at 11.15 am in the Board Room.

Present
Vice-Provost, Senior Lecturer, Registrar, Senior Tutor, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Professor B M Lucey, Dean of Engineering, Mathematics and Science, Dr M E G Lyons, Dr H Gibbons, Dean of Health Sciences, Dr V A Campbell, Dr J P Gormley, Ms F M Haffey, Dr A O’Gara, Mr B Rock, Mr C Hallworth, Mr H Sullivan, Mr G Magee.

Apologies
Provost, Dr M H Adams, Ms C Ní Dhubhda, Mr C Reilly, Mr D Walsh, Professor N M Claffey.

In attendance
Librarian, Secretary, Academic Secretary.

Observers
Dr M L Brennan, Dr P Coleman, Mr D L Parris, Dr G Biehler, Professor D B Murray, Dr M J F Brown.

Student observer
Ms E Keaveney.

SECTION A

CL/07-08/092 Minutes The Minutes of the meeting of 16th January 2008 were approved and signed.

CL/07-08/093 Matters Arising from the Minutes Council noted its appreciation to the Deans and Acting Deans of the former five Faculties for their work during a particularly difficult period in the past two years.

CL/07-08/094 Provost’s Report The Vice-Provost briefed Council on a sectoral project on key performance indicators carried out under the auspices of the Irish Universities Association. She noted the importance of achieving agreement on measurement indicators for teaching and research that are consistent across the university sector. She appraised Council on developments to introduce performance related funding across the higher education sector. A Council member queried the introduction of a funding model based on performance without prior negotiation with staff representative bodies. He drew Council’s attention to work-related agreements already established in Towards 2016.

CL/07-08/095 Restructuring Update: The Senior Lecturer noted that the Restructuring Implementation Oversight Group (RIOG) will be forwarding proposals for discussion at the next meeting of Council on (i) revised committee structures, (ii) the role of annual officers, and (iii) strategic staff recruitment devolution. He noted that the
RIOG has already considered the proposal before Council on the composition of Council.

**CL/07-08/096 Review of the Tutorial Service** A report from the Provost dated 1\textsuperscript{st} February 2008 on the review of the Tutorial Service was circulated with papers for the meeting. The Vice-Provost introduced this report noting the very positive observations by the external reviewers on the Tutorial Service in Trinity College. This was the first review of the Tutorial Service and the primary objectives of the review were to assess the (i) effectiveness and efficiency of the Tutorial Service; (ii) quality of the student experience in relation to the Tutorial Service; (iii) possibility for expansion of the supports provided by the Tutorial Service; (iv) integration of the Tutorial Service within College (student services, academic & administrative life). The overall impression of the Reviewers is that the Tutorial Service is unique in their experience of higher education in Ireland and the UK. The Service is an effective mechanism for supporting undergraduate students and the Reviewers commended the dedication and commitment of tutors and administrative staff. There is scope for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Service through immediate and long-term actions, and the Reviewers make specific recommendations in this regard. The Service is considered a major positive factor contributing to the quality of the student experience, and a number of suggestions were highlighted on how this could be further enhanced. In considering the future of the Service and its possible extension to cater for part-time and postgraduate students, the Reviewers cautioned against extension unless the Service was adequately resourced. The Reviewers noted that whilst the Service is well integrated into the life of students of the College, the same is not true of its place in College structures, and they proposed a future Student Service structure that incorporates the Tutorial Service as part of the overall student service provisions in College.

The Vice-Provost drew Council’s attention to the Dean of Students’ positive endorsement of the recommendations, and invited the Senior Tutor to comment on the report. The Senior Tutor expressed her appreciation to the former Senior Tutor for her role in the review process, and noted her agreement with the recommendations. She stressed, however, the importance of appointing a new administrative officer in order to extend the Tutorial Service to postgraduate students. She noted the Provost’s recommendations to Council, and while appreciating the need to address many of the recommendations of the Reviewers in conjunction with reforming the administrative and support services of College, she nonetheless felt that an administrative position should be made available to the service without delay.

Council discussed the report and its recommendations in detail. The need to make adequate provision available in order to expand the Service to postgraduate students was agreed, and there were differing views about the timing of this provision. The recommendation that College appoint a Director of Student Services was discussed. Student representatives fully supported this recommendation, but it was commented that there was not unanimous support among the heads of individual service areas for the position of Director of Student Services. The role of the Graduate Students’ Union in supporting postgraduate students was noted. In response to a question, it was clarified that the term ‘advocate’ used in the report referred to tutors representing students in disciplinary matters or academic appeals. It was noted that the needs of international students were not adequately addressed in the current structures, and that the salary paid to tutors has not increased in line with the workload. It was pointed out that while the Tutorial Service is deemed unique, the Reviewers also noted that the quality of the Service is not uniform across the College.
and that Trinity College was lagging behind other universities in providing adequate support to all its students.

In concluding the discussion, the Vice-Provost noted the need to review the implementation of the recommendations.

Council approved the recommendations in the review report on the Tutorial Service, reproduced below:

1. The Senior Tutor’s Office should investigate promotional activity, including appropriate research as applicable, to ascertain where to dedicate resources to this endeavour. This should include careful alignment of student expectations.
2. Examination marks should be forwarded to tutors as a matter of routine and in advance of publication to facilitate the timely discussion of progress between tutors and students.
3. The range of services being delivered by the Senior Tutor’s Office should be reviewed as a matter of urgency and that those services which are not part of the core functions of the Office be moved.
4. The use of the term ‘advocacy’ in tutor’s roles should be reviewed and appropriate guidance issued to tutors in an attempt to clarify practice.
5. All new tutors should be required to attend all mandatory training sessions prior to their appointment being confirmed.
6. An annual update of administrative procedures should be prepared and circulated to all tutors as a matter of routine.
7. A full-time administrative officer should be appointed to work in the Senior Tutor’s Office to ensure that staff workloads within the Office are manageable and to facilitate project management and staffing cover.
8. The Tutorial Service should be extended to graduate and part-time students as soon as possible by appointing a new administrative officer in the Senior Tutor’s Office and a small pool of perhaps six academic tutors to take referrals.
9. Staffing levels in the Senior Tutor’s Office should be kept under review.
10. Following the recommended appointment of new staff, consideration should be given to relocating the Senior Tutor’s Office to provide appropriate space for all staff.
11. The perception amongst the tutors that their role is not sufficiently valued by the College should be addressed.
12. The Senior Tutor’s Office should consider how to introduce appropriate performance monitoring of tutors.
13. The Senior Tutor’s Office should be recognised as a Student Service like the other services (e.g. Counselling, Disability).
14. The Senior Tutor should be recognised as a Head of Student Service, with status equivalent to the other Heads of Student Services.
15. The process by which funds are assigned to the Senior Tutor’s home academic School in exchange for their time should be made transparent.
16. A new post of Director of Student Services should be created to whom all the heads of Student Services, including the Senior Tutor, should report. The Director should be a full-time senior administrator whose office has adequate resource (an Executive Officer as a minimum, and ideally a Project Officer in addition).
17. Some of the current broad-ranging functions undertaken by the Senior Tutor’s Office should form part of the remit of the Director of Student Services’ Office (refers to 4.3).

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings
18. The Director of Student Services should report to the new Chief Operating Officer. The Director would work closely with the Dean of Students who could represent student services matters at the Academic Management Group.

19. The Dean of Students should be part of the Senior Management Team of the College i.e. of the new Academic Management Group, and a member of College Council, along with the Senior Tutor.

20. The Dean of Students should be given additional administrative support to allow this role to be fulfilled effectively.

21. The funds to establish the Director of Student Services position should not be taken from monies currently allocated to Student Services.

22. Front-line School administrative staff should be offered basic training in working with students in crisis and to address queries effectively.

Council also approved the Provost’s recommendations that:

1. the Tutorial Service address recommendations 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 15 and 22, and

2. all other recommendations be addressed as part of the reform of the administrative and support service areas.

CL/07-08/097 Council Composition A memorandum from the Working Party on Council Composition dated the 5th February 2008 was circulated with papers for the meeting. The Vice-Provost provided a brief overview of this item, noting written comments from the Dean of Students outlining why the Dean of Students should be on Council. The Registrar took Council through the rationale behind each recommendation noting proposed changes and areas where there were no firm recommendations as yet. The main changes included (i) the possible inclusion of the Dean of Students and the Dean of Research, (ii) the election of one of the senior faculty representatives from among the Head of Schools and one from the other senior members of Faculty, (iii) to retain the principle of rolling membership with annual elections, but to rotate the full membership of one Faculty per year, thus creating a three-year term of office, and (iv) the inclusion of the Secretary of the Scholars, and one postgraduate student per Faculty. With respect to those in attendance, the Working Group considered the introduction of a certain degree of flexibility in respect of the precise definition of central administrative functions in attendance at Council, and proposed that in attendance regulations should be descriptive rather than prescriptive, and suggested that “The College Secretary and a maximum of a further three heads of central administrative functions as defined in a Schedule shall be in attendance.” The overall size of Council would only change marginally from 37 to a maximum of 39. Finally, in respect of the electorate, the Working Group suggested that this should not form part of the Statutes, but should be undertaken via a Board decision as an interpretative opinion of Board, making it easier to adapt the electorate to changing legislation and other circumstances.

Council discussed at length the draft recommendations of the Working Party on Council Composition. Following clarification on a number of issues raised, Council was positively disposed to the inclusion of the Dean of Research, the Dean of Students, three Heads of School, the Secretary of Scholars, and the one postgraduate student per Faculty as members of Council. There was some discussion about the size of Council and it was concluded that Council is the primary committee dealing with academic affairs of the College and that representation was more important than size. Council considered the suggestions in respect of ‘in attendance’ and felt strongly that the Academic Secretary as head of academic administration should be named as in attendance at Council. There was general agreement that the Working
Council in considering this proposal sought clarification on a number of issues. The proposal was broadly welcomed and it was agreed that the provision of generic taught modules should be rationalised as far as possible. It was felt that it might be difficult to make some generic type modules available to all research students if such modules have specific funding regulations. The Dean clarified that funding such as the Graduate Research Education Programme (GREP) relates to increasing the output of PhD graduates, and not specifically to modules. Council discussed the desired length of a PhD programme and it was agreed that there were sound academic arguments for requiring students to complete their doctoral thesis within a four year period.

Subject to minor changes, incorporated below, Council approved the following recommendations for implementation in 2008.

1. Calendar Part 2 should clearly convey that there is one type of Trinity-PhD by research, based on a transfer procedure from the Masters’ to the PhD register. GREPs, structured PhDs, or integrated PhDs should all be considered as local variants of the core definition.

2. The current three entries (on page 61, 141 and 142 of the 2006-07 Calendar Part 2) on specific Integrated PhD programmes in Political Science, Neuroscience and Molecular Medicine should be removed and included in course handbooks. References to an Integrated PhD in the Calendar should also be removed.

3. With immediate effect, all research students should be accepted to the general research register.

4. Course handbooks should convey specific regulations pertaining to additional requirements on research students, e.g., to attend generic and discipline-specific courses, without these requirements being laid out in the Calendar Part 2, subject to those requirements not being in conflict with general Calendar Part 2 regulations, and subject to the course handbooks being approved at Faculty level and by the Graduate Studies Committee to ensure quality and consistency across College.

5. A maximum of 30 ECTS (15 per year) can be allocated to taught elements across the first two years of the research Masters/PhD degree.

6. In general, modules developed for research programmes should be available to all students who are interested or for whom they are relevant, irrespective of how these modules are funded.

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings
7. Subject to the requirements not being in conflict with general Calendar Part 2 regulations, research students are required to comply with requirements to attend generic and discipline-specific courses if these are specified as part of their programme. Such requirements should be specified in course handbooks which should be made available to each student on entry.

8. The current level descriptor entry 1.26.4 on page 26 Calendar Part 2, 2006-07 should be reviewed and re-titled to as follows:

8.1 **Research Doctorates (Level 10, National Framework of Qualifications)**

Research doctorates should continue to be known as Doctor in Philosophy. Those who hold this award have been able to demonstrate, through a variety of assessment procedures:

- a systematic comprehension of a field of study and mastery of the skills and methods of research associated with that field
- that they have the ability to conceive, design, implement and adapt a substantial process of research with scholarly integrity, rigour and discrimination, which may involve the development of new skills, techniques, tools or materials
- that they are capable of critical analysis, evaluation and synthesis of new and complex ideas
- that they have made a significant contribution through original research which extends the frontiers of knowledge by developing a body of work, some of which merits publication in national or international refereed publications
- that they can communicate with their peers, the larger scholarly community and with society in general about their areas of expertise in a sustained and exact manner
- that they can be expected to be able to promote, with due regard to ethical considerations, within academic contexts, scientific, technological, social or cultural advancement

8.2 **Professional Doctorates (Level 10, National Framework of Qualifications)**

Professional doctorates should be known by a specific title. Those who hold this award have been able to demonstrate, through a variety of assessment procedures including practice:

- a systematic comprehension of a field of study and practice, and mastery of the skills and methods of research associated with that field
- that they have the ability, either singly or as part of a team, to conceive, design, implement and adapt a process of research with scholarly integrity, rigour and discrimination, which may involve the development of new skills, techniques, tools, materials, or practices
- that they are capable of critical analysis, evaluation and synthesis of new and complex ideas and practices
- that they have made some contribution through original research that extends the frontiers of knowledge or the parameters of professional practice by developing a body of work, some of which merits publication in national or international publications
- that they can communicate with their peers, practitioners in their own professions, the larger scholarly community and with society in general about their areas of expertise in a sustained and exact manner

*Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings*
that they can be expected to be able to promote, with due regard to ethical considerations, within academic, professional and practice contexts, scientific, technological, social or cultural advancement

- that they can be expected to receive professional accreditation and recognition, where this is available, within their appropriate areas of expertise.

**SECTION B**

**CL/07-08/099 Heads of School Committee** The minutes of the meeting of the Heads’ of School Committee of the 22\(^{\text{nd}}\) January 2008 were circulated. The Senior Lecturer drew Council’s attention to the discussion on modularisation (HC/07-0/37). In response to a query, the Senior Lecturer informed Council that staff representative bodies were represented on the Working Group on Modularisation and Academic Year Structure and were consulted as part of a College-wide consultation process on modularisation. He noted the importance of involving staff representative bodies during the implementation stages.

The Senior Lecturer drew Council’s attention to the request from the Heads of School that the electorate for the election of Heads of School should be the same as that for the election of Faculty Deans (HC/07-08/35).

**CL/07-08/100 Information Policy Committee** The minutes of the meeting of the Information Policy Committee of the 29\(^{\text{th}}\) January 2008 were circulated. The Dean of Graduate Studies drew Council’s attention to IPC/07-08/24.2 in respect of the Postgraduate Application Centre.

Council noted and approved the recommendations as set out in the minutes of the Information Policy Committee of the meeting of the 29\(^{\text{th}}\) January 2008.

**CL/07-08/101 Student Services Committee** The Council noted and approved the recommendations as set out in the minutes of the Student Services Committee from its meeting of 8\(^{\text{th}}\) January 2008, which had been circulated.

**SECTION C**

**CL/07-08/102 Higher Degrees—Reports of Examiners** The Council noted and approved the reports of examiners on candidates for higher degrees, approved by the sub-committee of Board and Council on 15 January 2008 and noted by Board on 30 January 2008, as circulated.

(i) **Professional Higher Degree by Research Alone**

MD Monica Caitriona Ramona McLoughlin.

(ii) **Higher Degrees by Research Alone**

*Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings*
PhD Alecia Rowena Barry; Jorge Brotons; Shane Colwell; David Corrigan; Nicole Grimes; Julie Jacob; Oran Kennedy; Ruth Little; Miriam Anne McAndrew; Charlene Julie McCoy; Brian Edmond Murphy; Tara Maria Murphy; Jane Usher; Emma Veale; Steven Barry Watterson; Marguerite Ann Woods.

MSc Kevin Delaney; Sarah Durkin.

MLitt Jennifer Henry; Markus Schmidt.

CL/07-08/103 Membership of Council The Council noted that Professor D B Murray (replacing Dr M Stuart) had been nominated by the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science to attend Council meetings as an observer for the remainder of the academic year 2007-2008.

CL/07-08/104 School of Social Sciences and Philosophy - Directorship of Research The Council noted and approved the nomination of Dr C Newman for two years from Hilary Term 2008 to the end of Trinity Term 2010, in place of Dr J Wickham.

CL/07-08/105 School of Religions, Theology and Ecumenics - Irish School of Ecumenics (Trinity College Dublin - Acting Headship of Department The Council approved that Dr A Pierce should replace Dr D Tombs until 1 May 2008.

CL/07-08/106 Consolidated List of Teaching Assistants and Assistant Examiners The Council noted and approved a memorandum from the Senior Lecturer, circulated dated 6 February 2008.

CL/07-08/107 Academic Director - Long Room Hub The Council noted and approved a memorandum from the Secretary to the College, circulated dated 4 February 2008.

SECTION D

In compliance with the Data Protection Acts this information is restricted.

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings