

*Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Board meetings*

The University of Dublin

Trinity College

**Minutes of Special Board Meeting, 18 January 2005**

<i>Present</i>	Provost (Dr J Hegarty), Registrar (Dr D J Dickson), Bursar (Dr J W O'Hagan), Senior Lecturer (Dr J A Murray), Dr S P A Allwright, Dr W J Blau*, Dr J A Fitzpatrick**, Dr H Gibbons, Dr H M C V Hoey**, Mr F Kieran, Ms M Leahy, Dr J G Lunney, Mr D Mac Síthigh, Dr A N M Ní Chasaide, Mrs J O'Hara, Mr L Ryder, Mr R P Sheridan, Ms E K Stokes, Mr B Sweeney, Dr D L Weaire.
<i>Apologies</i>	Vice-Provost (Dr J B Grimson), Mr B Connolly, Dr L E Doyle, Mr H Kearns, Dr F Shevlin.
<i>In attendance</i>	
<i>(ex officio)</i>	Secretary, Treasurer, Assistant Secretary.
<i>(by invitation)</i>	Dean of Research for BD/04-05/143-145 (part).
<i>Present for</i>	* Minutes BD/04-05/143-144 (part) ** Minutes BD/04-05/144 (part) – 145

The Provost welcomed those present to the Special Meeting of the Board which had been convened specifically to consider issues in relation to the proposed Academic-based Resource Allocation Model and re-structuring.

**SECTION A**

**BD/04-05/143 ARAM and Structures - Draft minutes of Board discussions on 14 December 2004** In considering the draft minutes of the discussions which had taken place at the Board meeting on 14 December 2004 on the *Roadmap for Decision on ARAM and Structures* and the *Key Features of an Academic-Based Resource Allocation Model (ARAM)*, which had been circulated for information, Board members requested that in future, more details on the nature of discussions should be incorporated into the minutes, so as to more fully inform members of the College community as to the context of recommendations and decisions.

In response to comment, the Secretary clarified that the report of the Board's consideration of the restructuring issues at the December Board meeting, which was sent to all staff, was in response to unprecedented requests for information and should in no way be construed as a minute of the meeting of 14 December 2004.

**BD/04-05/144 Key Features of an Academic-Based Resource Allocation Model (ARAM) Proposals: Paper 2** The Bursar, introducing the topic, invited Board's attention to the background to the development of an ARAM, noting that the matter had been under consideration for over three years and that it had been included as a priority in the 2003 Strategic Plan and that first proposals had been presented in March 2004. The Bursar, noting that the

work of the ARAM Task Force on Phases 1 and 2 was drawing to a close, paid tribute to its members and to the Academic Secretary and the Treasurer who had contributed very significantly to its work.

The Bursar advised Board that following the discussion at the meeting on 14 December 2004 in relation to the key principles associated with the allocation of State grant income, which Board noted accounts for 75%-85% of an academic unit's income, (minute BD/04-05/119 refers), some very constructive suggestions had been received and would be incorporated into the final draft of the paper which would be considered by Board on 26 January 2005.

The Bursar advised Board that a paper entitled '*Further Features of an Academically-Based Resource Allocation Model – Proposals: Paper 2*', which had been circulated, considers all non-State grant income ('other income') together with cost elements and presents proposals as to how they might be treated as part of the ARAM.

The Board noted that 'other income', which may represent a significant element of an academic unit's discretionary funding, includes fees for postgraduate students, fees for undergraduate non-EU students, income directly attributable to academic units, i.e. targeted funded posts, funded research, and monies allocated from the Strategic Fund.

The Bursar also advised Board that, for the purposes of the model, costs were divided into direct and indirect costs, noting that direct costs account for between 55 and 65 percent of an academic unit's total costs, and include the pay costs of academic, technical and administrative staff, and such non-pay costs as recurrent equipment, recruitment costs and conference travel. The Board noted that indirect costs account for approximately 35 to 45 percent of the total costs of an academic unit and include costs associated with space, the use of IS Services, the Library and other Academic Services, the use of Administrative Services, General Educational Expenses, and the use of Student Services and miscellaneous expenses.

The Bursar invited Board's attention to the following specific proposals:

1. All 'other income' should flow directly to the academic unit in question.
2. The present method for assigning the running costs of space, under the unit-cost exercise, should be continued for now, but reviewed by the Task Force.
3. The running costs of all space in an academic unit should be assigned to the unit, including the costs of space for external research-funded activity, with the unit to recoup these costs from the associated overheads where they apply.
4. The present method of assigning the costs of IS Services, under the unit-cost exercise, should be continued.
5. Each academic unit should pay for library and academic services on the following basis: the student FTE for the unit arising from taught courses; the weighted (not based on a subject criterion) FTE for postgraduate research students; a weighted staff (academic and research) FTE for the unit.
6. The weights in calculating the weighted staff FTE for allocating the costs of Library and other Academic Services should be reviewed by the Task Force, but for now a minimum weight of 3.0 should apply to all full-time staff and researchers in the unit, with a pro-rata reduction for part-time staff.
7. The method of assigning the costs of Administrative Services should in all but one case (see point 8) be based on a weighted student FTE for each unit, with all EU students having a weight of 1.0 and all non-EU students having a weight of 1.5.
8. A separate method for assigning the costs of Administrative Services for external research-funded activity should be developed by the Task Force, at the latest by the end of 2004/05, reflecting both the greatly varying use of the different services by researchers and the requirements of different external funding agencies.

9. The present method of assigning the costs of General Educational Expenses, under the unit-cost exercise, should be continued.
10. The method of assigning the costs of Student Services and Miscellaneous Expenses should be based on a weighted FTE for each unit, with all EU students having a weight of 1.0 and all non-EU students having a weight of 1.5.

The Bursar noted that many of the recommendations in relation to the assignment of indirect costs reflect existing practice in the unit cost exercise.

The Bursar also invited attention to the issues identified in Section IV of his paper which highlighted a number of matters that had yet to be dealt with. These included (i) the level of costs in support areas, and the need to optimise value for money in terms of the level and quality of support; (ii) the need to have robust data and to provide adequate management information systems to support the ARAM and the devolution of financial decision-making to academic units; (iii) the preparation of a paper to deal with issues that will arise during the transition period.

In the course of a long and detailed discussion the following matters were raised by Board members:

- (i) the time and financial costs, and the personal inconvenience, incurred by those located Trinity Centres such as those at St James's Hospital and at the Hospital in Tallaght should be explicitly addressed when charges for services, which are located in the City Centre campus, are being applied to the model; the limited services available to non-city academic units should also be taken into account in the model; an academic unit's decision-making could be influenced by reduced costs for services associated with locations away from the City Centre;
- (ii) students in different disciplines differ in their usage of the Library, noting that Science students in particular tend to spend more time in laboratories and that the costs allocated to Science and other similar departments for Library usage should reflect this relatively lower level of usage; the view was also expressed that there should be no differentiation between disciplines in the allocation of Library costs;
- (iii) funds for postgraduate awards should be devolved to academic units for disbursement locally;
- (iv) there are some services, such as the Library, which are an integral part of a university's activities and 'value for money' analyses in its case must be addressed in a particular way to ensure that its centrality to the life of the College is not diminished;
- (v) the document should contain explicit reference to the aspiration that administration services should be devolved to academic units;
- (vi) imposing indirect charges is never popular and a balance has to be struck between devolving functions to academic units and the risk of creating of units which become independent of the College;
- (vii) the model will have to have an inherent flexibility to address future needs and circumstances;
- (viii) discussions on the ARAM and re-structuring have not taken place below the level of Head of Department in some areas;
- (ix) some departments will require information on how the ARAM will apply to them in order to assist in their discussions on re-structuring.

In response to queries from Board members the Bursar advised that:

- (a) costs associated with non-EU students are not accounted for in the State recurrent grant;
- (b) the Senior Tutor's Office is allocated to Student Services;
- (c) proposals presented in relation to the State recurrent grant as discussed at the Board meeting on 14 December make provision for students from non-

- traditional backgrounds, including mature students and those engaged in life long learning;
- (d) the next version of the paper should include clarification in relation to numerical data and where possible schematic representation(s) of the model;
  - (e) the principles and parameters of the model must be agreed before any outputs are considered. Specific issues which are highlighted by the application of the model can then be addressed within the context of the College's policies and if necessary by 'special case' arrangements;
  - (f) once costs have been allocated to an academic unit these costs can be managed in an appropriate way at a local level.

The Board noted the views of the Student members of Board that, as the Library and other student services are currently under-funded, the ARAM should not result in a reduction of the existing funding levels and that academic costs for student services should be allocated on the basis of student numbers and not usage. The Student members of Board also recommended that funds for student services should not be jeopardised by value of money considerations in the future, noting that there was a fear that the actions of individual academic units could result in lower levels of funding being available to student services.

The Board also noted the Bursar's comments that commitments cannot be made at this time about future discussions and decisions in relation to value for money considerations, noting that the current proposals, if implemented, will result in the maintenance of existing levels of funding for student services.

In conclusion, the Provost advised Board that a paper combining proposals in relation to the State recurrent grant and 'other income' and costs, and which would take account of Board members' comments, would be presented to Board for consideration on 26 January 2005 and invited Board members to send any further comments to the Bursar.

#### **BD/04-05/145 Structures**

- (i) **Governance** The Senior Lecturer invited Board's attention to a memorandum, dated 11 January 2005, which had been circulated, and which presented, in outline form, principles in relation to governance issues which had been developed following consultation and discussion with the Deans' Committee. The Board noted that, following agreement on future academic organisational structures, it will be necessary for each new School to form an Interim School Executive for the period to September 2005 to develop outline proposals for academic strategy, organisation and School governance.

The Senior Lecturer invited Board's attention to the following proposals.

- (a) **Head of School:** There appear to be three options with regard to the appointment of the Head:
  - election in accordance with procedures used for the election of Head of Department;
  - appointment by internal or open competition, using a selection process similar to that for any academic appointment or for professorial positions specifically;
  - nomination and election in consultation with the Provost and Executive Officers.

The Board noted the proposal that the Head would hold office for five years in the first instance, renewable for up to a further three years and in the case of an appointment by open competition, it was proposed that the appointment would be for a fixed term of six years, with review

within the first three. The Senior Lecturer also advised Board that, as the range of duties of the Head of School would be significantly greater than those of current Heads of Department, further consideration should be given to the incentives and rewards available for those taking on the role of Head of School. The Board also noted the proposal that consideration be given to the career of those taking on the duties of Headship after they have completed their term of office.

- (b) **Director of Teaching and Learning (Undergraduate), Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate), Director of Research:** It is proposed that appointments would be made to these positions from among the staff of the School by the Head and that they would be responsible for initiating and overseeing curriculum development and for research strategy and in particular for identifying and fostering cooperation possibilities between Schools. The Board also noted the proposal that Directors would be members of College-wide Committees of Teaching & Learning and of Research. The Senior Lecturer also advised that it was proposed that, in some Schools where a number of courses are offered, the chairs of relevant disciplines may have responsibility for the undergraduate teaching programme in consultation with the School's Director of Teaching and Learning.
- (c) **School Executive:** The School Executive would normally consist of the Head of School, Directors of Teaching & Learning (undergraduate and postgraduate) and the Director of Research, as well as the chairpersons of the disciplinary areas within the School and the School's student convenor(s).
- (d) **School Committees:** School Committees would consist of staff and student representatives from different programmes/years within the School.
- (e) **Chairs of Disciplines/Academic Leadership:** The Senior Lecturer advised that it is proposed that Chairs of disciplines would be analogous to the current Heads of Departments and that they would have a similar relationship with Professorial Chairholders as pertains at present.
- (f) **Resource allocation:** It is proposed that while resource allocation is fundamentally a matter for Schools there would be general principles to which all Schools must adhere to ensure fairness and transparency. It is proposed that decisions in relation to resource allocation would be made by the Head of School in consultation with the School Executive and with the advice of the School Committee.
- (g) **Academic Strategy and Resource Planning:** The Board noted proposals in relation to the development of three-year plans in Schools.
- (h) **Relationship between Schools and College decision-making:** The Senior Lecturer invited Board's attention to options for the relationship between School and College decision-making which were contingent on the decisions which would be made in relation to Faculty structures.
- (i) **Schools and Academic Promotion:** The Senior Lecturer advised Board that it is proposed that while Schools would have devolved authority to decide on and plan staff appointments within their resource envelope and their academic plan, staff promotions should remain a centrally guided process. The Board also noted the proposal that while decisions in relation to recruitment would be made locally the recruitment process would remain a central function.
- (j) **Research Institutes, Research Centres:** The Senior Lecturer advised Board that notwithstanding the outcome of the current discussions in relation to academic structures there is a need to clarify the position and

accountability of research institutes within the College that are not currently attached to any department.

- (ii) **Faculties and Deans** The Senior Lecturer invited Board's attention to a memorandum, dated 11 January 2005, which had been circulated, and which presented outline options with regard to Faculties and Deans in the context of a College in which there is a limited number of Schools. The Board noted that the options are currently under discussion with the Deans.

The Senior Lecturer advised Board that views have varied considerably on the matter of Faculties and that, in a College with devolved decision making, financial responsibility and accountability at School level, the role and function of Faculties and Deans has to be considered afresh. The Senior Lecturer invited attention to the following issues which need to be addressed: (a) the role of Faculties in managing certain aspects of integration between Schools; (b) the need for a Faculty where Schools of both an integrated and federated nature are formed; (c) the need for Faculties as a transitional mechanism; (d) the need for Faculties as the mechanism through which Schools are represented in central College decision-making. The Board also noted that there may be a need for a Dean to fulfil the role of mediator between Schools and to support and advise Schools in the matters of academic planning and practice and to provide a collective point of contact with external stakeholders.

The Senior Lecturer invited Board's attention to the following four options for Faculties noting the key advantages and risks of each:

1. **Schools Only** where Schools would interact directly with central College structures and decision-making
2. **Faculties as Co-ordinating and Integrating Structures** where Deans and their Offices, in addition to providing academic leadership and specialised administrative and financial support, and facilitating integration between Schools, might represent their Faculties in central College decision-making. The Senior Lecturer advised Board that under these arrangements consideration could be given to there being four Faculties and that Faculty Deans might be appointed by rotation among the Heads/Deans of Schools or be elected.
3. **Faculties Incorporating Resource Management and Planning Roles** which provides for three Faculty Deans with a significant role in resource allocation and planning. The Board noted that under this arrangement, Deans might be incorporated into the Executive Officers Group and would be accountable for the integrated implementation of College strategy, for resource allocation and budgetary compliance, for review and support of Heads of School, for quality improvement, and other coordinating activities. The Board noted that this option reflects substantially the proposals contained in the document prepared by nine academic staff members entitled 'A Faculty-Based Academic Resource Allocation Model' which had been circulated for information.
4. **Faculties as Transitional Mechanisms** where it was proposed that Faculties should continue temporarily, transferring functions and activities to Schools in a sequenced manner over a period of one to three years.

The Senior Lecturer up-dated Board on the current status of discussions in relation to the formation of Schools, noting that there are likely to be in the order of fifteen/sixteen Schools when all discussions are concluded. In response to queries, the Senior Lecturer clarified the situation in relation to specific departments and disciplines and advised

***Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Board meetings***

Board that the current degree programme, with the existing degree titles, would continue to be offered under the proposed new arrangements.

The Senior Lecturer advised Board that, following extended and detailed discussions with the current Faculty Deans, they have expressed a preference for having Faculties as co-ordinating and integrating structures. The Board noted comment that Deans may not represent the views of all staff in their Faculties.

In the course of a long discussion the following points were made by Board members:

- (i) courses with common entry requirements could experience difficulties if there is no over-arching Faculty structure;
- (ii) the introduction of the *Schools Only* (Option 1) structure would allow for the re-empowerment of Council by having all Heads of School as members;
- (iii) any proposal advocating no change in the College's structures should not be considered;
- (iv) a Faculty structure should remain with Schools having the autonomy to combine with other cognate Schools;
- (v) once new structures are in place there will be a need for a Dean to work with Schools and academic units to ensure the implementation of the plans and to facilitate adjustments to the original plans as required;
- (vi) if the *Schools Only* (Option 1) is chosen not all Heads of School will be able to be members of the Executive Officers Group and an alternative to appointing Faculty Deans to address this issue would be to have a selected group of Heads of School as members of Executive Officers;
- (vii) the optimum term of office for a Head of School should be five years and eligibility for Headship should be limited to Professors and Associate Professors;
- (viii) there are advantages of retaining the election of Heads, noting the opinion that there have been no difficulties with the calibre of elected heads in the past and that long service with the College is not a pre-requisite for election to headship;
- (ix) School plans should also be for five years to match the term of office of Heads and the duration of fixed-term contracts;
- (x) there may be considerable financial costs associated with the introduction of the proposed Schools;
- (xi) one of the reasons for the proposed restructuring was to encourage cross-faculty and/or cross-disciplinary teaching and research. The proposals have no provisions for such arrangements outside the boundaries of Schools but could be facilitated by Deans in a Faculty structure;
- (xii) some existing large Departments could be split between two Schools under the new arrangements.

In response to queries from Board Members, the Senior Lecturer advised Board that, under the proposed restructuring, while decisions in relation to recruitment would be made locally, all employment contracts would be with the College. The Senior Lecturer also advised the Board that discipline and functional titles could be retained within Schools.

In response to a suggestion that the Officers meet with the authors of the report submitted by the nine academic staff members with a view to considering their proposal in the context of Faculty structures, the Provost advised Board that he had met with some members of the group before Christmas and that he had sought a further meeting with them since they had circulated their report on 13 January 2005.

The Board, noting that there are similarities between the proposals contained in the report submitted by nine academic staff members and Option 3 (*Faculties Incorporating Resource Management and Planning Roles*) as presented by the Senior Lecturer, also noted

***Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Board meetings***

the Senior Lecturer's comments that it represents a more extreme version of the proposal in relation to the power of Deans compared with that presented by the Structures, Management and Systems Working Group in April 2004.

The Bursar invited Board's attention to the process which had led to the current proposals, noting that the report of the Structures, Management and Systems Working Group in April 2004 had presented options ranging from 'No Change' through 'Schools Only' to a proposal that there be three large Faculties each managed by a Dean, and that these proposals had been the basis of public staff meetings, discussions with Heads of Departments and other representative groups during Trinity Term 2004. The Bursar advised Board that following these discussions the consensus had been that the College move towards a School-based structure, noting that there are democratic processes within the College whereby members of the College community, can express their views and opinions. The ultimate decisions must be made by Board.

In conclusion, the Board requested the Senior Lecturer to develop proposals based on the *Faculties as Co-ordinating and Integrating Structures* (Option 2) and *Faculties Incorporating Resource Management and Planning Roles* (Option 3) as currently presented also considering the points raised in the paper prepared by the nine academic staff members.

The Senior Lecturer invited Board members to send any further comments directly to him.

Signed: .....

Date: .....