



Quality Committee	
<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>19 October 2023</b>
<b>Present</b>	Professor Orla Sheils, Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer (Chair); Ms. Patricia Callaghan, Academic Secretary; Professor Brian O’Connell, Dean of Health Sciences; Ms. Roisin Smith, Quality Officer; Ms. Orla Cunningham, Chief Operating Officer; Ms. Breda Walls, Director of Student Services; Mr. Patrick Magee, Director IT Services; Ms. Jessie Kurtz, Deputy Librarian; Ms. Catherine Arnold, SU Education Officer; Professor David Shepherd, Senior Lecturer; Professor Dirk Van Damme (External); Professor Jan De Vries, HS Representative.
<b>Apologies</b>	Professor Sylvia Draper, Dean of STEM; Professor Gail Mc Elroy, Dean of AHSS; Professor Martine Smith, Dean of Graduate Studies; Ms. Julia Carmichael, Chief Risk Officer; Professor Breiffni Fitzgerald, STEM Representative; Mr. David Fennelly, AHSS Representative; Professor Emma Stokes, Vice President for Global Engagement; Ms. Vickey Butler, Secretary to the College/Director of Governance – Designate.
<b>In attendance</b>	Dr Richard Porter, Dean of Students, for <b>QC/23-24/011 National Student Survey Reports PGT and PGR</b> .

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
<b>QC/23-24/008</b> Quality Committee minutes		<b>Decision QC/23-24/008:</b> The QC minutes of 21 September were approved.
<b>QC/23-24/009</b> Matters arising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>All Quality Committee papers will go to the next Academic Council meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> November.</li></ul>	



Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
<b>QC/23-24/010</b> Implementation Plan Thematic Review Mental Health	<p>The Director of Student Services highlighted the following key points in relation to the Implementation Plan for the Thematic Review on Mental Health Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) All ten recommendations included in the Implementation Plan will be delivered in either Semester 1 or 2 of the current academic year.</li> <li>(ii) All required funds have been secured through government financing or other means, such as repurposing other plans.</li> <li>(iii) There is one exception with regard to item no.9. S2S has already been relocated, but it has been decided that SLD are fundamental to SCS, as the two support services are intertwined. SLD is already primarily online, as there is an understanding that it can be difficult for students to be seen attending the building where counselling is happening.</li> </ul> <p>The Director of Student Services confirmed that outreach has begun in St. James's Hospital and Trinity Hall Campus in Dartry.</p> <p>The Director of IT Services commented on item no.6, that due to the sensitive nature of the data in question, data informed decisions would need to be made to ensure it is properly secured, and the Director of Student Services confirmed that the data would be safeguarded.</p> <p>The Dean of Health Sciences observed that in each action item of the Implementation Plan, responsibility for student mental health is placed on professional services, when in his experience there are a lot of cases that may not require professional help. The Director of Student Services agreed with this comment and does not wish to categorise</p>	<p><b>Decision QC/23-24/010:</b>            The Quality Committee recommended the Implementation Plan for the Thematic Review of Mental Health to Council.</p>



**Trinity College Dublin**

Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath

The University of Dublin

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<p>the work involved as entirely clinical and explained that they are trying to achieve a college - wide approach. This requires a degree of upskilling so efforts will be made to ensure the appropriate skill level is there.</p> <p>On the topic of the relocation of SLD (recommendation 9) the Senior Lecturer expressed his interest in discussing this matter further. The Academic Secretary commented that in previous years SLD was part of CAPSL, but feels it is best placed with SCS. In relation to item no.4, she enquired if this would require more systems. The Director of Student Services confirmed that it does not require more data systems, but rather interfacing across all three data systems to enable better reporting.</p>	
<p><b>QC/23-24/011</b> National Student Survey Reports PGT and PGR</p>	<p>The Dean of Students, Dr Richard Porter, introduced himself to Quality Committee, and thanked the Quality Officer and her team for all their work on the National Student Survey Report. He provided a high-level summary of the National Student Survey results for Postgraduate Taught (PGT) and Postgraduate Research (PGR) as summarised by the poster of results.</p> <p>The Dean noted that while we did quite well on several indicators such as higher-order learning and student-faculty interaction, effective teaching practices and quality of interactions left some room for improvement.</p> <p>The Vice-Provost noted that the survey will become under the remit of the HEA, who have commissioned a review of the survey. There is discussion about the relevance of the survey for the Irish landscape. She advised that there will be an opportunity to</p>	<p><b>Decision QC/23-24/011:</b> The Quality Committee recommends the National Student Survey Reports PGT and PGR to Graduate Studies Committee and to Council.</p>



**Trinity College Dublin**

Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath

The University of Dublin

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<p>have input into the new format and hopefully make it more suitable for the Irish landscape. It is hoped that a more concise survey including more pertinent questions will be the result of the HEA review.</p> <p>The Quality Officer citing the Crowe Evaluation Report on the National Student Survey explained that the HEA may adopt the process of completing the survey every second year. This would align with the HEA Act 2022. The frequency of the PGR report will most likely stay as it is, every two years, and the IUA will be seeking that the National Student Survey be administered on alternate years to the PGR Survey.</p> <p>The Deputy Librarian commented that the NSS questions appear to be generic, and she would like to see questions included that TCD specifically want answers to. She suggested that perhaps the survey, in the new format, could include a section pertaining to each institution individually.</p> <p>The SU Education Officer commented that from a national level there are a lot of concerns about what the NSS covers. TCD SU is in strong support of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and would like to see some action taken in terms of academic practice in relation to the adoption of the UDL approach by academic staff.</p> <p>The Senior Lecturer commented that the TCD Inclusive Project has been championing UDL and there are ongoing efforts to disseminate it across college. The Vice-Provost observed that there are caveats to rolling out UDL across College in terms of assessment. There is a desire to facilitate but we must remain mindful that there are</p>	



Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<p>significant resource issues limiting the speed at which we can adopt UDL. The Academic Secretary confirmed that the integration of UDL should be understood as a whole pedagogical exercise and changing of culture across college.</p> <p>Professor Dirk Van Damme observed that while the NSS could be better in terms of response and results, it still contains value and signals areas that should be taken seriously.</p> <p>The Quality Officer explained that there were two major topics within the PGR survey; finances and skills development. Through the PG Renewal programme, Board has approved a different financing model for 2023/24. Another gain has been with the design and launch of the supervisor agreement for research. We will be able to monitor the impact of the staff-student research agreement pilot by looking at the scores and indicators in the next survey.</p>	
<b>QC/23-24/012 Update on IEM</b>	<p>The Quality Officer gave a brief presentation to the Quality Committee to provide an update on the International Education Mark (IEM), within the context of recent meetings that took place over the summer months and the progress made as a result.</p> <p>The Vice-Provost in reference to the single brand stated that this decision appeared to have been made in a manner that lacked transparency. We had understood there would be a mark for HEIs and a separate mark for English Language Education sector. She worried that conflation of the two could impact on our reputational standing.</p>	<p><b>Action QC/23-24/012.1:</b>          The Vice-Provost will bring the QC responses on this matter to the Registrars.</p> <p><b>Action QC/23-24/012.2:</b>          The Quality Officer will communicate the QC response in feedback via the IUA IEM Working</p>



# Trinity College Dublin

Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath

The University of Dublin

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<p>She also voiced concern that that there was insufficient clarity regarding linked providers. Moreover, there was an inference that Micro-Credentials would be included on the NFQ which was also worrisome.</p> <p>The Director of Student Services asked for clarification with regard to non-EU students coming to college if we do not obtain the IEM, and it was confirmed that students will not receive a visa to study if Trinity does not hold the IEM.</p> <p>The Academic Secretary expressed dissatisfaction at the mandatory process that the College will have to undergo to achieve the IEM, as there have already been several external processes and documents that can attest to our quality and demonstrate compliance.</p> <p>The Quality Officer clarified the accommodation provided to Universities and HEIs following initial implementation of the IEM was that we will only be required to provide an annual update on compliance against the Code via the Annual Quality Report to QQI. English Language Education sector and Private Institutions will be required to undergo a cycle of reviews every three years.</p> <p>The Vice-Provost concluded that there is discontent on the matter, and some frustration around QQI's lack of confidence in the rigorous measures that higher education institutions have already undergone. These responses will be brought to the attention of the IUA Registrars by the VP-CAO.</p>	<p>Group due to QQI on the 28<sup>th</sup> of October 2023.</p>



Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<p>The Quality Officer undertook to incorporate the key points of the discussion in feedback to the IUA Working Group and to QQI due on the 27<sup>th</sup> of October 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rationale for the Self- Assessment Report in light of the rigorous quality measures already in place in Trinity as verified by the Cinnte Institutional Review Report.</li> <li>• The request made that the assessment against the Code not repeat the Institutional Self Evaluation Report approach, appears not to have been heard.</li> <li>• As a sector the Designated Awarding Bodies do not support the request to publish the Self -Assessment Report.</li> <li>• There is an urgent need to provide transparency on the cost to HE providers of the IEM and in particular our Linked Providers who carry the dual burden of an application cost and an annual cost.</li> <li>• Trinity objects to the use of a single brand for all providers in the state as it does not differentiate the different types of providers and levels of public responsibility and accountability.</li> </ul>	
<b>QC/23-24/013</b> Any other business	NA	
<b>QC/23-24/014</b> MIE Quality Review IT Services for Noting	<p>The Quality Officer spoke to the MIE’s Quality Review of IT Services highlighting the fact that it was MIE’s first review of a corporate service under procedures approved by Trinity.</p> <p>In response to a query from the Director IT Services on the remit of Quality Committee on the review report and recommendations arising from it, the Academic Secretary</p>	<b>Action QC/23-24/14:</b> The Quality Officer noted the MIE Quality Review of its IT Services.



**Trinity College Dublin**

Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath

The University of Dublin

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<p>advised that Trinity as the awarding body has oversight responsibility for linked providers' quality procedures but does not oversee the implementation of review recommendations from areas other than academic programmes.</p> <p>The Quality Committee recommended that in the case of corporate area reviews instead of submitting the review report that Linked Providers should be asked to simply provide a statement testifying that the areas subject to review demonstrate good quality assurance procedures and, where relevant, identifying areas that need improvement.</p>	<p>The QO to liaise with the LPs to develop an approach for communicating the outcome of corporate area reviews.</p>
<p><b>QC/23-24/015</b> HE Degree Classification Project</p>	<p>The Senior Lecturer gave an overview of the progress of the HE Degree Classification Project with the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) There are four programmes taking part; English, Law, BESS and General Nursing.</li> <li>(ii) The project is under way, and a meeting with QQI took place on October 13<sup>th</sup> which allowed the Programme Representatives to raise any concerns.</li> <li>(iii) There has been positive engagement so far, and we expect to receive some useful data as a result from the project, which we can utilise in the future.</li> <li>(iv) Check-in meetings will be offered to programme representatives as touch points throughout the project.</li> <li>(v) Professor Dirk Van Damme has kindly offered to look at the data as they evolve.</li> </ul>	





Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
<b>QC/23-24/016</b> AQR Call 2022/23 Received, due 23 February 2024	<p>The Quality Officer highlighted the following points with regard to the Annual Quality Report 2022/23:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) The call for the AQR 2022/23 has been received and is due for submission to the QQI on 23 February 2024. It is likely to come to Quality Committee on 25 January 2024.</li><li>(ii) This will be the first AQR post the submission of the Implementation Plan and the Institutional Quality Review. The Quality Office has contacted those responsible for implementation plan actions to provide an update for the AQR.</li></ul>	<p><b>Decision QC/23-24/016:</b> The Quality Office will be in contact with the those responsible for implementation plan actions relating to the Institutional Review to contribute updates to the AQR 2022/23.</p>