The University of Dublin
Trinity College

A meeting of the University Council was held on Wednesday 29 September 2010 at 11.15 am in the Board Room.

**Present**
Provost, Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer, Registrar, Senior Lecturer, Senior Tutor, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Dr E O’Dell, Dr M Ó Siochru, Dr J Wickham, Dean of Engineering, Mathematics and Science, Professor G Watson, Dr D O’Donovan, Dr J P Labrador, Dr A McNabola, Dean of Health Sciences, Dr D Brennan, Professor M McCarron, Mr S Gannon, Dr A O’Gara, Professor G Whyte, Ms J Fox, Ms M Collins, Mr R Bartlett, Ms Cameron-Coen

**Apologies**
Dean of Research, Dr Z Rodgers, Professor M Radomski, Dr H Mannan, Ms C Keating, Secretary to the Scholars (Mr B Roantree).

**In attendance**
Librarian, Secretary to the College, Academic Secretary, Chief Operating Officer, Head of Central Academic Administration Services.

### SECTION A

**CL/10-11/001 Statutory Declaration**
Those members attending Council for the first time made the statutory declaration.

**CL/10-11/002**

**CL/10-11/003**
Minutes of the meeting of the June 16, 2010 were approved and signed.

**CL/10-11/004**
Matters Arising:

(i) **Provost’s Report**
Referring to Actum CL/09-10/197 the Provost reported that following Board’s consideration of the report from the review of academic restructuring by external consultants at its meeting of the 30th June, 2010, a review taskforce was set up to consider the recommendations and to report to Board in Michaelmas Term 2010. The taskforce will present an outline of its report and draft recommendations to the next meeting of Council in advance of presentation to the November meeting of Board. One Council member
expressed concern that the University Council, responsible for the academic affairs of the University, was not afforded the opportunity to consider the review report of the external consultants, and has no representation on the review taskforce. The Provost noted this concern and undertook to give it due consideration.

(ii) **The Creative Arts, Technologies and Culture Initiative** Referring to Actum CL/09-10/198, the Provost reported that discussions with the NCAD (National College of Art & Design) had concluded with the NCAD deciding to maintain its connections with UCD.

(iii) **Weighting Higher Level Mathematics** Referring to Actum CL/09-10/201, following the decision of Council at its previous meeting, the Provost reported that the Irish Universities Association (IUA) is coordinating an approach to the awarding of additional points to Higher Level Mathematics.

(iv) **Promotions 2009** Referring to Actum CL/09-10/205, the Provost noted that he has been in discussions with the Higher Education Authority (HEA) on the Trinity 2009 senior promotions position. The Provost has requested a meeting with the government committee overseeing the Employment Control Framework. The Provost proposed that consideration be given to altering the nomenclature of the Junior Promotions Committee on the basis that its work was to consider junior academic advancement within a grade as opposed to promotion. It was agreed that this committee should be re-titled the ‘Junior Academic Progression Committee’.

(v) **Undergraduate Studies Committee** Referring to Actum CL/09-10/209, the Provost reported that following discussion with the Dean of Students it was agreed to change the ‘Provost’s Roll of Honor’ title to that of the ‘Dean of Students’ Roll of Honor’.

(vi) **Academic Freedom** In response to a query, the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer advised that a final meeting of the Working Party on Academic Freedom is scheduled to make necessary amendments to the draft policy document; it was expected that the final document would be presented to Council for approval at a future meeting in Michaelmas Term.

**CL/10-11/005 Provost’s Report.** The Provost made a presentation to Council outlining the highlights of the academic year 2009-10 and a programme of work for Council for 2010-11.

The Provost opened his presentation by highlighting the expected impact of external factors on College’s operation in the coming year. The deterioration in public finances and the general poor state of the Irish economy will adversely affect the College’s budgets and will impinge on the delivery of national policy on education. On the international front, an increasing focus on university rankings, a fiercely competitive market, and the trend towards globalisation underline the need for the realisation of the College’s strategic vision of further strengthening its reputation as a university of global consequence.
The Provost noted the key achievements in 2009-10, namely (i) a balanced budget for 2009/10 which was achieved on the basis of a robust process of management and control; (ii) delivery of the Strategic Plan 2009-2014; (iii) completion of the review of the Statutes; (iv) success in securing €82m under the PRTLI5 initiative which will be directed towards the building of the Biosciences Institute and a series of associated graduate programmes - the sterling work done by the Dean of Research and his team in this regard was specifically noted; (v) successful implementation of the new academic year structure; (vi) achievement of satisfactory rankings, albeit some slippage has occurred as expected owing to the financial situation; (vii) implementation of the first phase of the Ussher Fellowship scheme which is funded from non-exchequer sources; (viii) research quality metrics have been finalised; (ix) realisation of a new relationship with the associated Colleges of Education; (x) integration of an Academic Medical Centre, now Trinity Health (Ireland), with the agreement of College, St. James’ Hospital and Adelaide and Meath incorporating the National Children’s Hospital to work together in a new structure; (xi) formation of alliances with UCD, ESRI, Milltown Institute, Lir, CATC; (xii) achievement of €100m research income, the highest ever achieved, together with the formation of a record number of campus companies: however, it was anticipated that such growth would not be achieved in 2010/11; (xiii) successful pilot of the Graduate Network programme, facilitated by the Careers Advisory Service; (xiv) the appointment of a new Chief Operating Officer, Ms Darina Kneafsey; (xv) transfer of the pension liability to the state; (xvi) agreed policy on the student registration charge.

Referring to the challenges ahead, the Provost informed Council of the likely developments in policy at a national level. Whilst there have been significant increases in participation rates at third level in recent times, it was envisaged there would be demands to achieve double capacity over the next 20 years. The current funding mechanism (i.e. recurrent grant allocation model) would add further impetus to this objective as the model incentivised increased student numbers. It was noted that the focus has altered from quality of jobs to one of job creation. It is anticipated that there would be greater intrusion by government in the management of universities, and an extension of the employment control framework beyond December 2010 is predicted. The Provost highlighted that College suffered a 26% decrease in its core grant allocation in 2009/10, and a further 10%-15% decrease is predicted for 2010/11. While the loss in income has in part been compensated by introduction of the student charge in 2009/10, together with pay reductions, an overall net loss of €10m was likely in 2010/11.

In the period 2007/08 to 2010/11, there was an increase of approximately 1,000 registered students, against a 6% decrease of staffing provision in 2009/10, and a further 2% decrease annually for a further three years at least. Overall, increased student numbers coupled with reduced exchequer funding and staff recruitment constraints, present a challenge to the maintenance of the high quality of our academic programmes.

The Provost advised Council that the goal for 2010-11 was to keep ‘the show on the road’, while at the same time maintaining quality in education, research, and the student experience. His aspiration was to leave the College in sound shape for his successor. Central to this would be to work with the sector to make a case for critical public investment. Turning to the agenda for Council for 2010-11, the Provost noted Council’s role in monitoring the quality of provision particularly in (i) School reviews, (ii) the introduction of new courses and rationalisation of existing programmes (iii)
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ECTS. Consideration will be given to awarding a Postgraduate Diploma in Fine Art to students who do not satisfactorily complete the one-act play, and where all other modules have been passed.

Council welcomed the course proposal leading to the award of a M.A. in Fine Arts. Responding to queries, the Dean of Graduate Studies confirmed that staff recruitment for the delivery of the course was underway, and that some of the course will be taught by existing Trinity College staff. Referring to a query about the replacement of the normal requirement for a dissertation with a one-act play, the Dean noted that this was in line with international norms in this area. The Senior Lecturer commented that it was appropriate that a play should replace the requirement for a dissertation. She also suggested in respect of admissions to emphasis the portfolio requirement over academic requirements. The Dean of Graduate Studies undertook to bring this to the attention of the Course Director. The Registrar noted that the award of a Master in Fine Art would require the institution of a new award by the University Senate.

Council noted and approved the course proposal leading to a (new) award of Master in Fine Art (Playwriting), with a postgraduate diploma exit option.

CL/10-11/007  School Quality Reviews

(i) School of Nursing and Midwifery  The Provost’s report to Council on the Review of the School of Nursing & Midwifery had been circulated, together with the External Reviewers’ Report, and the joint response from the School and Faculty Dean dated 26th July, 2010. The Provost introduced the reports noting that overall the reviewers commended the School for the tremendous progress which it had made since the previous review undertaken in 2002. The School which was established in 1996, and has since become the largest School of Nursing & Midwifery in the country, with the largest numbers of undergraduate and postgraduate students. The School has gained international recognition within the nursing and midwifery professions as a centre for excellence in teaching and research. In establishing itself as the largest and leading School in Ireland for national and international nursing, midwifery and healthcare research, it had achieved the highest proportion and number of PhD qualified staff amongst all such Schools in Ireland.

The Reviewers were impressed by the enthusiasm of both staff and research students and by their level of commitment to advancing the research agenda. In response to the previous (2002) quality review report, the School had reviewed its strategic direction and centred its research activity around seven pillars or themes. More recently, the School reviewed its strategic direction and developed a matrix with three key research strengths and several cross cutting themes. It was noted that within each of the three areas there were clear areas of research strength and some of the research being undertaken was world leading. Each of the three areas has funded research programmes, and where possible, research students are attached to on-going research programmes. Since 2002, the School has developed a good track record of securing funding for research which has come from a variety of competitive sources.
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In relation to research outputs, staff members have published in a range of journals, some of which are focused primarily on practitioners, but are still peer reviewed. This is seen as an important vehicle for dissemination of research as it can more directly impact upon practice. There have been a significant number of papers published in high impact international journals. Overall, it is evident that the list of publications has generated clear lines of inquiry.

Referring specifically to teaching and learning, the reviewers’ overall impression is that the School is fulfilling its mission to a high standard in this regard. It was noted that the students and service providers had raised a number of issues, some of which echo issues in the previous review and some structural issues for the College as a whole. In general, students spoke very highly of the quality of their education, however, despite geographical and educational developments in the last eight years, students continued to feel psychologically and socially isolated from the rest of College. A number of structural issues were identified at the undergraduate level including a perception by students of an over assessment of theoretical components, the comprehensiveness of clinical experience in the midwifery courses, and a perceived separation of theory and practice in the nursing programmes. Related to this lack of perceived integration between theoretical and practical components of the nursing course, the service providers had observed that the presence and support of academic staff in clinical areas was ‘patchy’. The final-year internship was welcomed by both students and service providers and was seen as a real strength of the course. Service providers had expressed unhappiness that the internship had been reduced from 52 to 36 weeks as it created problems in maintaining adequate staffing levels for the 16 week period between internships. However, this problem had been created by national policy decisions outside the control of the School.

While recruitment to taught postgraduate courses remained stable, progress should be made in respect of flexibility of entry, course structure, and assessment, if the School is to meet its target of increasing student numbers on Masters programmes. Many students identified a lack of flexibility in course delivery at the postgraduate level as a major issue, particularly for practitioners with full-time jobs; the constraint was a result of compliance with College regulations.

Referring specifically to staff development, the reviewers noted the substantial and over-riding emphasis on research outputs as the main criterion for academic promotion. It was suggested that professional schools make broader and often competing demands on staff which should be recognised by College. Many staff feel pulled in three directions, (i) to publish and win research grants; (ii) to prepare students to the highest possible professional standards to practice; (iii) to maintain their own clinical competence / expertise. While the School valued and encouraged all three roles, it was perceived that only the first was recognised by College as a promotion route. The reviewers commended the staff that continued to be active in clinical practice despite the pressures. The reviewers highlighted the need to address the issue of the ratio of academic staff at the senior levels compared with those employed at the lower levels, and were of the view that it was vital for
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the School’s further growth and development that it seeks to resolve the issue by ‘growing its own’ promoted staff from within the existing establishment.

The Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences commended the work of the School and its development since the last review. He noted that he was working closely with the Head of School in addressing key recommendations.

Council welcomed the review of the School of Nursing and Midwifery. It was noted that the reviewers referred to the RAE (Research Assessment Exercise) which was replaced two years ago. It was felt that there was a case to consider a range of different outputs in the promotion process, especially in the professional schools. Noting the high number of junior staff recently conferred with a PhD, it was suggested that these staff should be afforded the opportunity to develop a research portfolio. The Head of the School of Nursing and Midwifery commented on the School’s investment to-date to develop staff and its aim to develop a strong PhD programme that will be integrated with other College disciplines. Staff members have spent considerable energy on developing the School’s infrastructure and are now in a position to devote more time to further developing its postgraduate education provision. The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer referring to the funding of postgraduate nursing education, noted that the College does not receive any core funding from the Higher Education Authority’s RGAM (recurrent grant allocation model) for nursing students. The HSE (Health Service Executive) funds undergraduate nursing degree students, but not postgraduate students. He noted that his Office is considering this issue with the relevant parties.

Council noted the following recommendations from the review report:

1. There should be continuation of support for staff to receive dedicated time to undertake PhD studies.

2. There should be clarification regarding current systems for funding of post-graduate provision within the School of Nursing and Midwifery. Such clarification is needed between the School and the College where there appear to be differing perceptions. It is also needed in relation to the Department of Health as it needs to be determined whether their funding for nurse education includes post graduate provision or not. If it is the latter, then clarification is needed as to where such funding should come from.

3. The School should consider giving educational research a stronger emphasis.

4. The School should be allocated space within the new biosciences building to allow for greater synergy and integration within the College.

5. The School develops new, and strengthens existing, collaborative partnerships with other Schools / Departments within the College.
6. The School promotes further the work they have undertaken in relation to developing service user involvement in research.

7. There should be an increase in the number of staff at senior grades (Professor, Associate Professor and Senior Lecturer) and that staff currently in post are provided with the support to progress to such grades.

8. The School should give greater attention and recognition to the practice component of the undergraduate courses when the students return to the School following a clinical placement. This might include more time and focus on reflection-on-action in relation to clinical experiences and development of the academic tutorial system in order to deal with clinical concerns of students.

9. The School should consider a review of theoretical assessments to determine whether the assessment load could be reduced.

10. Issues surrounding the internship programme should be discussed further with students and service providers, particularly in relation to:
   - The students’ perceived lack of relevant clinical experience on entering their final year
   - The current problems being experienced by service providers caused by the shortening of the internship from 52 to 36 weeks

11. The School and the College should explore together ways to ensure greater flexibility in relation to admission, course structure and assessment of students on taught postgraduate courses, including:
   - The consideration of assessment of prior learning (APL) and the assessment of prior experiential learning (APEL) as entry criteria to postgraduate courses;
   - An increasing commitment to on-line delivery of educational material;
   - A greater emphasis on work-based learning and the delivery of education in the work-place;
   - The introduction of larger modules or assessments shared across several modules in order to reduce the number of assessments and increase the time between them.

12. The School should consider establishing a more visible presence in clinical areas, for example by establishing centres of excellence and/or practice development units where academic staff can gain appropriate clinical contact and develop projects at the interface between academic and clinical scholarship/research.
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13. The School and the College should work together to develop a structured career path for professional/clinical schools which recognises and rewards teaching, the scholarship of practice and clinical excellence in keeping with Universities of similar standing elsewhere. This is particularly important at junior promotions committee level in order to address the issue of the ratio of junior to senior staff.

14. The School develops a transparent workload model in conjunction with an individual staff performance plan that reflects individual workload attribution.

Council approved the following recommendations from the Provost:

15. The School of Nursing and Midwifery working closely with the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, and other relevant Academic Officers, should consider the detailed recommendations of the Review Report and draw up an implementation plan for Council approval.

16. A working group (chair and membership to be decided) reporting to Council should be established to consider recommendation #13 in respect of developing “a structured career path for professional/clinical” staff and make recommendations to the University Council.

(ii) School of Genetics & Microbiology  The Provost’s report to Council on the Review of the School of Genetics & Microbiology had been circulated, together with the External Reviewers’ Report, and the joint response from the School and Faculty Dean dated 22nd June, 2010. The Provost introduced the reports noting that the grouping of Genetics and Microbiology into a School, formed in 2007, was working well with a high degree of collegiality; there were some new developments arising from the merger, and the standards of research and teaching remain high. However, several issues required the attention of College and the School, some of which had been significantly exacerbated by the current economic climate and the resulting constraints imposed on the University sector and the funding agencies.

Referring specifically to research, the reviewers found that quality of research in the School is very high by international standards and is recognised by the international communities in the disciplines. The publications of several members of staff have been in the highest quality international journals, many staff have scored highly in terms of the number of citations, and all senior academic staff exceed the accepted minimum standards of research citation in biological research at Professorial level. The reviewers note that this achievement is particularly noteworthy given the relatively small sizes of research groups in the School compared to what is found at other top institutions. The current research activity should lead to an output of high quality publications over the next two years, and future research plans, if funded, will continue to provide publications that are likely to appear in the top journals. Staff are engaged on many of the major topics of importance in the Life Sciences and have previously been well funded to pursue their research, more recently by SFI. Opportunities exist for
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collaboration within the School and across other Schools in the College. In
general future plans are appropriate, however, external factors will
undoubtedly affect the opportunity to pursue these plans. Internally, the
College decision not to provide start-up funds for staff is disadvantageous
both to the College and recently-appointed staff who are finding the
establishment of their research activity difficult due to the funding situation.
The reviewers highlight that the ability to make high-quality appointments,
particularly junior staff, will be difficult without start-up packages. Concern
was expressed about the use of research grant funding to subsidise teaching,
and could potentially become serious as current constraints on grants worsen.
There was a serious deficiency in the research profile of the School as a result
of the non-appointment of a virologist; such a post is critical to a university
with an international profile in microbiology, and has research-led teaching.
At least one senior appointment, and preferably a second more junior
virologist, was needed to bring the School to competency in this key area of
modern microbiological research, and to meet a critical teaching need.
Research students are viewed as the life-blood of the School; the numbers of
PhD students are appropriate to the number of active laboratories. There is a
robust formal process for dissemination of information to Microbiology
research students, which also could be applied in the supervision of research
students in Genetics.

Referring specifically to teaching and learning, with the exception of virology,
the range of the curriculum is deemed appropriate across the disciplines
taught in the Moderatorships in Microbiology, Genetics, and Human Genetics.
The provision of some teaching in this field is not appropriate to a research-
led teaching environment, and limits the research opportunities for
undergraduate students.

The formation of the School has resulted in more teaching between the
disciplines in appropriate areas. It was noted that there are differences in
teaching loads between the disciplines, due to differences in the calculation
of the workload in respect of Senior Sophister projects, and maybe due to
staffing levels. The School would benefit from an agreed workload model to
ensure appropriate contribution by all staff to the functions of the School.
While students consider the staff to be readily accessible, there is no
formalised process of obtaining and acting on feedback from undergraduate
students and mechanisms should be established to facilitate formal feedback
feeding into course and curriculum review. The mechanisms of assessment
were largely appropriate to the curriculum. It was noted that there were no
taught Masters programmes in the School, and an opportunity existed to
establish novel and attractive courses at this level expanding on the range of
scientific expertise in the School, and potentially creating a much needed
revenue stream.

The Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science welcomed
the Reviewers’ recommendations. He noted that the reviewers provide an
unequivocal recommendation that College should support research-intensive
Schools, however, he drew Council’s attention to the absolute incompatibility of
this recommendation to the ARAM (Academic Resource Allocation Model) and,
now to a greater extent, the RPM (Resource Planning Model), which has severe
financial consequences for research-intensive Schools such as the School of
Genetics and Microbiology. Commenting on the suggestion that the School should become more integrated and its processes more efficient with appropriate supports, he noted that attention will be given to how this can be achieved. The recommendations are already being considered by the Dean and the Head of School. The Dean, referring to the recommendations on communication issues, noted that there were already three annual Faculty Forums, electronic Faculty Newsletters, Faculty Executive Minutes and the web-site, and numerous ad hoc meetings between the Dean and individual School members. He wondered if the issue was more related to lack of engagement rather than poor communication.

Council welcomed the review of the School of Genetics and Microbiology. Referring to the need for Schools to engage proactively with society, it was commented that the School’s response to the reviewer’s recommendation in respect of public engagement, was inadequate. It was pointed out, however, that this School has a very high public profile and its staff are often at the fore of public debate. It was felt that the School was strategic, broadminded and effective in its engagement with society. The Students’ Union Education Officer commented that there is a need for greater integration of students on the different courses delivered by the School. The direct impact of the Employment Control Framework on the delivery of core provision was noted by the inability of the School to recruit a virologist. The Faculty Dean and the Head of School are aware that this position is a priority for the School.

Council noted the following recommendations from the review report:

1. The School should modify its Mission Statement to include training and public engagement, and that this is confirmed at Faculty and College levels.

2. The College should make start-up funds available for staff taking up post since the moratorium was imposed.

3. The Faculty should urgently release a post to allow a senior Virologist to be appointed.

4. The School should consider redressing the low number of women faculty when making future Staff appointments.

5. The School should add one or more small courses to the PhD programme to repair any deficiencies in student background.

6. A workload model should be established and agreed in the School to ensure that the contributions of staff to the work of the School are appropriate.

7. Student feedback on courses should be formalised and widely adopted across the School’s teaching provision as soon as the College-wide web-based system is available.

8. Undergraduate students should be given formative assessments to prepare them better for essay-based examinations.
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9. The School should explore possible taught Masters courses and discusses with the College the opportunity to use course income to hire new staff to deliver such courses.

10. The College should review data on entry grades and degree classification to ensure consistency of high standards across the Faculty and College.

11. The College, Faculty and School should work to establish efficient, effective and formal lines of communication, using arbitration between parties as necessary.

12. An Administrator should be appointed to assist the Head of School in the day-to-day running of the School and to act as liaison with the College Administration.

13. The College should consider financial models in which technical posts are underwritten against grant income and the School ensures that such posts are requested in applications for funding.

14. Further research space should be allocated to the Genetics department contiguous with the existing research space in the Smurfit Institute.

15. The planned and funded refurbishment of the Moyne Institute Teaching and Research laboratories and preparation areas should proceed on schedule in Spring and Summer 2010.

16. The College should recognise and rewards pre-existing high performance in future Resource Allocation to Schools.

17. The College should consider retiring historic deficits to allow Schools to respond more easily to opportunities.

18. The College should compare its model of allocating resource to central activities with those used by comparator institutions.

19. The School should move to unitary procedures in all functions which operate across both departments, adopting best practice from each.

20. The College should adopt transparent and clearly-understood processes for decision-making, and communicates decisions quickly and formally.

Council approved the following recommendations from the Provost:

21. The School of Genetics and Microbiology working closely with the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics & Science, and other relevant Academic Officers, should consider the detailed recommendations of the Review Report and draw up an implementation plan for Council approval.
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22. The Senior Lecturer should review student data on entry grades and degree classification in respect of the courses offered by the School (recommendation # 10) and report to Council.

CL/10-11/008 Quality Review Implementation Plan - School of Natural Science

An Implementation Plan for the School of Natural Sciences dated September 2010 was circulated. The item was withdrawn because it was deemed incomplete for Council’s consideration.

CL/10-11/009 Quality Review Progress Reports

Progress Reports addressing the recommendations arising from the quality review of the School of Education, the School of Law, the School of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies and the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences were circulated.

(i) School of Education: the Dean of the Arts Humanities & Social Sciences referring to the progress report from the School of Education noted that the remaining three recommendations yet to be implemented were in train albeit that they had not been achieved in full. It was further noted that the status of four additional recommendations which had been categorised ‘cannot be implemented’ were being progressed. Some funding had been secured to support staff in the presentation of papers at conferences. In regard to supporting the centres of excellence that exist with a funded research fellowship, the School had successfully managed to provide a PhD studentship in one of its targeted research areas, and additional space has been provided for research students in Phoenix House.

(ii) School of Law: referring to the progress report of the School of Law Dean of the Arts Humanities & Social Sciences noted that progress was being made in building on the research strategy set out in the School’s strategic plan. While it had been proposed that a more detailed review of research take place, the Dean was of the view that this should be suspended until it was financially viable to do so. With regard to the recommendation in respect of permitting students on joint programmes to take some subjects earlier in the programme, and/or a reduction in the number of subjects required to be taken, the School was of the view that this would be difficult to implement given the delicate balance that has been achieved in each of the combined degrees with the partner disciplines, and would not be in the students’ interests to do so.

(iii) School of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies: referring to the progress report of the School of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies, the Dean noted that the School is working well with the implementation of the recommendations. While it currently was not financially viable to reintroduce ab initio language for German and French, the situation would be kept under review. The question of offering TSM students the possibility of spending a year abroad was related to the structure of the TSM degree programme. The Senior Lecturer advised that a review of the TSM practices would be an integral part of the preparatory work for the implementation of a new student administration system.
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(iv) **School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences**: the Dean of Health Sciences referring to the progress report from the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences noted that the School is making significant progress in implementing the outstanding recommendations. The School is in discussions with the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland (PSI) regarding the replacement of the 4+1 model of pharmacy primary education with a five-year fully integrated programme of education, training and assessment as the basis for application for registration as a pharmacist. The PSI had expressed a desire to have a partnership approach with Schools of Pharmacy, and it was expected in future that Schools would have greater input into curriculum definition and design. The School recognised the development of a structured PhD programme will prepare and enable it to engage in international programmes. All postgraduate courses had been modularised and it was not possible to offer individual taught modules to postgraduate research students. The School’s growth strategy would be further strengthened by its involvement in the new Biosciences Institute.

Council noted the progress reports addressing the recommendations arising from the quality review of the School of Education, the School of Law, the School of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies, and the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences.

**CL/10-11/010 Graduate Studies - Student Case** Council noted that this agenda item had been withdrawn by the Dean of Graduate Studies.

**CL/10-11/011 Academic Appeals Committee** The Minutes of the meetings of 30th June, 2010, July 1, 2010, and 2nd July, 2010 were noted and approved by Council.

**CL/10-11/012 Any other urgent business**

*University Council - membership* Council noted the election of Dr Zuleika Rodgers as a member of the Junior Constituency for the Faculty of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences for the two year period from 2010-12.

**SECTION B**

**CL/10-11/013 Graduate Studies Committee**

The Council noted and approved the recommendations as set out in the minutes of the Graduate Studies Committee from its meeting of 17th June 2010 which had been circulated.

**CL/10-11/014 Information Policy Committee**

The Council noted and approved the recommendations as set out in the minutes of the Information Policy Committee from its meeting of 10th June 2010, which had been circulated.
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SECTION C

CL/10-11/015 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 16 June 2010 and noted by Board on 30 June 2010.

(i) Professional Doctorate in Education (DEd)

Thomas Joseph Peter Farrelly; Niamh Margaret Kelly.

(ii) Higher Degrees by Research Alone

MD Dermot O’Callaghan.

PhD Sinead Aherne; Jennifer Cooke; Noelle Maria Cotter; Dominik Roman Christian Dahlem; Christina Dold; Ivana Dusparic; Laurence William Gill; Lorna Claire Gleeson; Mark Gleeson; Sophia Gold; Catherine Gorman; Andrew Jackson; Marcin Karpinski; Louise Kehoe; Dana Kilroy; Catherine Ann Leonard; Matthew Manktelow; Eilish McAuliffe; Ute Anna Mittermaier; Jorge Garcia Molinos; Jennifer Munnelly; Joanna Alicja Muras; Neil Paul O’Connor; Anne O’Farrell; John O’Grady; Nicholas Liam Owen; Gillian Margaret Paul; Niall William Paterson; Claire Louise Raftery; Karen Margaret Ryan; As’ad Salkham; Jason Silverman; Kimberley Smith; Georg Urich; Navin Kumar Verma; Kevin Williams; Simon Lee Workman; Irena Yanushevskaya; Atieh Zarabzadeh.

MSc Louise Baragwanath; David Leen; Michael Edward Quille; Karin Vadovicova.

MLitt Fabian Armendariz-Cordova; Sylvester Patrick Murray.

CL/10-11/016 University Council 2010-2011
The Council noted members of the University Council for 2010-2011, as circulated.

CL/10-11/017 Administrative Procedures, 3 July to 29 August 2010
The Council noted business dealt with during the period 3 July to 29 August 2010, set out in the memorandum from the Secretary to the College, circulated, dated 8 September 2010. Nominations for Appointment approved during this period are set out in Appendix 1 to this minute.

CL/10-11/018 Zoology - Headship
The Council noted and approved the continuation of Dr J Wilson’s appointment as Head of Zoology to 2012.
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CL/10-11/019 School of Social Sciences and Philosophy
The Council noted and approved the nomination of Dr G McElroy as the Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate) for 2010-2012.

CL/10-11/020 Accenture Chair in Mathematics
The Council noted and approved the title for the new Chair in Mathematics, ‘Accenture Chair in Mathematics’, and noted a memorandum from the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science, dated 22 September 2010, as tabled.

CL/10-11/021 Title of Personal Chair
The Council noted and approved the title of Professor S Connon’s Personal Chair, ‘Professor of Synthetic Chemistry’.

CL/10-11/022 Student Cases
The Council approved the request of the Senior Lecturer for three named students to repeat a year in the academic year 2010-2011.

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

Signed ...................................................

Date ....................................................

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings