



Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

XX = Board relevance

The University of Dublin

Trinity College

A meeting of the University Council was held on Wednesday 13 April 2016 at 11.15 am in the Board Room.

<i>Present</i>	Provost, Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer, Registrar, Dean of Undergraduate Studies/Senior Lecturer, Dean of Graduate Studies, Senior Tutor, Dean of Students, Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Professor C Morash, Professor J Walsh, Dean of Engineering, Mathematics and Science, Professor G Watson, Professor R Dahyot, Professor J Jones, Dean of Health Sciences, Professor J P Spiers, Professor P Cronin, Professor M Clarke, Dr S Bloomfield, Professor D Kelleher, Ms S Cameron-Coen, Ms M Kenny.
<i>Apologies</i>	Dean of Research, Vice-President for Global Relations, Professor D Faas, Professor A Holohan, Professor I Donohue, Professor C Comiskey, Ms P O'Beirne, Mr D Whelehan, Mr J Bryant, Dr G Hegarty, Mr M McInerney, Mr A McDermott.
<i>In attendance</i>	Academic Secretary, Librarian and College Archivist, Secretary to the College, Chief Operating Officer, Ms S De Brunner.
<i>Observers</i>	Secretary to the Scholars (Ms A P Worrall)

SECTION A

The Provost requested that Council members declare any potential conflicts of interest in relation to the agenda items. In relation to item A5(CL/15-16/149), the School of Chemistry Quality Review, Professor G Watson drew attention to the fact that he is a staff member in the School of Chemistry. The Secretary to the College proposed that Professor Watson should remain for the full item and take part in its discussion, since he was not specifically referred to in the report. In relation to A6 (CL/15-16/150), the Tutorial Service Quality Review, the Senior Tutor declared an interest along with a number of College tutors present at the meeting (Professors J Walsh, R Dahyot, J P Spiers). The Secretary to the College proposed that the Senior Tutor be allowed to make summary remarks in relation to reviewers' report and then withdraw from the meeting for the remainder of the item, given that the recommendations had an impact on her role. He also proposed that the other tutors remain for the entire item and be allowed to take part in the related discussion. Council approved these proposals.

CL/15-16/145 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 9 March 2016 were approved and signed.

CL/15-16/146 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising.

CL/15-16/147 Provost's Report

In consideration of the long agenda, the Provost deferred his report to Council.

CL/15-16/148 Trinity Education Project: Feedback in relation to the college wide discussion regarding the proposed Curriculum Principles and Programme Architecture

A memorandum from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies/Senior Lecturer, dated 6 April 2016, was circulated. Speaking to the document, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies/Senior Lecturer provided an update on the feedback received on the proposed curriculum principles and architecture since the last meeting of Council. Since then, four separate Trinity Education Consultation Fora were held on 16 March 2016. She commented that there had also been consultation with the Heads of School Committee and that she and the Trinity Education Project (TEP) Manager had engaged directly with Schools. Details of the curriculum principles and the proposed models of undergraduate education were provided during the consultation sessions and four specific questions were put forward for consideration:

1. Are there additional curriculum principles that should be considered?
2. What would your programme(s) need to change in order to embed these principles?
3. Which of these models best suit your programme(s)?
4. Which changes might need to be made to adopt one or more of the proposed models?

She summarised the feedback both in terms of positive comments and concerns raised. Of the supportive comments received, participants thought that the architecture would provide structures for flexibility into the future, flexibility and transparency in relation to progression pathways and student choices and that it would allow for good breadth of learning. It was commented that the graduate attributes were distinctive and could be easily communicated and that the proposal to use a range of teaching, learning and assessment methods was welcomed. In terms of concerns, comments were received in relation to the high proportion of free elective choices in the freshman years at a time when students should be taking foundation modules in their subject areas, there was insufficient differentiation in terms of ECTS volume between subjects taken under the major/minor model when compared to subjects chosen through a double major course, the 20 ECTS capstone project was too large for some courses with suggestions that there should be a permissible range from 10-20 ECTS, and that care should be taken in relation to the free elective modules to ensure that they are different from the current Broad Curriculum offerings. Throughout the discussions, general concerns were outlined in relation to implementation issues and the need for sufficient resources.

She advised that the models of undergraduate education are currently being revised, following which work will be undertaken to map courses to their most suitable model(s). Work will also be undertaken to identify courses which do not fit well with any of the models and to discuss any issues with the course owners. She noted that an additional meeting of Council would be scheduled before the end of the academic year to focus specifically on the TEP.

During the discussion, the following comments were made:

- the introduction of semesterisation and changes to the academic year structure are not merely implementation issues to be worked out, they are critical to the success of the project;
- the free electives aspect was welcomed and it was stressed that the choice within these should be as broad as possible;
- there should be some flexibility allowed in relation to the size of the capstone project, especially in the case of professionally accredited courses, which are required to include specific content in their curricula;
- consideration should be given to the timing of certain curriculum elements, such as the capstone project, where courses rely on teaching staff in hospitals and other professional settings.

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer responding to some of the comments noted that a consultation forum was scheduled for 18 April 2016, specifically to look at matters related to assessments and the academic year structure, and that proposals on these items would be brought to Council for discussion and approval. In relation to professional courses, she noted that a spectrum exists, with some courses being able to adopt the proposed features of the TEP more easily than others.

Council noted the update on the Curriculum Principles and Programme Architecture strand of the TEP.

Ms M Kenny joined the meeting.

CL/15-16/149 School of Chemistry Quality Review

A memorandum from the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer, dated 5 April 2016, was circulated along with the Report to Council on the Quality Review of the School of Chemistry. The Report to Council contained the report from the external reviewers, the response from the Head of School and the response from the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science. The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer spoke to the item and highlighted the positive nature of the external reviewers' report and especially their comments in relation to the excellent research record within the School.

She outlined a number of the external reviewers' findings and recommendations. At the School level, they recommended that priority should be given to the development of a strategic plan which academic staff could unite behind and suggested that this could take the form of a business plan to be negotiated with College. The academic staff numbers should be allowed to increase, with all staff hiring decisions led by the School, in dialogue with the associated research institutes, as appropriate. The relationships with its research institutes need to be re-examined and clarified. Staff in the School should be brought together into the same building and communications and decision making processes need to be more inclusive of all academic staff. In relation to non-EU student recruitment, they advised that this should primarily focus on one country, potentially America.

In relation to postgraduate students, the reviewers thought that there should be greater clarity between students and their supervisors in terms of the roles and responsibilities of both parties and that communication with this group of students could be improved. The reviewers did not comment extensively on undergraduate education in the School as they noted that the Science (TR071) programme had recently undergone a review; they endorsed its findings.

In relation to staffing, they noted that a pragmatic workload model should be devised and used to allocate duties to academic staff. They commented on the high workloads carried by administrative and support staff and suggested the appointment of an additional administrative staff member. They also suggested a review of administrative and technical support provision. Commenting on financial matters they stressed that the overhead policy and percentage allocation to the School should be clarified and agreed between the School and College. Turning to safety, they commented that basic safety must to be taken seriously by all staff and students at all levels.

The Dean of Engineering, Mathematics and Science praised the thorough work of the external reviewers. He noted that they had referred to the success of the School, in terms of securing research funding and publishing findings, which was all the more remarkable given the relatively small size of the School. He cautioned that staff members in the School are involved with different research institutes and in the delivery of several different courses. Added to this, they are spread out across a number of locations, resulting in a high potential for fragmentation. The reviewers have provided advice to help the School to address a number of issues to allow it to build on existing successes and move forward as a more cohesive entity. He

noted that the School had already started to draft the recommended strategic plan, the resourcing of which will be important.

Members of Council discussed the fragmentation in the School due to its disciplinary divisions (Organic Chemistry, Inorganic Chemistry and Physical Chemistry) and the spread of staff across various locations. It was noted that the School should give careful consideration to whether or not it wishes to retain its disciplinary boundaries given that the disciplines are small and the divisions are not particularly helpful to research in the field of Chemistry; their main purpose relates to the organisation of teaching in the subject. Council noted the difficulty in trying to resolve the issue of spatial fragmentation experienced by the School since a high proportion of its academic staff also belong to different research institutes.

The Provost queried if the management structures in the School were hindering the ability of the School to work together as a coherent unit. He also queried the rationale of drafting the strategic plan along the lines of a business plan, and the suggestion that this should be negotiated with College. In response to the latter, the Dean of Engineering, Mathematics and Science commented that the external reviewers appeared to be mindful of the constrained funding environment across Trinity, the lack of certainty in relation to annual budgets and the impact of both of these factors on the School in terms of what can be reasonably delivered, and suggested that there needed to be meaningful discussion on these points.

Council noted and approved the Report to Council on the Quality Review of the School of Chemistry and requested that the implementation plan, to be drawn up for consideration at the Quality Committee, includes actions related to the fragmentation of disciplines within the School and management structures. It was confirmed that Council members see implementation plans related to academic quality reviews via the appendices of the Quality Committee minutes.

CL/15-16/150 Tutorial Service Quality Review

A memorandum from the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer, dated 5 April 2016, was circulated along with the Report to Council on the Quality Review of the Tutorial Service, which comprised the report from the external reviewers along with a joint response from the Senior Tutor and the Senior Tutor Elect. The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer advised that she would introduce the item, though noted that the Senior Tutor reports to the Provost.

She highlighted that the reviewers were highly impressed with the commitment and expertise shown by all staff involved in the Tutorial Service, by the value accorded to it in general and by the services provided by the Tutorial Service and the Postgraduate Advisory Service. Summarising the recommendations and findings, she noted that the reviewers suggested that the mission and strategy of the Tutorial Service should be reviewed and aligned to actions in the Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin, Strategic Plan 2014-2019 and that, related to this, performance indicators should be developed and used to evaluate their achievement against the strategy. The facility to gather important management data should also be provided.

They expressed concerns about the ability to manage and co-ordinate the Tutorial Service given the large number of stakeholders spread across Trinity. In particular, the reviewers noted that a recommendation in relation to tutor training, arising from the quality review in 2007, had not been fully implemented. They emphasised that College should consider additional ways of ensuring that all College tutors attend the requisite training. Another recommendation from the previous review, in relation to clearly defining the advocacy role of tutors, had not been addressed, thus the role of tutors should be considered further, defined and communicated. They also pointed to a lack of consistency in relation to tutors keeping notes of their meetings with students, and recommended that an IT solution be identified for this purpose.

The reviewers noted the continual struggle to ensure that there are enough tutors to meet needs and recommended that College give serious consideration as to whether the system to appoint tutors should be 'opt in' or 'opt out'; this is currently done on an 'opt-in' basis. Whatever the outcome of this deliberation, more could be done to improve the attractiveness of the role, such as, recognising the time commitment within work allocation models. In relation to the Senior Tutor's Office, they suggested that the current resource allocation and facilities provided need to be reassessed since both are inadequate when considered against College's aspirations articulated in the Strategic Plan 2014-19.

The Senior Tutor commented that she worked with her successor to jointly draft the response to the external reviewers' report. The recommendations were welcomed by both and she emphasised that the key issue Trinity must grapple with is the method by which tutors are appointed. Decisions on the other recommendations will be more straightforward after this key decision has been made. She acknowledged that not all recommendations had been implemented following the 2007 review but noted that much had been achieved in the intervening period. The issue of tutor training hinged largely on the amount of available time tutors have to give and made the point that training needs are the same for all tutors, whether they have a full- or half-chamber. In relation to evaluating the performance of the service, she cautioned against introducing too many managerial aspects as this could make the role of tutor more unattractive. Concluding her response, she commented that some of the recommendations could be addressed by the Tutorial Service itself but certain key recommendations can only be dealt with at a College-level.

The Senior Tutor withdrew for the discussion of the item.

In the ensuing discussion, differing views were expressed as to the ideal role for College tutors, whether it should focus entirely on advocacy or be enhanced to consider the development of tutees, in an holistic sense, in line with the Trinity graduate attributes or by advising students in relation to electives and pathways post-implementation of the TEP. There were differing views made as to whether the position of tutor should be 'opt-in' or 'opt-out'. It was suggested that under the current system, academics putting themselves forward for tutorship are more likely to be interested in the role and, therefore, more dedicated to the support and advocacy nature of the position. This was countered with comments that not all tutors appointed under the current system are well suited to tutorship and that students are not well-served by the Tutorial Service if chambers are unmanageably large, due to insufficient numbers of eligible staff putting themselves forward. It was suggested by another member that if Trinity is serious about supporting this service, tutorship should be mandatory for all academic staff. From a student perspective, it was felt that all teaching staff should have gained experience as a tutor, as this makes them more knowledgeable of the regulations and students' needs. Concerns were expressed about the introduction of performance indicators and it was thought that this recommendation might be more applicable to universities in the United Kingdom which tend to have a more managerial culture.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic noted Council's strong support for the Tutorial Service and that, in implementing changes, it should remain student-centred. Key questions must be answered in relation to the purpose of the service, the nature of advocacy and whether or not tutorship should be mandatory. The simplification of academic and progression rules, through the TEP should assist tutors in their role. Responding to a query, she advised that analysis work will have to be carried out in relation to the fundamental issues highlighted in the external reviewers' report and this analysis will need to be a key action in the implementation plan.

Council noted and approved the Report to Council on the Quality Review of the Tutorial Service and requested that the implementation plan be drawn up for the consideration of the Quality Committee and Council.

The Senior Tutor returned to the meeting.

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

CL/15-16/151 Quality Assurance Review of Degree Programmes**(i) BESS (B.A. (Mod.) Economics and Social Studies)**

A memorandum from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies/Senior Lecturer, dated 5 April 2016, was circulated with the Report to Council on the Quality Review of the BESS Programme. The Report to Council comprised the external reviewers' report, the response from the BESS Programme Director and the response from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies/Senior Lecturer spoke to the item. She noted that the reviewers emphasised the strong brand established by the BESS programme as demonstrated by the high number of applicants to the course and by the demand for graduates of the programme. They commented, however, that the course presents itself as multi-disciplinary when, in fact, this relates only to the first year, after which student choice is determined by pre-requisites for their sophister year subject choices. They stressed the need to emphasise the distinctiveness of the course and to differentiate it from the course in Philosophy, Political Science, Economics and Sociology as well as the denominated entry course in Business Studies. They suggested certain ways in which this could be done, such as, developing a second-year module exclusively for BESS students allowing them to focus on a number of themes from different disciplinary perspectives, or by requiring all students to take two subjects to degree level, either as joint-honors or through a major/minor model, or requiring student to take a cluster of thematically linked modules.

They commented on the over-reliance on end-of-year examinations, which they considered to be costly for College, and highlighted that this method of assessment is not differentiating between students; for example, most students graduate with a 2:1 degree classification. They suggested that consideration be given to including the Junior Sophister result in the calculation of the award classification.

Other recommendations included: increasing student choice through the provision of more 5-credit modules; revising the first year business studies module so that it is brought into line with the other introductory modules; improving SITS functionality to allow online student registration to optional modules; reviewing the co-ordination of Erasmus and other exchange programmes; providing more systematic training for teaching assistants; and conducting a review of the funding and resource allocation model to support large programmes in College.

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences outlined his response to the report. He noted that it praised both academic and support staff emphasising their strong sense of enthusiasm, commitment and professionalism. He acknowledged, with concern, the possibility that the reputation of the course is being jeopardised by the lack of multi-disciplinarity after the first year and by the effects of a lack of resources which, in turn, has led to unacceptably large class sizes and poor facilities. Indeed, these two issues are linked since diminishing resources has led to a reduction in modules, thereby reducing student choice and flexibility.

The Dean of Undergraduate Studies/Senior Lecturer commented on the helpfulness of the reviewers' report and noted that many of the recommendations align with proposals being put forward under the TEP. The Provost raised some concerns in relation to the capacity within College to implement these recommendations, and those arising from the other quality review reports, and commented on the growing dependency on the TEP to address many of the issues raised through external quality reviews.

Council noted and approved the Report to Council on the Quality Review of BESS and requested that the implementation plan be drawn up, in line with the TEP and in

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

consultation with the relevant Schools, for consideration by the Quality Committee in due course.

(ii) B.Sc. Human Nutrition and Dietetics, joint degree Trinity College Dublin and the Dublin Institute of Technology

A memorandum from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies/Senior Lecturer, dated 5 April 2016, was circulated with the Report to Council on the Quality Review of the B.Sc. in Human Nutrition and Dietetics. The Report to Council contained the report from the external reviewers and the joint response from the Head of the School of Medicine in Trinity and the Head of the School of Biological Sciences in the Dublin Institute of Technology. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies/Senior Lecturer spoke to the item and noted that the reviewers commented favourably on the students and graduates of the course.

She outlined the main findings and recommendations which included:

- the curriculum is well designed and proposed changes are appropriate, and, in particular, the professional practice modules were commended;
- the governance structures to implement the new curriculum must be clearly defined;
- the working relationships across the two institutions, both academic and administrative, should be strengthened to improve the student experience;
- the delivery of research-led teaching should be expanded and different delivery methods for this explored;
- a strategy to increase the level of service user input into the programme should be developed;
- a structure should be put in place to support the further education of practice educators and to strengthen the interface between the institutions and placement providers;
- post-registration opportunities for graduates should be explored and could include short courses, postgraduate modules and Professional Doctorates;
- a clear programme identity should be developed and Trinity should provide improved orientation for students;
- the quality assurance processes should be harmonised across the two institutions;
- within one year, a placement report should be produced which includes a risk assessment on placement provision, related documentation and associated assessment processes.

Council noted and approved the Report to Council on the Quality Review of the B.Sc. in Human Nutrition and Dietetics and requested that an implementation plan be developed in collaboration with the external partners for consideration by the Quality Committee and other appropriate fora.

(iii) Master in Theology (M.Th.) in collaboration with the Church of Ireland Theological Institute

A memorandum from the Registrar, dated 5 April 2016, was circulated with the Report to Council on the Quality Review of the Master in Theology (M.Th.). The Report to Council comprised the external reviewers' report, the response from the Head of the Confederal School of Religions, Peace Studies and Theology, the response from the Director of the Church of Ireland Theological Institute (CITI) and the response from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. As chair of the M.Th. Management Committee, the Registrar spoke to the item.

The Registrar noted that the M.Th. is jointly delivered by Trinity (30%) and CITI (70%) and it replaced the Bachelor in Theology (B.Th.) to provide for the education, training

and formation of those preparing for ordained ministry in the Church of Ireland. The reviewers observed the successful partnership between the two institutions and noted that the M.Th. offers a better standard of education and training than its predecessor course, as well as similar courses in the United Kingdom. They noted that the Foundation Course, provided by St. John's School of Mission in Nottingham, offers reasonable preparation ahead of entry to the M.Th., however, the support needs of foundation students place additional work on CITI academic staff and they suggest that the Church of Ireland may wish to give this attention.

The Registrar advised that a number of the recommendations were similar to those reached by the School and CITI through the self-assessment process, and, as a result, implementation had already begun on certain areas. These included the restructuring of course content and the establishment of a curriculum sub-committee of the M.Th. Management Committee. She summarised the main findings and recommendation of the reviewers, which included: modules provided to M.Th. students should be provided to students on other courses; external examiners should review assessments from earlier years of the course; administrative processes should be strengthened between CITI and the Academic Registry in Trinity and contact staff members should be identified; research leave for academic staff members in CITI should be established; Mode B of the M.Th. should be reduced from six years to four years in duration and it was suggested that consideration be given to whether or not Mode B would be needed into the future.

Council noted and approved the Report to Council on the Quality Review of the M.Th. and requested that the implementation plan be developed in collaboration with the relevant internal and external partners, and provided to the Quality Committee for consideration, and other appropriate fora.

CL/15-16/152 Quality Review Careers Advisory Service

This item was deferred to the next meeting due to a lack of time.

CL/15-16/153 Postgraduate Course Proposal: M.Sc. in Community Health with an exit award of P.Grad.Dip.

A memorandum from the Dean of Graduate Studies, dated 6 April 2016, was circulated with a proposal for a new course in Community Health, leading to an award of M.Sc. with an exit P.Grad.Dip., from the School of Nursing and Midwifery. The Dean of Graduate Studies noted that the proposal had been prepared in collaboration with the School of Medicine through the Institute of Population Health, Tallaght. The course has been developed using a multi-disciplinary approach, and is intended to help meet community healthcare needs. Its main focus is on putting into practice findings from public health research studies related to the early detection of health issues, thereby reducing the level of hospital admissions. Applications would be welcomed from practitioners in a wide variety of healthcare professions including social workers, occupational therapists, community nurses, pharmacists, dentists and general practitioners.

She confirmed that the course for the Master's degree carries 90 ECTS with the award of P.Grad.Dip. available to those exiting having successfully completed taught modules amounting to 60 ECTS. The course will be offered on a part-time basis, over two-years, from 2016/17 and full-time, over one-year, starting in 2017/18. The proposal was reviewed by Dr Roger Watson, Professor of Nursing, Faculty of Health and Social Care in the University of Hull. He was extremely positive about the academic merits of the course.

In response to a query about another course, now discontinued, bearing the same title, she assured Council that there would be no confusion between the previous and proposed programmes. She also confirmed that the Chair of Population Health Medicine, who had been

involved in the previous course, would be involved in teaching on the proposed course and that the School of Medicine was happy with its development.

Council approved the proposed course in Community Health, leading to the award of M.Sc. or P.Grad.Dip. (exit only), on a part-time basis from 2016/17 and on a full-time basis from 2017/18.

CL/15-16/154 U-LEAD

A memorandum from the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer, dated 6 April 2016, was circulated. Speaking to the item, the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer commented that she wished to inform Council of the establishment of a new overarching structure in the Academic Services Division (ASD) entitled U-LEAD (University Leadership and Academic Practice). Its purpose is to provide a framework to achieve the strategic goal of facilitating and enabling academic staff to be leaders in teaching and research (Goal 4 of the Strategic Plan 2014-2019) by maximising impact and achieving greater coherency and integration of academic development and support activities.

At present academic development and support programmes are delivered by Trinity Teaching and Learning (TT&L), Trinity Research and Innovation (TR&I), the Science Gallery Ireland (SGI), and the Innovation Academy. U-LEAD's work programme will be built around the three pillars of (i) Academic Practice; (ii) Research Leadership, and (iii) Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Rather than duplicating existing supports and services, by creating a separate and additional entity, U-LEAD will provide a platform within the ASD to co-ordinate and prioritise activities. There will be a steering group chaired by the Dean of Graduate Studies which will include in its membership the heads of TT&L, TR&I and SGI. It is also envisaged that a part-time Director will be appointed from the academic community to sit on the steering committee and to feed into the work programme and ensure its delivery.

The Provost questioned the usefulness of a steering group to oversee this activity. He expressed some concerns about the merit of appointing a part-time Director to co-ordinate and prioritise the activities as the heads of the areas concerned are responsible for their own brief and staff. The Dean of Graduate Studies suggested that having the relevant information in one place on a webpage would be beneficial. Council gave its support to the establishment of U-LEAD subject to a review of its effectiveness after its first year of operation.

The Senior Tutor retired from the meeting.

CL/15-16/155 Trinity Centre for Gender Equality and Leadership

A memorandum from the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer, dated 5 April 2016, was circulated. Introducing the item, the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer noted that the purpose of the document was to inform Council of the establishment of the Trinity Centre for Gender Equality and Leadership (TCGEL) within the ASD. The TCGEL builds on the success of WiSER (Centre for Women in Science and Engineering Research) and broadens its remit to create sustainable, structural and cultural change throughout the College to deliver an inclusive community in which women and men participate at all levels, and where all are recognised fully for their contribution to the University.

The expanded remit has necessitated changes to the original governance structure. TCGEL will be led by a Director who will also be a member of a re-constituted steering committee comprising the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer (ex officio) (or nominee), Ms Aveen Batt, Deputy Director of Human Resources, Professor Vinny Cahill, Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science, two self-nominated members of College and up to two expert external members. The Director will report to the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

and will be appointable for three years, with a continuance possible for a further three years. The steering committee members will also serve for a three-year term with a possible extension of three years.

It was commented by an attendee that there are a number of positions and committees responsible for examining and promoting gender equality in Trinity and that a planned approach should be taken to ensure that collaboration occurs and that synergies are exploited. Another member suggested that consideration should be given to reviewing the title of the Centre.

Council noted and supported the expansion of the remit of WiSER, to include men and women from all disciplines in College in its remit, under the newly constituted TCGEL within the ASD.

CL/15-16/156 Any Other Urgent Business

There was no other business.

SECTION B

CL/15-16/157 Undergraduate Studies Committee

The draft minutes of the meeting of 22 March 2016 were noted and approved.

CL/15-16/158 Graduate Studies Committee

The Dean of Graduate Studies highlighted the discussion concerning the postgraduate modularisation pilot project. The draft minutes of meeting of 24 March 2016 were noted and approved.

CL/15-16/159 Human Resources Committee

The draft minutes of the 11 February 2016 were noted and approved along with the following appended documents:

- (i) Revised Sick Leave Policy;
- (ii) Revised Annual Leave Entitlements;
- (iii) Revised Special Unpaid Leave for Career Breaks; and
- (iv) Circular from the Higher Education Authority re Revised Sick Leave Arrangements for all Staff of Universities and other Third Level Colleges under the remit of the HEA, dated 1 December 2015.

CL/15-16/160 Research Committee

The minutes of the meeting of 23 February 2016 were noted and approved.

CL/15-16/161 International Committee

The draft minutes of the meeting of 11 February 2016 were noted and approved.

CL/15-16/162 Quality Committee

The draft minutes of the meeting of 15 March 2016 were noted and approved.

CL/15-16/163 Student Life Committee

The draft minutes of the meeting of 25 February 2016 were noted and approved.

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

SECTION C

CL/15-16/164 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 9 March 2016 and noted by Board on 23 March 2016.

(i) Professional Higher Degrees by Research Alone

MD Mary Davoren; Barry John Sheane

D.Ch.Dent John Crotty; Georgios Gkikas.

(ii) Higher Degrees by Research Alone

PhD Sajad Alimohammadi; Andrew Anderson; Maria Browne; Aibhin Bray; David Casserly; Jeffrey Alexander John Chambers; Sarah Cleary; Eimear Connolly; Siobhán Connolly; Graeme Cunningham; Colm Delaney; Raymond Donnelly; Sarah Edwards; Mary Margaret Everett; Derek Raymond Fagan; Gerard Noel Farrell; Leo Farrell; Claire Fergus; Brian Flood; Niamh Fox; Silvia Gallagher; Fintan Geoghegan; Yasmeen Ghnewa; Saeed Hajebi; Karen Miriam Hand; Barbara Hart; Vasileios Karanikolas; Beth Kelly; Stephen Christopher David Kenneally; Daniel Keogh; Anthea Lacchia; Niamh Lally; Gerard Loughnane; Frank Lynam; Michela Jane McMullan; Luca Mancinelli; Jacob Sebastian Mealy; Jeff Morgan; Clair Moylan; Nóra Ní Loinsigh; Aoife Mary O'Brien; Georgia O'Callaghan; Michael Patrick O'Grady; Kate O Keeffe; Niamh O'Regan; Neal O'Riain; Adam O'Reilly; James O'Sullivan; Eoin Parle; Astrid Vanessa Pérez Pinán; Andreea Petrasca; James Phelan; Jade Kirsten Pollock; Francis Quilty; Cian Quinn; Shivaun Marie Quinlivan; Veronica Ranieri; Youcef Sai; Carlo Spaccasassi; Jack Short; Saloni Surah; Delma Sweeney; Sarah Tecklenborg; Olzat Toktarbaiuly; David Turpin; Henrique Vazao De Almeida; Peter Weldon; Sarah Anne Whelan; Sinead Winters; Jonathan Jacob Wolf; Hongjun Xu; Kuan Yang.

MSc Nicholas Fennelly; Sam Mehigan.

CL/15-16/165 Council Attendance

The Council noted and approved a memorandum from the Secretary to the College, circulated, dated 5 April 2016.

CL/15-16/166 School Directors**(i) Law – Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate) 2016-2017**

The Council noted and approved the nomination of Dr Caoimhín Mac Maoláin as Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate) with effect from 16 March 2016 to the end of the academic year 2016/17.

(ii) Linguistic, Speech and Communication Sciences – Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate) 2016-2018

The Council noted and approved the nomination of Dr Lorna Carson as Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate) with effect from July 2016 to July 2018.

CL/15-16/167 Consolidated List of External Examiners 2016/2017

The Council noted and approved a memorandum from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies/Senior Lecturer dated 6 April 2016.

CL/15-16/168 Senior Academic Promotions 2015/16: Membership of the Faculty Review Committees

The Council noted and approved a memorandum from the Acting Secretary to the Senior Promotions Committee, Ms Louise Power, dated 5 April 2016.

SECTION D

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

Signed

Date