

*Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Board meetings*

**The University of Dublin**

**Trinity College**

**Minutes of Special Board Meeting, Tuesday 26 June 2007**

<i>Present</i>	Provost (Dr J Hegarty), Vice-Provost (Dr R M J Byrne), Bursar (Dr D C Williams), Senior Lecturer (Dr C Kearney), Dr N J Biggar, Dr A Butterfield, Ms M A Coffey, Dr J F Donegan, Dr A C Donnelly, Mr H Kearns, Mr R Kearns, Ms D Keogh, Ms M Leahy, Dr E Mac Cárthaigh, Dr D P O'Donovan, Dr E J O'Halpin, Ms R Pe Palileo, Dr J A N Parnell, Dr A J Piesse, Mr D Quinn, Mr B Sweeney, Dr J K Vij.
<i>Apologies</i>	Registrar (Dr J Barkhoff), Ms G M Clarke, Dr J M Kelly, Dr M A Lynch, Dr K J McGinley.
<i>In attendance</i>	
<i>(ex officio)</i>	Secretary, Treasurer, Assistant Secretary.
<i>(by invitation)</i>	Dean of Research (for BD/06-07/351) Dr T N Mitchell (for BD/06-07/353)

**SECTION A**

**BD/06-07/351 Research Matters** The Dean of Research, present by invitation, invited Board's attention to the following matters which had been raised.

**PRTL:** The Board noted concerns at the lack of communication with those developing inter-institutional proposals for submission under PRTL about the change in the College's position vis-à-vis ranking of proposals, from one where it had originally been intended to give all proposals equal priority to a situation where the final College submission had ranked each proposal. It was noted that this change in policy, albeit required by the HEA, should have been communicated to Principal Investigators prior to the submission of proposals so that partner institutions could have been advised of Trinity's position.

The Dean of Research advised Board that the ranking of proposals being submitted under Phase 2 of PRTL had been a firm requirement of the HEA, despite the College's stated preference to give equal priority to its individual proposals. He advised Board that the ranking exercise had taken place within a very tight deadline and that there had not been sufficient time to convene a meeting of the Research Committee to consider the matter. He acknowledged that Principal Investigators had not been advised of the rankings until after the submission had been made to the HEA. The Board noted that the ranking had been undertaken by a group of Academic Officers, and the Dean invited Board's attention to the criteria used and how each individual proposal rated accordingly.

In response to comments that the process to select projects for submission to the HEA had not been transparent and had been selective, the Dean advised Board that there had

been discussions with the Directors of Research in all Schools in order to prepare for the PRTL exercise. Dr Vij expressed reservations about the Dean's explanations.

**Research in the Arts and Humanities:** In response to query, the Dean advised Board that the review of the Arts and Humanities had been considered at the earliest opportunity by Council and Board.

**Research Committee:** In response to queries about the operation of the Research Committee, the Dean advised Board that the Committee had met five times during the academic year and that one further meeting had been deferred as it had not been quorate. He stated that, in his opinion, the Board's decision to follow the advice of the Audit Committee in relation to the membership of the Committee had been premature and that the membership should be representative of the College's best researchers, including, he agreed, young researchers. The Dean advised Board that when the new Faculty structures are in place there will be opportunities to devolve business from the Research Committee to Faculties.

**Business and Industry Committee:** The Board noted that the terms of reference for a newly-constituted Business and Industry Committee would be considered at the next meeting of the Research Committee on 19 July 2007, and that the proposed membership would include a significant number of external members.

The Board, thanking the Dean for attending the meeting, noted that, as agreed at the last meeting (minute BD/06-07/335 refers), regular reports from the Dean of Research would be built in to the schedule for Board meetings in future and that the dates would be advised to the in-coming Dean as soon as possible.

**BD/06-07/352 Restructuring – Phase 2** The Senior Lecturer invited Board's attention to a memorandum, dated 21 June 2007, which had been circulated together with the following documents:

- (i) Central Management and Administrative and Support Services Reform;
  - (ii) Estimated costs of Faculty Office Personnel, Faculty Deans, the Chief Academic Officer and the Chief Operating Officer;
  - (iii) Draft Restructuring Implementation Schedule;
  - (iv) Proposed Titles for new Faculties and recommendations for their establishment;
- Circulated for information:
- (v) The Draft minute on restructuring from the Council meeting of 14 June 2007;
  - (vi) A copy of the report from Prospectus Consultants arising from site visits to Queen's University Belfast, the University of Bristol and the University of Edinburgh.

The Senior Lecturer advised Board that the Finance Committee, at its meeting on 30 May 2007, approved the estimated costs, subject to among other things, the costs of administrative and support services reform not adversely affecting academic activity and, in particular, the filling of academic posts in College. The Resource Management Committee at its meeting on 11 June 2007 also approved the costs subject to savings being achieved in the long term across the entire administrative and support services, and that the baseline for measuring the achievement of targets would exclude the additional costs identified for the Chief Operating Officer, the Chief Academic Officer, the Faculty Deans and the Faculty personnel.

The Board noted that the Restructuring Advisory Committee, having considered the issues raised to date as part of the consultation process, the recommendations of Council, the Finance Committee and the Resources Management Committee, and having been apprised of legal considerations in respect of the Statutes, recommended to

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

Board the adoption of the proposals on Central Management and Administrative and Support Services Reform.

In response to a query, the Senior Lecturer advised Board that, if agreement is reached on the four issues proposed in Section 3 of the paper on Central Management and Administrative and Support Services Reform, the matters outlined in Section 4 of the paper, namely, Executive Officers Group, Statutory and non-Statutory Annual Officers and College Committee Structures would be addressed during Michaelmas Term 2007 and presented to Board for approval in due course.

Dr Vij invited Board's attention to the following concerns in relation to the proposed changes. He stated that the role of the Bursar, which in the past has been a very significant one in the life of the College, will be untenable in the proposed new structures and the very valuable academic oversight of the buildings and finance areas will be lost as a result of the reporting arrangements to the proposed Chief Operating Officer. The proposals are overly bureaucratic and the checks and balances which exist under the current arrangements will be lost. Dr Vij stated his belief that the views expressed during the extensive consultation process have not been reflected in the proposals currently before Board. He expressed concern that the proposals which have been developed for central management and administrative and support reform are based exclusively on UK models and no consideration has been given to European or Japanese experiences. It was noted that a recent article in *Nature* discussed the relative decline in the quality and output of universities in the UK, with the exception of a very small number of top UK universities, and Dr Vij suggested that the College was misguided in adopting models currently in use in a country whose contribution to the generation of knowledge is declining. He stated that, while he was not averse to change, he did not agree with the form of change being proposed and he stated that the nomenclature being proposed for the Chief Academic Office and the Chief Operating Officer was inappropriate for an academic institution. Dr Vij concluded by stating his belief that the College is proceeding too fast with the proposed changes and he requested that his dissension from the introduction of the proposals be noted, for the reasons stated.

A number of the Fellow Board members invited Board's attention to the discussion which had taken place at a recent meeting of Fellows on the proposed restructuring. This meeting had been attended by about one fifth of the Fellows. The Board noted that there had been a wide divergence of views expressed by both older and younger Fellows at the meeting, with strong views in favour of, and against, the changes being expressed. It was stated that there was a fear among the Fellows that the proposed changes would interfere with the academic life and traditions of the College but, at the same time, there was a need to introduce the administrative and support reform necessary to support the new academic structures.

In the course of a discussion on the proposals, the following issues were raised by Board members:

- (i) it is necessary to implement the proposed administrative and support services reform without delay, in order to adapt the management of the College to the changes which have taken place both within the College, and externally, in recent decades and to meet the stated needs of the academic community for appropriate administrative and support services to underpin the academic reforms;
- (ii) the consultation process has been very effective and thorough and the Students' Union and the Graduate Students' Union members of Board expressed satisfaction that their comments and concerns have been adequately addressed throughout the process;

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

- (iii) academic leaders, such as Heads of School or Deans of Faculties should have adequate administrative and services support so as to enable them to engage as fully as possible with the academic development of the areas within their remit;
- (iv) there needs to be clarification as to the role and function of the Academic Management Group so as to avoid confusion with Executive Officers Group and Board and Council;
- (v) the College has to recognise that, given its current scale of operation, it must adopt more robust management structures than heretofore;
- (vi) consideration should be given to the views of experienced Fellows of the College who feel that the administrative and support reforms are proceeding too quickly;
- (vii) it will be difficult to fill the position of Chief Operating Officer as proposed until there is full clarity as to the role and responsibility of Statutory Annual Officers and other Statutory Officers;
- (viii) the College's postgraduate students, many of whom aspire to an academic life, trust the experienced academics in College to make the correct decisions which will impact on their future careers.

In responding to a number of the issues raised, the Senior Lecturer advised Board that additional detail would be added to the job specification for the Chief Operating Officer to address concerns about the academic pre-eminence of the College's activities and the need to link activities in administrative and service areas to academic functions. He noted that the Registrar had been inadvertently omitted as a member of the Academic Management Group in the document which had been circulated. He also stated that in the development of procedures to give effect to the proposals under consideration, care would be taken to enshrine the College's traditions and collegiality. In response to a query, the Senior Lecturer advised Board that the duration of the term of office for the Chief Operating Officer had been the subject of much deliberation and the proposed seven year term, with an option to renew for a further three years, was considered to offer the best arrangement for the College. In response to a query, the Secretary advised Board that the procedures for recruiting the Chief Operating Officer would be similar to those employed for all such positions, with a public advertisement, a Search Committee, and the services of a recruitment consultant.

The Senior Lecturer also advised Board that the Council at its meeting on 14 June (minute CL/06-07/203 refers) had considered the proposals and had recommended their adoption.

The Board approved the proposals for Central Management and Administration as presented, subject to the issues raised in relation to academic pre-eminence, tradition and collegiality and agreed to the:

- (i) clarification of the role of Senior Lecturer as the Chief Academic Officer;
- (ii) establishment of the position of Chief Operating Officer;
- (iii) establishment of an Academic Management Group;
- (iv) establishment of a Senior Administrative Management Group.

The Board requested that the job specification and procedure for the appointment of the Chief Operating Officer would be presented to Board at the next meeting.

The Senior Lecturer invited Board's attention to the memorandum dated 21 June 2007, outlining proposed titles for new faculties and recommendations for their establishment. The Board noted comments in relation to the difficulties which the switch from a five Faculty to a three Faculty arrangement on 1 January 2008 is likely to cause for students and to the academic processes of the College. The Senior Lecturer advised Board that Council had considered the proposals and had approved them as being the

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

best option, noting that there would never be an ideal time to make such a transition. In response to a query, the Senior Lecturer advised Board that research institutes whose activities span a number of Faculties will, for the purposes of financial management, report to one named Faculty Dean.

The Board, approving the Faculty titles and constituent Schools as proposed, agreed that Council would be asked to provide regular reports to Board, over and above the minutes of Council meetings, on the management of academic processes during the transition.

The Board thanked the Senior Lecturer and the Acting Academic Secretary and all those members of the College community who contributed so effectively to the development of the restructuring procedures to date, noting that this exercise had, in many cases, been additional to existing very heavy work loads.

**BD/06-07/353 Appointment of Provost – Working Party Report** The Provost welcomed Dr T N Mitchell, Chair of the Working Party on the Appointment of the Provost to the meeting. Dr Mitchell invited Board's attention to the Working Party's report, which had been circulated, and he drew particular attention to the Working Party's recommendations in relation to each of the issues it was asked to address.

*Term of Office of the Provost:* Dr Mitchell noted that while the Universities Act 1997 gives no real flexibility in regard to the ten-year term of office of the Provost, the Working Party recommends that, in line with good international practice, the Board should conduct a mid-term performance-related review according to a process of determined by the Board.

*The Role of Provost as Chief Officer of the College and the Chairperson of the Board:* Dr Mitchell advised Board that the Working Party gave detailed consideration to this issue, conscious of the fact that the College is now unique in having the positions of both the Chief Officer of the College and the Chairperson of the Board held by the Provost. He noted that this runs counter to best governance practice which recommends the separation of the two roles. He advised Board that the Working Party had noted that College's arrangements have and continue to work satisfactorily, notably because of the predominance of members of College on the Board. The Board noted the Working Party's view that the College's system of accountability, both internal and external, is also robust, thus giving further weight to its recommendation to maintain the *status quo* in this regard.

*Process of Appointment of the Provost:* Dr Mitchell invited Board's attention to the Working Party's conclusion that, based on legal advice, the College's procedures for appointing Provosts do not conform to the provisions of the Universities Act 1997 thereby necessitating changes in the processes. The Board noted that, in recommending changes to the election processes, the Working Party was cognisant that the system of election has a long and valued tradition in the College with proven benefits. Therefore the Working Party had sought a way by which the legal requirements could be met while retaining the form and benefits of the current system to the greatest possible degree. Dr Mitchell invited Board's attention to the proposed two-stage process which combines both interview and election procedures, the details of which were outlined in the Report. Dr Mitchell noted that the Working Party believes that these proposals have the benefits of:

- (i) meeting the requirements of the law;
- (ii) giving more opportunity to external candidates to compete on a more equitable basis;

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

- (iii) putting greater order on the campaign process;
- (iv) retaining all the main benefits of the electoral process.

*Electorate:* Dr Mitchell invited Board's attention to the Working Party's conclusions that the electorate, as specified in the Statutes, should be expanded to include, in addition to academic and research staff, administrative and support staff. These changes are also intended to take account of the broader role for the Provost as Chief Officer, while at the same time recognising that the academic function is the core responsibility of the College, and that it is primarily discharged by the academic staff led by the Provost and supported by the wider College community. The Board noted the Working Party's recommendations in relation to the definition of different categories of staff and the need to assign weightings to the total votes cast by each group. Dr Mitchell advised Board that due to the technical nature of assigning weightings, the Working Party did not address this issue.

In response to queries from Board members, Dr Mitchell advised Board that:

- (a) the appointment of an Emeritus Fellow as Chairperson of the Board would not comply with the legislation;
- (b) the Working Party had not considered what form the election might take, noting that that it had been considered a technical matter for Board to determine;
- (c) the Board has the supreme right to approve the nomination of Provost;
- (d) there is no scope to reduce the term of office for Provost as it is defined in the legislation;
- (e) the three week election period was recommended to facilitate external candidates who may have to travel to Dublin for the election.

Dr Mitchell clarified that the Interview Panel, as proposed in Stage 1, would develop the criteria for the appointment, for approval by Board, and would work closely with the recruitment company as it carries out its work.

In the course of a discussion on the Working Party's recommendations, the following points were made by Board members:

- specific consideration will have to be given to the mechanisms for including students in the electorate;
- consideration should be given in the future to separating the roles of Chief Officer and Chairperson as such a separation may give the Provost more scope to effect change when he would not be the Chair of the Board. The Board noted that it would be possible to appoint an external Chair without legislative change. It was suggested that this issue be considered when the College's committee structures were being reviewed;
- the predominance of internal Board members runs counter to governance best practice which recommends that the majority of members on Boards should be non-executive, which in the case of Trinity would be external to the College.

The Board thanked Dr Mitchell and his Working Party for the excellent report.

The Board agreed that the Working Party's report, incorporating the agreed amendments, would be circulated for discussion among the College community, and that a final report, together with proposals on the associated technical procedures, would be presented to Board in Michaelmas Term 2007.

**BD/06-07/354 Acta of the University Council** The Board confirmed Acta of the University Council from its meetings held on 14 June 2007 subject to further comments covering CL/06-07/204, CL/06-07/205.

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

- BD/06-07/355 Election of Heads of Discipline (see Actum CL/06-07/204 of 14 June 2007)** The Senior Lecturer advised Board that in the light of queries raised in relation to the eligibility of part-time staff to vote in elections for the Headship of Disciplines, legal advice was now being sought and would be considered at the next meeting of Council.
- BD/06-07/356 Senior Promotions – Associate Professorships (see Actum CL/06-07/205 of 14 June 2005)** The Board confirmed the recommendations of the University Council and approved the following promotions to Associate Professorship and Clinical Professorship with effect from 1 October 2007:
- (i) **Associate Professorship**
    - Dr J Barkhoff (Germanic Studies)
    - Dr V A Campbell (Physiology)
    - Dr J Coleman (Physics)
    - Dr P Crowley (Obstetrics and Gynaecology)
    - Dr M R Gale (Classics)
    - Dr H Garavan (Psychology)
    - Dr I Gun'ko (Chemistry)
    - Dr A Irvine (Clinical Medicine)
    - Dr A Kokaram (Electronic and Electrical Engineering)
    - Dr B M Lucey (Business)
    - Dr M Meegan (Pharmacy)
    - Dr O Sheils (Histopathology)
  - (ii) **Clinical Professorship**
    - Dr S Daly (Clinical Medicine)
- BD/06-07/357 Library Opening Hours** Under Other Business in response to a query from the Students' Union Education Officer, the Senior Lecturer advised Board that on the recommendation of the Library Committee, the Information Policy Committee had approved in principle the proposed extended opening hours for the Library, noting that this was now a matter for the Finance Committee. The Senior Lecturer agreed to contact the Deputy Librarian with a view to progressing the matter.
- BD/06-07/358 College's relationship with the IMI** Under Other Business, in response to a query, the Secretary advised Board that it was his understanding that insufficient progress had been made to warrant a report to Board on the proposed arrangements with the IMI but that the School of Business would be invited to present a report to Board.
- BD/06-07/359 Staff Matter – Pension** Under Other Business, in response to a request that the Board do all in its power to rectify issues in relation to a named former staff member's pension entitlements, the Secretary agreed to discuss the particular issue with Ms Leahy.
- BD/06-07/360 Investigation of Staff Complaint** In response to a query, the Secretary advised Board that the Pro-Senior Dean investigating a complaint initiated by a named staff member had completed his report and was consulting with the relevant parties. He stated that the Board would be advised of any matter arising from the investigation which required its attention.

**BD/06-07/361 Pension Trustees** Under Other Business, the Secretary invited Board's attention to a recommendation from the external Chair of the Pension Trustees that in view of the on-going discussions in relation to future arrangements for the Pension scheme, there would be many advantages to re-appointing the existing Trustees to hold office until the current issues are resolved. The Board approved this proposal in principle, pending consultation with the various constituencies from which the membership is drawn.

Signed: .....

Date: .....