

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

The University of Dublin

Trinity College

A meeting of the University Council was held on Wednesday 24 June 2009 at 11.15 am in the Board Room.

<i>Present</i>	Provost, Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer, Senior Lecturer, Senior Tutor, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Research, Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Dr C Laudet, Dr C Morris, Professor J Wickham, Dean of Engineering, Mathematics and Science, Dr V Kelly, Dr D O'Sullivan, Dean of Health Sciences, Professor M McCarron, Professor M Radomski, Dr D Walsh, Ms D Flynn, Professor G Whyte, Ms C Ní Dhubhda, Mr F Hughes, Ms A Murphy, Mr D Kavanagh.
<i>Apologies</i>	Registrar, Dr C MacMaolain, Professor J Fitzpatrick, Dr M Lyons, Dr D Brennan, Dr A O'Gara, Mr H Sullivan, Mr D Walsh, Ms A Mc Gowan.
<i>In attendance</i>	Librarian, Acting Secretary, Academic Secretary.
<i>Observer</i>	Secretary to the Scholars (Mr B Devlin).

SECTION A

CL/08-09/197 Minutes of the meetings of the 3rd June and the 5th June 2009 were approved.

CL/08-09/198 Matters Arising: There were no matters arising.

CL/08-09/199 **Provost's Report:** the Provost informed Council that the Department of Finance has not produced the expected employment control framework and has not responded to the submission by the Irish Universities Association (IUA) on the employment moratorium and the proposed framework. In order to make decisions on staffing for the 2009-10 academic year, the IUA University Presidents and Provost have developed an employment framework for the sector and have submitted this to the Department of Finance. The IUA employment control framework proposes recruitment within existing budgets, retaining staff levels in line with those as of December 2008. The proposal meets the requirements of the Government while at the same time respects university autonomy. A formal position on staff recruitment will be proposed to the College Board for approval at its meeting on the 8th July 2009.

CL/08-09/200 **Undergraduate Teaching Analysis:** a memorandum dated 9th June 2009 from the Vice-Provost was circulated. The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer introduced this item noting that the University Council requested at its meeting of the 3rd December 2008 (Actum CL/08-09/050) the Undergraduate Studies Committee to conduct an analysis of the delivery of undergraduate teaching in the College. Senior government

officials and members of the public perceive that increased activity in postgraduate supervision and research may have led to a reduction in the number of senior staff teaching undergraduate students. An analysis of undergraduate teaching was carried out during Hilary Term 2009. Data regarding the delivery of undergraduate teaching was extracted from the timetabling system (CMIS) and the Schools filled in gaps where they existed. This data was then collated by the Student Administration System (SAS) User Support Unit and verified by the Schools.

The undergraduate teaching analysis exercise has revealed some interesting trends in the delivery of undergraduate teaching in College. The vast majority of academic staff are active in the teaching of undergraduate students, and there is little to support the notion of a disengagement from undergraduate teaching by senior academic staff. Ninety six per cent (96%) of professorial staff taught undergraduates in 2007/08, however, in a few Schools a number of Professors are not engaged in undergraduate teaching largely due to those Professors taking on administrative roles within the university. The distribution and the nature of contact hours with undergraduates differ across Schools. There are eleven Schools where Professors teach the least of any other grade of staff and four Schools where they teach the most (excluding Schools with no Professors). The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer drew Council's attention to the recommendations of the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

Council discussed the data presented and welcomed the finding that all academic staff teach undergraduate students. The Provost considered it important to develop a workload model for staff to include undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, research, and administration. Referring to the recommendation that all Professors should teach undergraduate students, the Provost proposed an amendment to this to read that "all academic staff, including Professors, should teach undergraduate students." A policy stating that all Professors should teach undergraduate students would not only benefit students but also sends a positive message to junior academic staff that teaching is valued. Council noted the high percentage of teaching by non-faculty and commented on the high number of hours that postgraduate assistants teach in some Schools. While it is important that postgraduate assistants get access to teaching, it is equally important that they are not giving lectures and are not responsible for an overall module or course. The absence of any specific reference to postdoctoral researchers was noted. Responding to the recommendation in respect of new Lecturers being given a reduced teaching load in their first year of employment, it was pointed out that some lecturers are employed only to teach and these are usually on a short term contract.

Council noted the report on undergraduate teaching and approved the following recommendations:

- (i) All academic staff, including Professors, should teach undergraduate students. This policy applies on a reduced contact hours basis for those Professors who are employed primarily for research.
- (ii) Professors should teach Freshman courses.
- (iii) New Lecturers on a contract of five years or more should be given a reduced teaching load in their first year of employment to enable them to develop high quality teaching materials and to develop their research.
- (iv) Postgraduate teaching assistants should only be permitted to give lectures in exceptional circumstances and should not have responsibility for a module or course.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked the Academic Secretary and her staff for their work on this project. The Academic Secretary noted the importance of accurate timetabling, and Council agreed that:

- (v) Schools should maintain accurate timetable scheduling to allow for ease of access to teaching data.

CL/08-09/201 Provost's Report on Quality Reviews

- (a) *School of Dental Science* A report dated June 2009 on the quality review of the School of Dental Science was circulated. The Provost introduced this item noting that the School of Dental Science was reviewed in February 2009 by reviewers from the University of Bristol, the Academic Centre for Dentistry Amsterdam, and the University of Helsinki. He noted that the reviewers report that the Dublin Dental Hospital is overall an excellent educational facility and the School of Dental Science has a modern undergraduate dental curriculum. The dental research programmes at the School are addressing appropriate topics, have a link with the dental field, and are recognized within their respective peer groups. The reviewers comment that all senior staff have a strong scientific interest and are aware of the need for the school to excel in research. The staff members share positive attitudes and appreciation of support by the Dental Hospital to facilitate their research activities. The reviewers note, however, that there is still room for further increase in the output of quality papers and PhD theses, and report the need for internal collaboration beyond the Dental School within Trinity College.

The Provost highlighted a number of main points from the review report referring in particular to the useful and constructive criticism of some of the research activity in the School. Referring to teaching and learning, the review report commented positively on the majority of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, but expressed significant concern about the viability of the Dental Technology degree programme. The Provost noted that, in general, grade inflation is a matter of growing concern and noted the reviewers' remarks that the proportion of first class honors degrees in Dental Science is low relative to other university departments. The reviewers feel that this may be explained by the regulations in place for the award of honors in Dental Science in the UK and Ireland. The Provost drew Council's attention to the comments on Problem Based Learning (PBL) teaching methodology, noting the recommendation that an audit of the performance of students under PBL compared to previous conventionally delivered programme would be timely.

The Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences noted the School's response to the review report, and commented that the School is aware of the need to increase the publication of quality research papers. He noted the appointment of a new Director of Research and expressed some regret that the reviewers did not have an opportunity to meet members of the Board of the Dental Hospital. The Dean commented on the need for greater collaboration with other College disciplines and for College to engage more proactively with the Board of the Dental Hospital. He drew Council's attention to the diversity and high calibre of the team of reviewers.

Council noted the review report of the School of Dental Science and approved the following recommendations:

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

- i) *The School is advised to draft a new strategic plan for research for the period 2009-2013 with aims and agreed outcome measures to co-ordinate and facilitate the scientific activities.*
- ii) *The Directorship of Research should be restructured to an internal research committee, chaired by the Dean with the responsibilities of planning activities and allocation of resources. The administrative support from the Dean's office seems most likely sufficient to support the committee.*
- iii) *Alternatively, the role of the Director of Research should be clarified and the jurisdiction clearly defined. However, the Director of Research should document output on a yearly basis and distribute the yearly research KPI's among all in the dental school and the Hospital Board, Dean of the Faculty and the Vice-Provost. In this exercise, the Dean should separate full scientific papers with impact from opinion articles, case-reports and non-impact reports. On this basis personal performance could also be assessed.*
- iv) *A yearly monitor of on-going research projects and PhD projects is needed. The reviewers feel that it must be possible to publish at least four full-length scientific papers with impact from each PhD thesis. The planning of appropriate PhD programmes must be the task of the professor/mentor.*
- v) *The reviewers feel that focus and concentration of research efforts on the best performing groups and people will help to achieve the goal of increased research output. There are several clinical lecturers and professors who are spread thinly on many aspects in their appointment. The reviewers realise the difficulty for staff to meet the heavy demands of clinics, teaching, research and administration. A further concentration on efforts in which each staff member is the best and/or has the most time allocated, may help to alleviate some of the feelings of heavy workload.*
- vi) *The reviewers see the need for more stimulation from the College for excellent research. They recommend that the College confirms its commitment to the dental school by providing some research funds. This can be done for example on the basis of a "reward system" for accomplished PhD's or on the basis of excellent publications or other KPIs. Some transfer of research-earmarked monies (e.g. €100k) will indicate and signal how the College is attached to an internationally esteemed dental school and will stimulate the staff to accomplish excellent research. Reciprocally, with this measure, the staff should feel a stronger connection to the University.*
- vii) *A yearly competition for a School-funded PhD position (funded at the cost of some less productive research efforts) could help to stimulate excellent research to thrive.*
- viii) *The reviewers recommend improved research collaborations with other departments in Trinity: knowledge of other biological systems may be researched in oral systems and visa versa. The oral cavity is a very good model for infectious and inflammatory diseases, including mucosal immunity, and this should be advertised and exploited.*
- ix) *Educational research could be implemented as a specific line of research within the school as long as it has the prospect of good outside funding and that research reports are published in peer-reviewed journals with some impact. Care should be exercised that the projects are "generic" i.e. also applicable to educational programmes other than just dentistry.*

- x) *The reviewers recommend that the Dental School and Hospital anticipates the consequences of future retirements in its staff recruitment policy.*
- xi) *Teaching on the undergraduate dental science programme is based on the Problem Based Learning (PBL) approach which allows little flexibility in the curriculum. Further integration of basic sciences with clear reference to dentistry through the whole curriculum would be beneficial to facilitate undergraduates' learning. This action would possibly reduce dental staff time with these topics.*
- xii) *Considering the scope of comprehensive treatment provided by both undergraduate and postgraduate students, the lack of opportunities for 3D imaging under the supervision of a specialist in the field was a surprise to the reviewers. Solving this problem is a strongly recommended by the reviewers.*
- xiii) *The present situation does not allow an adequate exposure to dental team work since the students (nurses, hygienists, technicians and dental students) have little if anything to do with each other at a clinical or intellectual level. The School should consider better collaboration with different programmes to fully utilise this exceptional educational opportunity.*
- xiv) *Although students appeared to be happy with PBL they were often unsure of the aims and learning outcomes of several aspects of the curriculum. These could be clarified by short descriptive lectures at the beginning of specific modules/courses, or the provision of more information on Blackboard. In this respect, an audit of the performance of students under PBL compared to the previous conventionally delivered programme would seem appropriate at this juncture.*
- xv) *In view of the limited benefit to so few students of the exchange programmes established according to the Bologna Declaration, the School should consider opting out and possibly formalising an elective period programme of, for example, 4 weeks duration and based on a research project.*
- xvi) *An independent research track for all students concluding with a minor research project/literature review is recommended to increase critical and scientific thinking of the future oral health professionals.*
- xvii) *The Curriculum Committee might wish to carefully consider the workload of the second year which was described as overloaded by the students. By the same token, the relevance of Physics and Chemistry in the course was questioned, and training in Practice Management in the latter part of the course would be appreciated by students.*
- xviii) *Active interaction by students and staff members with their counterparts in Trinity College may create further learning environments with positive consequences to be enjoyed at various levels of the school's activities.*
- xix) *Interaction in both clinical work and education of students in Dental Nursing with undergraduate dental students has plenty of room for development.*
- xx) *Given the very high quality of the E-learning programme for the part-time diploma nurses it is surprising that some if not all of this material is not used in the full time programme: this would significantly reduce the already heavy teaching burden of the tutors and more particularly academic staff, and the increased synergy*

- between the part-time and full-time Dental Nursing programmes would be beneficial.*
- xxi) *The magnitude, role and significance of this programme should be carefully assessed in relation to other activities in the Dental School.*
 - xxii) *Students on the course mentioned a lack of knowledge of basic oral biology, dental anatomy and dental terminology at the time of entering the clinics. The possibility of a basic core course on these subject areas could be arranged as students first enter their course. Such a lecture course could be given simultaneously to hygienists, technicians and nurses.*
 - xxiii) *It is recommended that relevant specialty students should have more integration with the Hygiene Department.*
 - xxiv) *Because of the implications of dissertations to the research standard of the School, it is recommended that research supervisors make strong efforts to achieve the goal of at least one peer reviewed paper published.*
 - xxv) *To foster outside links in research within the University as a whole it is recommended that more thought be given to placing students for their research in other university departments, particularly as there is already evidence of such collaboration.*
 - xxvi) *Since entry requirements for the doctorate includes at least one postgraduate dental qualification, much of the core course has been learned both at undergraduate level and again at postgraduate level. Clearly, certain aspects of the course were very relevant such as statistics, research methods, scientific writing and these might deserve more emphasis in the future, probably jointly with other faculties. The reviewers recommend reorganising the content of the core course.*
 - xxvii) *The course organisers may wish to consider related modular courses in the British Isles where learning is student directed and supported by clinical away days, usually at weekends.*
 - xxviii) *Critical integration of the course within the primary tasks of the school is warranted.*
 - xxix) *Critical integration of the course within the primary tasks of the school is warranted.*

Council also approved the Provost's recommendations that:

- x) *The School of Dental Science working closely with the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, and other relevant Academic Officers, to consider the detailed recommendations of the Review Report and draw up an implementation plan for Council approval.*
 - xi) *College in association with the Dublin Dental Hospital should establish a collaborative partnership in the delivery of the teaching and research objectives of the School of Dental Sciences.*
- (b) *School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences* A report dated June 2009 on the quality review of the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences was circulated. The Provost introduced this item noting that the School was reviewed in April 2009 by an external panel comprising members from the University of Geneva, the University of Antwerp, and the University of Warwick. The reviewers feel that considering the financial and environmental limitations that the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences is operating under, the staff is doing an outstanding job. They note,

however, that the School will face a number of new challenges related to an ever increasing level of competition for the best students, teachers and researchers at a national and international level. They were positively impressed by the quality of the staff and the pragmatic measures taken to make the best of their situation, and reported that important first steps have been taken by the Head of School to improve both research output and quality without compromising teaching quality. With respect to research, the reviewers report that the School continues to find itself in a transition phase, with senior staff having retired and not been replaced over the last couple of years. They note that emphasis has been put on teaching, leaving little time to develop research, and they feel that this has resulted in a comparably low research output in terms of publications and a comparably low visibility and standing of junior faculty on the international scene. The hiring of Professor Marek Radomski, a scientist of high calibre and excellent reputation, is seen by the reviewers as a significant step towards the amelioration of this situation. The reviewers note that he has already undertaken steps to address the "precarious research situation" by hiring new junior faculty with the potential to contribute significantly to the research output and thus the visibility and standing of the School in the future.

Commenting on teaching and learning, the reviewers report that the existing curriculum in pharmacy, imposed by the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland (PSI), appears to be up-to-date and adequate towards the training of pharmacists, and that the Course Management Committee (CMC) is aware of impending alterations to the curriculum due to the evolving changes in pharmacy practise. The reviewers report that the supervision of Ph.D. students by the staff and the accessibility of the latter seem to be excellent.

The Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences noted the diversity and calibre of the review panel, and noted the School's response. He stressed the value of pharmacy to the health of the nation, and noted the importance of the School retaining a leadership role in Irish education as well as supporting the College's development in biomedical and biosciences. The Head of the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences noted that the biggest challenge facing the School currently is securing the resources to deliver the 5th year of the degree programme which the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland wants to roll out.

The Senior Tutor referring to the reviewers' observations on the tutorial system noted that the policy is to try to allocate students to tutors outside their home department.

Council noted the review report of the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences and approved the following recommendations:

- i) *In order to further establish the School as an internationally competitive research unit within the pharmaceutical sciences the reviewers consider it to be absolutely mandatory to immediately engage in the recruitment of the vacant Chair in Pharmaceutics at the full professorial level, to also immediately create a new Chair in the Practice of Pharmacy and to eventually fill the vacant Chair in Pharmaceutical Chemistry.*
- ii) *The highly motivated junior staff members must be given the resources (consumables, ear-marked start-up funding) and the appropriate environment (leadership, mentoring, administrative and*

- technical support) to establish themselves as independent researchers and increase their visibility and the standing of the School at the international level.*
- iii) It is essential to focus research activities of the School on areas of existing research strengths. Research activities of junior staff members should be aligned to this evolving strategy. This is imperative in view of the goal to double research output, as defined in the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Science's Self Assessment Report.*
 - iv) Procedures should be put into place to increase the active involvement of technical staff in research, e.g., by focused re-training in critical areas in alignment with the evolving research agenda. The reviewers see room for improvement in the appreciation of and communication with the technical staff to make better use of this untapped potential.*
 - v) The reviewers highly recommend assurance, by becoming more actively involved in the planning process, that proper equipment and infrastructure will be made available to researchers from the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Science in the new Biomedical Sciences building. Likewise, the reviewers deem it necessary to improve the situation within the existing facilities.*
 - vi) The addition of the new facilities is seen as an opportunity to create certain core facilities (analytical services, cell culture and sorting, imaging, etc.). In addition to a more optimized use of equipment and consumables, the creation of such facilities could offer new vistas to re-assign technical staff, further the integration of research activities of different groups within the School as well as with outside partners.*
 - vii) The reviewers ask the School to consider the establishment of a faculty incentive program to stimulate efforts in research activities.*
 - viii) In order to reduce their heavy teaching load, the School faculty might consider teaching some undergraduate and postgraduate modules only every two years.*
 - ix) The CMC must be involved in the definition of the curriculum in cooperation with PSI. The reviewers expect that the presence of the newly appointed chairs will add additional weight to this process. The arrival of new faculty will also result in better balancing of the teaching load.*
 - x) Excellence in teaching must be rewarded - the School should consider establishing a teaching award in pharmacy.*
 - xi) To improve the quality of practicals, faculty members should follow teaching activities of demonstrators and provide adequate guidance and training to them. On the other hand, students should be encouraged to come to the practicals prepared using the material made available to them.*
 - xii) Students should be provided with more guidance as to the relevance of study materials with respect to pharmaceutical sciences and pharmacy, e.g., by an introductory course into the overall curriculum at the start and provision of a "roadmap" for reference use by multiple instructors throughout the curriculum.*
 - xiii) Potentially contentious issues arising may be subject to conflicts of interest. To allow the resolution of such issues, we recommend nominating at least one tutor from outside of the School.*
 - xiv) Efforts should be increased to advertise the postgraduate courses. Revenues obtained by these courses could be put to better use for*

- direct support of research of junior faculty. Contacts with industry should be exploited for common projects as a further source of income and scientific interaction.*
- xv) *The School should consider establishing an internationally competitive Ph.D. program with a regular high-calibre seminar series, transferable skills modules (including e.g., record keeping, scientific writing and presentation, time and project management), and mandatory enrolment in at least one college course unrelated to the individual Ph.D. student's research subject.*
 - xvi) *The progress of Ph.D. projects should be monitored by two additional staff members.*
 - xvii) *Appointment of senior staff members to provide mentorship, leadership, and lend credibility to the School.*
 - xviii) *Providing internal seed funds for junior faculty to allow organic growth of research activity, to enable staff to prepare internationally competitive grant applications, and capitalize on the motivation and enthusiasm of the junior faculty at the current critical stage of the development of the School.*

Council also approved the Provost's recommendations to Council as follows:

- xix) *The School of School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Science working closely with the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, and other relevant Academic Officers, should consider the detailed recommendations of the Review Report and draw up an implementation plan for Council approval.*
 - xx) *College should instigate a process to determine the effectiveness of the technical support to the School and provide the necessary supports to enable technical staff participate fully in the teaching and research activities.*
- (c) **School of Social Sciences and Philosophy** A report dated June 2009 on the quality review of the School of Social Sciences and Philosophy was circulated. The Provost introduced this item noting that the School was reviewed in April 2009 by an external panel comprising members from the University of London, the University of Newcastle, and the University of Lancaster. He noted the reviewers' belief that Social Sciences at TCD are very strong internationally. The School is unique in the constellation of subjects taught, and for this reason they found it difficult to compare it with similar Schools in other universities. The reviewers focused their comments on the component disciplines in the School. With respect to Political Science, the reviewers feel that it is very strong in international comparison and that economics has great strengths in international economics, development and economic history. The strength and high profile of the department in open economy macroeconomics is a great advantage for TCD because this is an area where there is an identified weakness in other European countries. The only issue of concern to the reviewers is the lack of resources available in the teaching and research of applied micro-economics.

Referring to Philosophy, the reviewers feel that there is a good wide-ranging undergraduate programme in Philosophy which reflects the various interests and competences of the teaching staff. In terms of its research, however, the reviewers feel that Philosophy is currently underperforming and displays research excellence only in a limited number of areas.

Referring to Sociology, the reviewers note that Sociology has some particular areas of strength, but that these and its activities overall are threatened by an anomalous age structure and recent and impending departures. They feel that the Institute for International Integration Studies (IIIS) has been very successful in raising both the funds and the profile of Economics and Political Science in the School.

The Provost noted the reviewers' observations that the School has not succeeded in implementing the findings in the last research review on interdisciplinary and policy research, and they suggest that research objectives need to be defined by each discipline rather than by the School as a whole, but there is very little school integration evident. The reviewers were very critical of some of the teaching practices in place, especially the overuse of postgraduate assistants, junior faculty carrying a disproportionate administrative load, and the scheduling of some undergraduate lectures in the expectation that students will not attend. The School's undergraduate programmes appear to enjoy healthy demand from good quality students, but the reviewers expressed concern that the way the undergraduate programmes are organised does not give much autonomy to individual disciplines. They suggest that the structure of the School does not fit in with the undergraduate course structure and feel that this is an inevitable aspect of offering students a wide choice of subject combinations and flexibility in degree programmes.

The portfolio of master's courses available in the School is growing and the course offerings are being developed and extended. The reviewers commend the new MSc in Comparative European Politics as a good initiative and feel that early indications suggest that it can compete directly with similar programmes at other top political science departments in Europe (such as LSE, Oxford, and UL Brussels). The reviewers observe that master's courses appear rarely to cross School boundaries and do not raise the same issues of complexity of offerings and collaboration with other Schools as arise in the case of the undergraduate courses. In general, the reviewers feel that in relation to undergraduate teaching the School needs to raise the bar in terms of online learning.

Finally the Provost highlighted the comments in respect of governance noting that the new School has not yet become embedded in the intellectual life and administrative structures of the disciplines or of the College, whose administrative structures are themselves new in relevant respects. They also feel that, in general, the School's strategic priorities have not been realised.

The Council meeting started at an earlier time of 10:00 and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences was unable to attend until 11:00. In his absence the Provost invited the Head of the School of Social Sciences and Philosophy, Professor J Wickham, to comment on the School's response. Professor Wickham noted that the School welcomed the review report and has begun already to address many of the recommendations. He noted the School's choice of reviewers, all male and all from the UK, and noted that this was by accident rather than design. Nonetheless, the reviewers themselves were of a very high calibre and they did not shrink from being critical of certain practices. He noted a range of developments since the review, and stressed the critical staffing situation in Sociology.

Council in discussing the review report expressed concern about the practice of scheduling large lectures in unsuitable venues, and Professor Wickham guaranteed that this practice has been discontinued. In response to a query on the reviewers' comments about the different PhD supervision practices in the School, the Dean of Graduate Studies noted that these exist because of the different disciplines, but that there was no suggestion that existing practices contravene College regulations. A student representative noted that while student:staff contact hours were high, the class sizes are very large and this was not always conducive to achieving high quality. A Council member queried what evidence there was to assert that a discipline is placed within the top ten internationally. It was suggested that it is possible to assert this in general terms having considered the list of publications and where these are published.

Council noted the review of the School of Social Science and Philosophy and approved the following recommendations:

- i) *TCD, given its history, profile, aspirations and existing international recognition, is uniquely placed in Ireland to be a world class research university. Achieving this standard should be a collective aspiration of the School as a whole, as well as individual aspirations of the disciplines. It is apparent that two of the disciplines are already close to achieving this standard.*
- ii) *Given the relatively small size of the discipline groups, the reviewers believe that they should consider specialising in their research priorities, rather than spreading themselves too thinly. There is potential for more research and research training collaboration between Political Science and Economics, and perhaps Sociology, using, for example, the infrastructural resources of the IIS. Collaborations between these disciplines have enjoyed success in many of the top universities around the world. TCD is well placed to pursue such collaboration with success.*
- iii) *The Department of Sociology needs to consider how it can move up to the next level. A Chair and Lectureship or a broader appointment strategy are urgently needed and may be the best mechanisms to achieve this objective. Sociology should identify its research strengths, i.e. its national and international comparative advantage and should develop and build upon these strengths.*
- iv) *The Department of Political Science needs to consider how it can consolidate on its already strong position. Given its relatively small size, specializing in a few key areas has paid off so far. Moving forward, though, the department should think about how it can develop the natural synergies with Economics and broaden its research and teaching coverage to other key areas in the modern discipline, such as international political economy*
- v) *The reviewers suggest that the School should introduce good practice for PhD programmes to include there being clear guidelines, annual appraisals, regular meetings between students and supervisor, regular seminars and so on.*
- vi) *We have received positive feedback about the Master's programmes and would encourage the School to consider expanding them in the future. In relation to the high level of contact hours for undergraduates, we are not sure that this level of contact is sustainable. The issue of rebalancing time and resources needs to be*

- looked at. Also, more permanent staff should be delivering more of the teaching.*
- vii) *We recommend the School introduce a School wide induction course for their undergraduates on arrival. Topics covered could be essay writing, study skills, critical thinking, etc.
We recommend that the School give serious consideration to reviewing and refreshing the undergraduate programme, with a view to simplifying degree formats. We do not wish however to propose changes in detail. Absenteeism and undergraduate class sizes - it is not satisfactory for the School to provide teaching resources on the presumption that a substantial fraction of the students will not attend class.*
- viii) *We recommend that IIS be made a resource priority. It's imperative that the project is continued as it provides a mechanism to promote international collaboration and research activities.*
- ix) *We feel that it is inappropriate for junior staff in the School to be overloaded with senior administrative duties.*
- x) *The lack of resources available in the teaching and research of applied micro-economics is an issue of concern.*
- xi) *The School needs a new strategic plan which should set out clearly the School's self-perception of its collective added value in terms of teaching and research collaboration. Some consideration should be given to future re-structuring of the School, if this helps to implement the strategic plan.*
- xii) *We feel that there are missed opportunities for co-operation with other Schools (e.g. medicine, education) and Faculties in TCD, at undergraduate teaching level, master's level and on research activities.*
- xiii) *We believe that the planning of teaching resources for a university of TCD's calibre should be better.*

Council also approved the Provost's recommendations to Council as follows:

- xiv) The School of Social Sciences and Philosophy working closely with the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Science and other relevant Academic Officers consider the detailed recommendations of the Review Report and draw up an implementation plan for Council approval.
- xv) The Dean working closely with the Head of School and the Head of Philosophy should develop a plan to strengthen the position of Philosophy in the School, in College and nationally.
- xvi) The Head of School working closely with the Dean should develop the School into a fully cohesive and integrated academic unit.
- xvii) College should develop a system-wide workload model for academic staff to ensure an equitable share of research, outreach and administrative responsibilities and, of undergraduate and postgraduate teaching.

CL/08-09/202 **Student Retention:** A report of Student Retention dated June 2009 was circulated. The Vice-Provost introduced this item informing Council that the Planning Group (formerly the Funding Group) recommended the establishment of a retention taskforce to determine, among other things, the cost of non-completion to College. The report on retention shows that investment in retention strategies would in time have a positive effect on College's overall financial position. The Vice-Provost/Chief

Academic Officer invited the Academic Secretary to bring Council through the detailed findings and recommendations of the taskforce. The Academic Secretary highlighted the main findings of the study beginning with the definition of retention. She noted that for purposes of the study, retention refers to all students who are retained within College and this includes students who transfer to another course and students who go off-books. Students who withdraw from College or who are made withdrawn by the College are generally referred to as 'non-completion' in the literature on retention. In 2005 study commenced that tracked the status of all new entrants to first year of all undergraduate degree programmes as they progressed through their studies. This study charted the progress of the 2001/02, 2002/03, 2003/04, and 2004/05 new entrant cohorts at course level.

This retention study shows that overall approximately 15.4% of new entrant students do not complete their undergraduate studies at Trinity College. This varies across courses, from as low as 3% (Dental Science) to as high as high as 60-70% (Germanic Languages - now discontinued). In the large un-denominated entry courses the non-completion rates range from 11% (Engineering), 12% (BESS), 19% (TSM), and 22% (Natural Science TR071). The study shows that the majority of students who withdraw from College do so while they registered as Junior Freshman students. On average across the four cohorts studied, 10.5% do not complete first year (i.e. they do not progress to second year of their studies); 3.6% do not complete second year; 1.2% do not complete third year, and 0.1% do not complete fourth year.

On average 8.5% of students in the study went off-books during the course of their study. Two percent (2%) of registered new entrant students in the study did not complete their courses and withdraw after they went off-books. Referring to gender, the study shows that proportionally more females than males complete their undergraduate studies. Over the four years studied, 62% of new entrants were female and 38% were male. The percentage of registered female students who did not complete their studies was 14% compared with 17.5% for males. Of the 2,451 new entrants to undergraduate degrees at Trinity in 2004/05, 380 students did not complete their studies. Seventeen percent (17%) of students from Dublin City and County did not complete; this compares to 11% from Connaught, and 14% from Munster and Ulster. Regarding academic ability, students with lower points on entry are slightly more likely not to complete than students on higher points. The study also shows that of those who withdrew, 53% had received their first preference course choice.

The Academic Secretary drew Council's attention to the data on the 2007-08 cohort, noting that the outcomes are remarkably stable across the five set of new entrant cohorts studied. Data on postgraduate taught and research courses were also collected and analysed. There would not appear to be a problem with retention at these levels, but there is a need to conduct a study over a longer period of time in order to establish trends. She drew Council's attention to the literature on retention, and noted that Trinity studies as well as national and international studies show that the main reason cited for non-completion of a course relates to students having made the wrong course choice. Secondary reasons relate to lack of student and social integration, inability to cope with stress and to form relationships, commitment to one's course, poor educational preparedness, and the quality of the educational experience. She noted international retention comparisons with Ireland at 85%, UK at 78% and the USA at 54%.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer drew Council's attention to the financial consequences of non-completion at undergraduate level. He noted that in calculating the financial cost of non-completion at undergraduate level, a number of simulations

based on trends to-date were carried out. The simulations were conducted on real situations taking into account that 68% of students who withdraw from College do not progress to Year 2; 23% do not progress to Year 3; and 9% do not progress to or complete Year 4. The simulations show the financial gain to College if (i) all courses reached a minimum retention threshold of 85%, (ii) of 90%, and (iii) 95%. If a 95% retention were reached by 2014 then College's projected cumulated deficit would be negated.

The Provost welcomed the report on student retention noting the importance of having an understanding of why students leave before completing their studies and of the financial consequences of non-completion. He suggested in reference to the recommendation that all courses should plan to retain a minimum of 85% of new entrants, that this should be increased to 90%. The view was expressed that some level of non-completion is inevitable and College should minimise the financial loss by attracting qualified students into vacant places in years 3 and 4. With respect to non-EU students, it was suggested that students from different parts of the world may have a greater chance of completing than others, probably for cultural and financial reasons, and it would be useful to know what the success rates are for such students. With respect to admitting students to years 3 and 4 of an undergraduate degree programme, it was argued that teaching is planned based on reduced numbers and any increases would have additional space requirements. Council discussed the recommendations and it was felt that many of the recommendations would require additional funds to help some Schools increase their retention rate. It was recognised that increased numbers would have a positive effect on the School's finances but where Schools are in deficit the additional funds could not be directed to boost resources towards strategies to increase retention. The Provost commented on the importance of delivering more with less in the current economic climate.

Council endorsed the report on retention and approved the following recommendations.

- (i) All courses should review their undergraduate Prospectus entries and make sure that these realistically describe the course and expectations. Entries should provide web links to course handbooks, especially first year handbooks, and programme and module learning outcomes should be articulated and published. Descriptions of courses in the undergraduate Prospectus should be accessible to young adults and school-leavers, and Schools should seek input from current students on the course description when reviewing entries for the Prospectus.
- (ii) The Admissions Office should seek input from Second Level Guidance Teachers on the type and level of course information that College should make available for second-level students.
- (iii) Each School should review and update their website to ensure ease of access to course descriptions for prospective applicants.
- (iv) In order to reduce the number of withdrawals due to wrong course choice, College/Schools should consider:
 1. Recruiting student ambassadors to visit second-level schools
 2. Organising discipline-specific open days
 3. Posting vidcasts/podcasts of lectures, practicals, etc. on School website.
- (v) Each course should have mechanisms in place that alert the course coordinator / committee that a first year student is experiencing difficulties and may be at risk of dropping out. Non attendance at tutorials or laboratories or failure to complete a project/essay should prompt a response

- from the course. Exiting procedures in respect of non-satisfactory returns could be a basis for early detection. These should be web-based.
- (vi) As a significant number, relatively speaking, of withdrawals appear to take place earlier in the year, College tutors should make contact with their Junior Freshman tutees in week 5 or 6 and again after the Christmas break to check how they are progressing.
 - (vii) Students in receipt of free fees must re-register in February. Students not eligible for free fees should also be required to re-register to ascertain total first year withdrawals. First year students who do not complete second registration should be contacted directly to ascertain reasons for withdrawing. These data should be made available to Schools and considered annually by the Undergraduate Studies Committee.
 - (viii) Each course should have a Year Head responsible for Junior Freshman students.
 - (ix) The new student administration system (as part of eStrategy) should facilitate the tracking and monitoring of student progression and should interface with student supports information systems to enable the production of accurate management information reports on retention and non-completion.
 - (x) Student learning and personal supports services should be integrated, and College should build on existing services and especially models of good practice.
 - (xi) Orientation and induction programmes should develop approaches to assist students build relationships and these activities should be facilitated by Schools/courses, Students' Union, Student Services and Supports, Clubs and Societies.
 - (xii) College/Schools should develop and support 'peer assisted learning' and 'peer mentoring' programmes.
 - (xiii) Existing quality improvement and assurance processes should be further developed taking a more integrated approach to:
 - (a) teaching and staff development;
 - (b) student learning and academic & student supports;
 - (c) staff development and technology enhanced learning;
 - (d) curriculum reform/review and programme/module evaluations;
 - (e) academic workload and quality of student experience.
 - (xiv) Schools should conduct student evaluations of modules, and provide feedback to students and address any substantive issues arising.
 - (xv) All courses should plan to retain a minimum of 90% of new entrants, and retention should be reviewed each year at School and Faculty Executive meetings.
 - (xvi) Funding should be made available to support both 'peer assisted learning' and 'peer mentoring'.
 - (xvii) Tutor chambers, especially in areas where there is a high Junior Freshman attrition rate, should be reduced, and such tutors should be supported to provide social outings for their Junior Freshman tutees, for example, Commons early in the academic year.
 - (xviii) Faculty Deans should provide support to Schools to increase retention on courses.
 - (xix) College should create sufficient student accommodation capacity to offer accommodation to all new entrants.
 - (xx) All courses should put in place a progression mechanism for level 7 graduates from other third level institutions, and these should be activated if places become available in years 3 and 4 of an undergraduate course.
 - (xxi) The Academic Secretary should prepare an annual progress report on the implementation of the above recommendations for consideration by the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

The Provost recommended, and Council agreed, that a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations on retention should be brought to Council for its consideration at the end of the next academic year.

CL/08-09/203 Provision of 'Upskilling/Re-Skilling' Courses to meet current and future education needs: A memorandum dated 17th June 2009 was circulated. The Vice-Provost introduced this item noting that earlier in 2009, the Higher Education Authority (HEA) requested the institutions of higher education to make recommendations on how higher education can contribute to address the current and future employment needs of the country. To consider this matter, a small taskforce was convened to look at how the College could use its existing expertise to respond to the growing numbers of unemployed individuals, and, in particular, those who have a primary or higher degree and/or relevant work experience. The taskforce also considered the type of provisions needed to respond to the future economic needs in line with the government's "Smart Economy" framework.

A preliminary report to the Higher Education Authority was submitted in March 2009 which indicated the College's commitment to contributing to the current and future education and training needs of the workforce. The HEA convened a "Labour Market Activation Working Group" and in June 2009 issued a call for proposals, inviting submissions for courses at Levels 8 and 9 for unemployed graduates. In April 2009, Schools were invited to make recommendations on what new courses they could develop in response to the current and future employment and many Schools responded with suggestions at levels 8 (undergraduate) and 9 (postgraduate).

The Vice-Provost noted the need to respond to the current economic crisis as swiftly as possible over the next few months. The main types of new programmes relate to either undergraduate conversion courses or postgraduate flexi-courses. The Dean of Graduate Studies explained that the 'flexi-masters' concept involves students registering for a selection of modules tailored to their educational goals. They will be able to draw upon existing postgraduate modules from a range of disciplines, with the possibility of limited use of advanced undergraduate modules. The student will be required to agree to a selection of courses with an assigned Academic Advisor and the course may be taken full-time in one calendar year, or part-time up to four years. She noted that the Graduate Studies Committee at its meeting of the 11th June 2009 endorsed this concept.

Council discussed the proposal and approved subject to adherence to College's quality procedures the following arrangements for the summer period 2009:

- (i) Regarding Level 8, the Senior Lecturer has delegated authority from the University Council to approve Higher Diploma proposals where they are created from existing provision to be delivered in the academic year 2009-10.
- (ii) Regarding Level 9, the Dean of Graduate Studies has delegated authority from the University Council to approve and pilot (a) a number of 'flexi-masters' courses for commencement in the academic year 2009-10, and (b) postgraduate proposals involving a mixture of existing undergraduate and postgraduate modules (and associated ECTS credits) for continued professional development.

CL/08-09/204 Joint Degree Awards

- (i) ***Policy and Protocols for Award of Joint Degrees*** A revised policy for the award of Joint Degrees from the Working Party on Joint Degrees was circulated. The Senior Lecturer introduced this item noting that Council had discussed the proposed policy in detail at its meeting of the 3rd June (Actum CL/08-09/177). She drew Council's attention to 5.6 'Assessment provisions and quality assurance' and noted the reference to the Foundation Scholarship examination. It is proposed that "where the TCD contribution to a joint degree is 50% or more, consideration has to be given to enable students on this programme participation in the Scholarship Examinations.'"

Council noted and approved the Policy and Protocols for Award of Joint Degrees, as set out in Appendix 1 to this Minute.

- (ii) ***B.Sc. in Human Nutrition and Dietetics - Joint B.Sc. Degree Award with Honors Classified.*** A memorandum from the Academic Secretary dated 17th June 2009 was circulated. The Academic Secretary introduced this item and provided background information. The B.Sc. in Human Nutrition and Dietetics is con-jointly delivered by Trinity College and the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT). As part of the DIT quality procedures, a review of the programme curriculum was conducted in May 2008 by an external review panel, chaired by Professor John Scattergood, TCD. The panel of reviewers made a number of recommendations which have been incorporated into the new curriculum for the B.Sc. in Human Nutrition and Dietetics. One such recommendation was that the revised programme should lead to a joint University of Dublin and the Dublin Institute of Technology degree award of B.Sc. (Honours) Human Nutrition and Dietetics. In order to advance this recommendation and to strengthen the partnership between the DIT and TCD the Provost and the President of the DIT established an Oversight Group comprising Professor Reynolds and the Academic Secretary (TCD) and Professor Devereux and the Director of Academic Affairs (DIT). A focus of this Oversight Group was to establish this programme on par with the other therapies (physiotherapy, occupational therapy and radiation therapy) and increase clinical involvement by Trinity clinical staff. Professor Reynolds secured HSE (Health Service Executive) funding to support the position of Practice Education Co-ordinator/Senior Clinical Nutritionist/ Dietician, and the position will be based in Trinity College. The Oversight Group agreed the management structure for the programme, and is now turning its focus to postgraduate and research opportunities arising from these new developments.

The Academic Secretary noted that Council approved (CL/07-08/186) in principle the award of a joint University of Dublin and the Dublin Institute of Technology award of B.Sc. (Honours) Human Nutrition and Dietetics at its meeting of the 4th June 2008, and also recommended the development of a College policy on the award of joint degrees at the same meeting.

This submission before Council seeks permission for the approval of a joint degree to be awarded by the University of Dublin and the Dublin Institute of Technology for the B.Sc in Human Nutrition and Dietetics. It proposed that the 2009/10 cohort of students will enter the programme leading to the new joint award. The proposal satisfies the criteria set out in the Policy and Protocols for Award of Joint Degrees considered by Council at its meeting of

the 3rd June 2009 (Actum CL/08-09/177). Entry to the existing B.Sc. in Human Nutrition and Dietetics will be discontinued if this proposal is approved.

The Academic Secretary took Council through the proposal highlighting the potential benefits to Trinity College, the governance structures, the financial arrangements, the admissions criteria, the assessment and quality assurance measures, the progression regulations including an exit award of a B.A., the classification of awards, discipline arrangements, the administration of student records and awards, and commencement ceremonies.

The Provost welcomed this new development and commented on the depth of detail provided and the significant volume of work by both parties involved in bringing this proposal to completion. The Dean of the Faculty of Health Science also welcomed the development and commented on the largely unmet demand for this course and the potential loss of very able students who travel abroad to study this subject. Council in discussing the proposal also supported the initiative, noting the need for greater flexibility in our response to national and international collaborative educational developments. The Academic Secretary, in response to queries, noted that there are no changes to the registration status of students on this course. She noted that because of the new funding model for the Institute of Technology sector, the financial arrangements have not been finalised, but the distribution of funds is expected to be input based.

Council noted and approved the B.Sc. in Human Nutrition and Dietetics leading to a Joint University of Dublin and Dublin Institute of Technology B.Sc. Degree Award with Honors Classified.

CL/08-09/205 Postgraduate Appeals: a memorandum from the Dean of Graduate Studies on postgraduate appeals was circulated. The Dean of Graduate Studies spoke to this item noting an increase in the number of postgraduate student appeals in the past few years. These relate to taught postgraduate and research students, and she brought Council through the proposed appeal processes as well as the proposed Calendar entries. The processes are defined in terms of general principles, regulations for re-checking/re-marking of examination scripts, regulations for appealing taught course results, Academic Appeals Committee for Postgraduate Students (taught), appeal against the decision of a transfer/confirmation panel, appeal against the decision of the examiners of a research thesis, and Academic Appeals Committee for Graduate Students (Research). The Dean noted the proposed composition of the new Academic Appeals Committee (Research).

Council discussed the proposed processes at length, and there was some confusion about the difference between an appeal and a re-check of examination marks. Rather than drill down to detail at Council, the Provost recommended that Council approve in principle the proposal subject to the issues raised being satisfactorily clarified.

Council noted and approved in principle, subject to clarification of the issues raised, the postgraduate appeals processes for inclusion as a new section in the Calendar Part II.

CL/08-09/206 School of Computer Science and Statistics - New Academic Structures: a memorandum dated 17th June 2009 from the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science was circulated. The Dean introduced this item noting that following internal reorganisation, the School of Computer Science and Statistics

wishes to replace the Department of Computer Science and the Department of Statistics with five new research disciplines. He noted that this proposal was approved by the Department of Computer Science, the Department of Statistics, and the School and Executive Committees.

Council welcomed this development and approved the proposal to establish five new research disciplines of Computer Systems; Intelligent Systems; Software Systems; Statistics; Information Systems.

CL/08-09/207 *Policy on Good Research Practice*: a policy on good research practice dated May 2009 was circulated in a supplementary circulation. Given the importance of the subject and the fact that a majority of Council members did not get an opportunity to read the policy, the Provost recommended deferring this item until the first meeting of Council in the new academic year. The policy document will be discussed together with the minute of the Research Committee on this matter.

CL/08-09/208 *Committees of Council*: a memorandum from the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer dated 19th June 2009 was circulated. The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer introduced this item noting that Council at its meeting of the 8th April 2009 (Actum CL/08-09/127) and Board at its meeting of the 22nd April 2009 (Actum BD/08-09/221) approved the first report of the Committee Review Group, dated March 2009. The Review Group wishes to complete its work in respect of Committees of Council and has made recommendations in respect of the Research Committee and the Quality Committee. A final report of the Review Group on Committees will be presented in Michaelmas Term 2009, addressing the Principal Committees of Board and consolidating all decisions and recommendations made to date.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer noted that the First Report of the Committees Review Group recommended that committees of Council should be referred to as "Academic Committees of the University Council." These Committees have a devolved policy-making and/or implementation function, and play an important and central role in the development of academic policy and in implementing decisions on behalf of Council. It was also recommended that the membership of these Committees should reflect the new governance structure at School and Faculty levels. He noted that Council has already approved the terms of reference of three of the four Academic Committees of Council, namely, the Undergraduate Studies Committee, the Graduate Studies Committee, the International Committee. He drew Council's attention to the revised terms of reference for the Research Committee, noting that there is currently one active sub-committee of the Research Committee, namely, the *Business and Industry Committee*.

With respect to Compliance Committees of the College Board and the University Council, the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer noted that the First Report of the Committees Review Group recommended the adoption of the term, Compliance Committee, for Committees that have a compliance function. These committees, normally report to Board, and normally fulfil a legal requirement. This Report also noted that the Quality Committee is currently a sub-committee of Council, and since Quality assurance and quality improvement span across all areas of College and is concerned with legislative compliance, the Group recommends that the Quality Committee be established as a Compliance Committee. As a very large part of quality matters relates to academic activity, it is also recommended that the Quality Committee report to both Council and Board. These recommendations were approved

by the Quality Committee at its meeting of the 25th May 2009. Both the Quality Committee and the Committees Review Group recommend to Council and Board the process of self-nomination to select committee members, and that this process be reviewed after the first term of office of members has expired. The Vice-Provost Chief Academic Officer drew Council's attention to the new terms of reference for the Quality Committee.

Council noted and approved the terms of reference for the Research Committee as an Academic Committee of Council and the Quality Committee as a Compliance Committee of Council and Board, as set out in Appendix 2 to this Minute.

Council also noted and approved the change of title of the *Business and Industry Committee* to the "*Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Committee*" and that the terms of reference of this Committee should remain unchanged.

CL/08-09/209 Any Other Business: The Academic Secretary noted that Professor Ciaran Cosgrove was elected Head of Hispanic Studies for the period 13 July 2009 to 12 July 2012.

The Provost thanked Dr C Morris, Dr C MacMaolain, and the student representatives who were stepping down from Council for their contribution during their tenure of office.

SECTION B

CL/08-09/210 Graduate Studies Committee The Council noted and approved the recommendations as set out in the minutes of the Graduate Studies Committee from its meeting of 11 June 2009, which had been circulated.

CL/08-09/211 Undergraduate Studies Committee The Council noted and approved the recommendations as set out in the minutes of the Undergraduate Studies Committee from its meeting of 9 June 2009, which had been circulated.

CL/08-09/212 Quality Committee The Council noted and approved the recommendations as set out in the minutes of the Quality Committee from its meeting of 20 May 2009, which had been circulated.

CL/08-09/213 Student Services Committee The Council noted and approved the recommendations as set out in the minutes of the Student Services Committee from its meeting of 28 April 2009, which had been circulated.

CL/08-09/214 Information Policy Committee The Council noted and approved the recommendations as set out in the minutes of the Information Policy Committee from its meeting of 26 May 2009, which had been circulated.

CL/08-09/215 Research Committee The Council noted and approved the recommendations

as set out in the minutes of the Information Policy Committee from its meeting of 18 June 2009, which had been tabled.

SECTION C

CL/08-09/216 Membership of the University Council - Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences - 2009-2012 The Council noted that the following have been elected:

Senior Constituency	Dr E O'Dell
Senior Constituency, Head of School	Professor J Wickham
Junior Constituency	Dr C Laudet
Junior Constituency	Dr M Ó Siochrú

CL/08-09/217 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 3 June 2009 and noted by Board on 17 June 2009.

(i) **Professional Higher Degree by Research Alone**

MD Susan Mary O'Connell.

(ii) **Higher Degrees by Research Alone**

PhD Conor John Breen; Rory Diarmuid Costello; Niamh Aine Connolly; Sean Cullen; Michael Davy; Brian Paul Dooney; Gerard Doorley; Alexander Eastman; Johan Antoni Elkink; Kevin Feeney; Darragh Greene; Rory Hearne; Xiao Qing Jaber; Rachael Jordan; Manoj Paul Kanichae; James William Anthony Kelly; Alison Mary Lennon; Jinghuan Li; Sinead Maire McNally; Joanne Mary Murphy; Hyuneong Nam; Andrew Nolan; Anna Nunan; Danijela Petrovic; Dilwyn John Roberts; Stefan Sean Gordon Storrie; Ann Marie Torres; Michael Salter-Townshend; Han Chun Wu.

MSc Stephane Dudzinski; Barry Harrington; Claire Gertrude Jessel; Maria Pertl; Roseanne Reilly; Ritesh Shreevastav.

MLitt Sabine Maria Jeannine Cahill; Geraldine Prizeman.

CL/08-09/218 Student Charter The Council noted a memorandum from the Chair of the Student Services Committee and Education Officer, Students' Union, circulated, dated 15 June 2009, together with the Student Charter.

CL/08-09/219 The University of Dublin Calendar 2009-10, Part 1 The Council noted that the Undergraduate Studies Committee considered Calendar changes for 2009/10 at two separate meetings. Changes to course entries were considered its meeting of 3 March 2009 and amendments to the General Regulations were considered and approved at its meeting of 28th April 2009.

CL/08-09/220 Academic Year Structure The Council noted that the M.Sc. in Environment and Development, approved at the meeting of Council of 3 June 2009, will conduct a field trip in weeks 44-45.

CL/08-09/221 Admissions - Scoring System for Revised A Level Grades The Council noted and approved a memorandum from the Admissions Officer, circulated, dated 17 June 2009, as set out in Appendix 3 to this Minute.

CL/08-09/222 Headship of Department - 2009-2012 The Council noted and approved the following nominations:

- (i) **Italian** Professor C Ó Cuilleaináin;
- (ii) **Physiology** Professor V Campbell;
- (iii) **Physiotherapy** Dr J Hussey (second term);
- (iv) **Public Health and Primary Care** Dr J Barry;
- (v) **Sociology** Dr R Lentin.

CL/08-09/223 School Directors

- (i) **School of Dental Science** (to 30 April 2010)
Director of Teaching and Learning (Undergraduate): Dr J McLoughlin;
Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate): Dr C Healy;
Director of Research: Professor D Sullivan.
- (ii) **Law**
Director of Teaching and Learning (Undergraduate): Professor Y Scannell (2009-2010);
Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate): Dr N Cox (2009-2011);
Director of Research: Dr E O'Dell (2009-2011).
- (iii) **Psychology**
Director of Teaching and Learning (Postgraduate): Dr K Tierney (2009-2011) to approve that Dr Tierney may serve a third term;
Director of Research: Professor F Newell (2009-2010).
- (iv) **Social Sciences and Philosophy**
Director of Teaching and Learning (Undergraduate): Professor K O'Rourke: three years from 13 July 2009.
- (v) **Social Work and Social Policy**
Director of Teaching and Learning (Undergraduate): Ms G Kirwan: 2009-2011.

CL/08-09/224 School of Dental Science

- (i) **Pro-Dean of Dental Affairs** The Council noted and approved the nomination of Professor J Nunn, to 30 April 2010.
- (ii) **Heads of Divisions** The Council noted and approved the following nominations to 30 April 2010:

Oral Biosciences:	Professor D Sullivan
Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine and Oral Pathology:	Professor S Flint
Public and Child Dental Health:	Professor M T Garvey
Restorative Dentistry and Periodontology:	Dr F Quinn

CL/08-09/225 Operational Governance of TCIN The Council noted and approved a memorandum from the Dean of Research, circulated, dated 16 June 2009.

- CL/08-09/226 **College Fitness to Practice Policy** (see CL/08-09/129 of 8 April 2009) The Council noted and approved a memorandum from the Dean of Students, circulated, dated 16 June 2009.

- CL/08-09/227 **Student Case** The Council noted and approved the request of the Senior Lecturer that a named student may repeat a year.

- CL/08-09/228 **Annual Equality Monitoring Report** The Council noted the Annual Equality Monitoring Report, as circulated.

- CL/08-09/229 **Vacation Procedures** The Council noted that matters of routine business will be dealt with by the Provost under Vacation Procedures, from 13 July to 30 August 2009.

SECTION D

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

Signed

Date

Policy and Protocols for the award of Joint Degrees
Recommendations from the Working Party on Joint Degrees

1. Introduction

In June 2008 Council requested the establishment of a Working Party to prepare for consideration a policy on the award of joint degrees and the procedures and protocols to approve and implement them (CL/07-08/186).

Under its Terms of Reference the Working Party set out to develop principles under which the institution will consider proposals for joint degrees and to establish a protocol for the processing, approval and monitoring of such Joint Degrees.

This Working Party was set up in December 2008 and met eight times. It reviewed existing programmes across College, considered a number of relevant internal and external documents and consulted with stakeholders inside College and in the Irish Universities Association and the European Universities Association.

Membership of the Working Party:

Registrar Prof Jürgen Barkhoff (Chair)
Senior Lecturer Dr Aileen Douglas
Dean of Graduate Studies Prof Carol O'Sullivan
Faculty Representative AHSS Prof David Singleton
Faculty Representative EMS Dr Pádraig Carmody,
Faculty Representative HS Dr Thomas Connor
Ms Alexandra Anderson (Bologna Desk)
Ms Leona Coady (Secretary)

1.2. Context:

There is now strong momentum for increased collaboration at national and international level leading to the delivery of joint programmes and the award of joint degrees:

- International drivers include the Bologna process and the creation of the European Higher Education Area EHEA; new funding opportunities at European level (e.g. Erasmus Mundus II); increased cooperation within existing and emerging networks like Coimbra and Erasmus; the College's aim to attract new groups of international students and/or from new markets; support of international educational initiatives (in the developing world) like the Trinity International Development Initiative TIDI
- National drivers include the OECD strategy and NDP, SSTI, SIF II, the recent creation of the Dublin Region Higher Education Area DRHEA and the Innovation Alliance. All these call for and require greater inter-institutional cooperation. In the current financial crisis the necessity to pool resources, to avoid duplication and to develop specific areas of strengths is greater than ever.
- As recently as last April the communiqué of the Bologna process Council of Ministers in Belgium stressed the centrality of mobility for the future development of the EHEA and stated: "Joint degrees and programmes as well as mobility windows shall become more common practice."

1.3. Definitions: Joint degrees and joint programmes

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

The award of joint degrees and the sharing of joint programmes between two or more institutions are related but separate issues. College is currently involved in a number of cooperative arrangements with other institutions in which teaching is shared between institutions and which lead either to the award of one degree from one of the participating institutions and a joint certificate or to the award of two (or more) separate degrees. In the latter cases the principle applies that no additional degree is awarded without extra work (in terms of duration and/or ECTS credits).

In contrast to those a joint degree is understood as a university qualification issued jointly by (at least) two higher education institutions on the basis of a study programme developed and provided together. A joint degree thus goes beyond joint programmes and double degree programmes in that on completion students will be awarded one single degree, awarded jointly by two (or more) institutions.

Although the Statutes do not currently explicitly provide for the institution of joint degree, they do not prevent them either. The general provisions under Ch. X, s. 7 cover the possibility of awarding joint degrees. The new draft statutes include a new clause providing for the establishment of external linkages, and consideration should be given to adding an explicit provision pertaining to the establishment of joint degrees.

2. Benefits and Risks

2.1 Potential benefits

There are many good reasons for establishing joint programmes and joint degrees. These include

- increased quality and scope of the education of our graduates
- offering attractive specialist/niche courses to highly qualified students
- new and stronger strategic alliances with cognate institutions
- increased reputation through alliances with top institutions
- synergies and creation of critical mass
- optimisation of resources through shared delivery
- increased internationalisation
- new target groups and international markets
- better ability to serve society and foster innovation

2.2. Potential risks

Expressions of interests for such programmes will increase from within and outside the institution in the years to come. College should encourage and facilitate the exploration of the opportunities they offer. However, despite considerable enthusiasm around them they also pose potential risks: - financial (given the start-up and running costs in view of often small numbers), - motivational (if numbers remain too small or if programmes fail after a lot of effort) and, perhaps most importantly, reputational (if academic standards appear to be compromised through such alliances). Caution is therefore required when approaching new proposals:

- The planning, implementation and running of joint programmes and joint degrees are hard work, are very resource and time intensive and require sustained effort.
- Experience shows that the coordination of such programmes across national and institutional structures involves a considerable amount of commitment and great attention to detail. They require flexibility and credibility where possible, but equally the ability to clearly define and uphold essential principles and clear procedures, especially around quality control mechanisms and their reinforcement.
- Numbers in such programmes are typically small at all levels (UG, PG and PGR) and a critical mass of students, where the benefits to all stakeholders justify the input from College, is neither easy to achieve nor to maintain.

- Given that a joint degree associates institutions much closer than other cooperative models and that this association is directly linked to academic standards, great care has to be exercised in the choice of suitable partner institutions and the design of the cooperation framework in order to protect the University's reputation and the Trinity 'brand'.

3. Criteria for the establishment of Joint Degrees

3.1 Joint Programmes or Joint Degrees?

While the following proposals pertain in the first instance to joint degrees, most of the recommendations are equally relevant for joint programmes and large parts of the suggested protocols should apply for both. It is paramount however, to develop and enforce clear criteria as to when a joint degree rather than a joint programme suits College objectives better and should be developed.

In the coming years we can expect considerable pressure from interested institutions within Ireland and beyond to establish joint degrees with TCD as a partner. In this situation we need to protect against the potential risk of franchising the 'brand' of the University of Dublin.

In view of these considerations **the Working Party recommends that joint degrees should be the exception rather than the rule.** If the needs of a programme are met by a joint programme, preference should be given to this. In approving joint degrees College should be guided by a number of **stringent and specific criteria.** The Working Party recommends that a joint degree programme should be developed when it meets the following key criteria:

- each participating institution delivers specific and unique aspects of the programme that are not available in the partner institutions.
- there is a distinct distribution of workload and input between participating institutions with a minimum Trinity input of 25% of the course programme (as expressed in ECTS).
- While one institution would often take the lead in such a programme, there has to be a parity of esteem and a sense of a partnership among equals. Trust and respect are fundamental for the success of joint degrees.
- in terms of their qualifications, skills profile and enhanced employment prospects graduates are identifiably formed by all participating institutions.
- Joint degrees should in all cases enhance the College's reputation, but reputation needs to be understood in broader terms, not only relating to academic excellence or institutional ranking: strategic objectives like the enhancement of core areas of teaching and research, the support of emerging research strengths, service to society, outreach, the support of development initiatives or internationalisation can equally be of strategic relevance.
- Overall joint degrees should be reserved for programmes with a high level of 'jointness'.

3.2. Preliminary Feasibility Study

For all of these reasons, advantages and disadvantages of proposals to establish joint programmes or joint degrees have to be vetted carefully before embarking on their development. At all stages, particular consideration has to be given to issues of **Quality Control, Sustainability, Accountability and Cost control.**

Proposals for joint programmes and joint degrees will, as for internal undergraduate and postgraduate courses, originate at School level.

The Working Party recommends that Council requires, as a first step, a **feasibility study** for all proposed new joint programmes/ joint degrees for undergraduate courses, taught postgraduate courses and joint Ph.D. programmes. Small-scale inter-institutional cooperations for TCD Ph.D. students do not fall under this category. The following key aspects should be addressed:

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

3.2.1 Rationale for the course

- Identifying and filling the gap: the specific educational objectives that can not be achieved without a joint programme.
- Academic benefit for students as defined by broad learning outcomes at programme level.
- Tangible demand based on market research and comparison with national and international competitors, highlighting the specifics of the proposed programme.
- Added value for
 - Students: - added academic skills and qualifications; - increased employability; - access to expertise and material not available here; - added dimension to educational experience; - international experience.
 - the School and the College: - new competencies/research fields; - new synergies/pooling of resources; - new target groups/markets; - increased cooperation with cognate institutions and in fields of strategic importance; - increased reputation.
- Link to School strategy and the College's Strategic Plan.
- Academic viability and sustainability across participating institutions in terms of personnel and equipment (library facilities, lab facilities).
- Economic viability and sustainability across participating institutions in terms of cost-benefit analysis and minimum numbers of students required. Such a consideration should not necessarily be strictly numerical. For strategic purposes a new programme can be designed/tolerated as a loss-leader in the start-up phase.

3.2.2. Choice of partner institutions

It is of critical importance that partners are identified and chosen strategically according to appropriate criteria. Experience shows that often initial ideas for cooperation arise out of contacts, approaches or even coincidences that are not always centrally related to the suggested programmes. For the success and sustainability of programmes it is essential that partner institutions provide good academic and institutional 'fit' and share common goals and objectives. Suggested partner(s) need to be compatible and/or complimentary in terms of their

- Commitment to the project
- Disciplines, subject areas and research fields
- Fields of specialisation/expert knowledge
- Academic structures, Bologna cycles and term times
- Assessment procedures and marking scales
- Quality control mechanisms
- Potential for utilizing and sharing of resources and experts
- Legal and regulatory framework

For such an assessment existing links, established and reliable contacts and a proven record of successful cooperation are generally an advantage, but not a prerequisite.

3.2.3. Governance structures

A broad outline of the proposed governance structures of the partnership needs to be provided:

- Role of steering group / coordination committee
- Division of roles and responsibilities between partners
- Mechanisms of communication and information flow

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

- Definition of lead institution, role of Course Director, local coordinators

3.2.4 Broad ownership in School

For the success and sustainability it is important that a proposal has the full support at all levels in College. The following questions should be addressed in relation to this:

- academic champion who will drive the development of the programme and take responsibility;
- sufficient critical mass of personnel in the Discipline/School to ensure continuity and stability (and not an over-reliance on individuals who might leave);
- administrative support and back-up within the Discipline and School.

3.2.5 Financial feasibility

The development of joint programmes requires additional resources and is likely to cost rather than generate money, especially during the start-up phase. The following issues need to be considered:

- additional costs for coordination, administration, travel and meetings across the network;
- equitable cost sharing arrangements (reflecting the different roles and capabilities of the partners);
- suggested fee structure and distribution of fees across partners;
- sources for external funding (e.g. Erasmus Mundus II) at network level;
- possible allocation of strategic seed funding from School and/or Faculty;

4. Protocol for approval of joint programmes and joint degrees

This feasibility study should be developed at School level with the involvement of the academic champion/prospective Course Director of the joint programme/degree, the DUGTL or DPGTL respectively, the Head of School, the Faculty Dean and the Faculty Financial Advisor.

It will be vetted by an Expert Group of Council and Board. Its membership will include the Registrar, the Senior Lecturer for UG programmes, the Dean of Graduate Studies for PG programmes, the Academic Secretary, the respective Dean of the Faculty and colleagues with experience in running joint programmes. Subject specialists from the discipline can be co-opted.

4.1 Proposals requiring an external funding bid and/or consortium application

- Step 1: Following approval of the feasibility study by the Expert Group, Schools will be authorised to develop a full funding bid and/or consortium application in cooperation with its consortium partner(s).
- Step 2: Once the project bid has been successful, proposals should, within the School and the Faculty, take the same route to Council as UG and PG proposals currently.
- Step 3: The Working Party suggests adapting the current templates for proposals for new undergraduate and postgraduate studies for this purpose in line with the recommendations under 5.
- Step 4: Complete proposals need approval from the Senior Lecturer or the Dean of Graduate Studies and should come to the Undergraduate Studies Committee or the Graduate Studies Committee respectively before submission to Council.

- Step 5: The Memorandum of Understanding or inter-institutional cooperation agreement for joint programmes should also be vetted by the Expert Group before submission to Board
- Step 6: New degrees need final approval from Senate.

4.2 Proposals for bilateral joint programmes/ joint degrees

- Where no funding or consortium application is involved, step 1 is not necessary and the protocol starts at step 2 after approval of the feasibility study.

4.3. Monitoring of established programmes

- Routine monitoring of joint programmes should be via external examiners' reports to the Senior Lecturer and Dean of Graduate Studies.
- The Expert Group can request reports on the cooperative arrangements and can propose formal reviews of the joint programmes to Council.

5. **Issues to be addressed in course proposals and cooperation agreements (in addition to those in the feasibility study):**

Previous experience within College and also internationally suggests that joint ventures require a variety of programme structures and that no institution will be able to run its cooperative arrangements under one single model. In order to fit as smoothly as possible within our existing structures while at the same time achieving the best academic and administrative fit with our partners, a certain degree of flexibility will be required at the level of organisation (though not in relation to quality standards!) of joint programmes. For this reason the Working Party did not see it as its role to provide detailed regulations for all relevant aspects, but rather provide general guidelines on what aspects need to be covered and on preferred general practice compatible with existing College requirements and procedures.

5.1 Institutional anchoring

- In all participating institutions commitment to the project at the highest level has to be ensured. A Memorandum of Understanding or a formal cooperation agreement, approved by the Governing authority and signed by the Head of the University, should be established. It should outline the tangible contributions made by each institution, including financial support.
- In College all joint programmes and joint degree co-operations should be overseen in respect of:
 - inter-institutional relations by the Registrar;
 - academic content by the Senior Lecturer or Dean of Graduate Studies;
 - financial arrangements by the Faculty Dean.

5.2 Governing structures for the cooperation

- The Working Party recommends that for each joint programme/joint degree a Co-ordinating Committee should be established with overall responsibility for the running of the course.
- Within College it should report to the Senior Lecturer via the DUGTL or to the Dean of Graduate Studies via the PGDTL.
- The composition and the competencies of the Co-ordinating Committee have to be clearly defined.

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

- It should be the forum at which all questions of policy, curriculum, quality control and finances will be discussed and prepared for decision.
- It should prepare changes to admissions policy and examination regulations.
- It should deal with differences of opinion.
- The roles and responsibilities of the Course Director and the Co-ordinators in the partner institutions have to be clearly defined.

5.3 Clarity of planning, decision making and communication

- Channels of communication: Communication channels and requirements must be clear and transparent. Experience shows that the success of joint programmes depends to a high degree on good communication and good knowledge of the requirements and processes in the partner institutions. Familiarity and trust is formed on that basis.
- Coordination and decision making processes must be clearly defined and transparent, outlining who is empowered to take what decisions and when

5.4 Curriculum development

- Establishment of an effective joint curriculum, tailor-made for its purpose and with agreed well-defined programme goals and student learning outcomes.
- The distinct contributions of each institution in the delivery of the curriculum have to be defined and expressed in terms of modules and ECTS weightings.

5.5 Selection and admissions process

- Admissions criteria and entry requirements need to be agreed at the proposal stage and need to be approved by the Senior Lecturer and Dean of Graduate Studies respectively.
- For joint undergraduate courses within Ireland applications will be processed via the CAO.
- For joint postgraduate courses a joint admissions committee will consider all applications.
- Applications to a joint programme should be at a single contact point.

5.6 Assessment provisions and quality assurance

- For the success and credibility of a programme, safeguards against an erosion of academic standards are fundamental. It is in this area that the reputational risk is highest.
- Quality assurance mechanisms should as much as possible be aligned with current College practice (module descriptors, learning outcomes, ECTS, Diploma supplement).
- The compatibility of examination regulations across participating institutions needs to be assured. The course outline needs to establish clearly for which part of the programme the regulations of which institution apply.
- In addition to this the proposal needs to include agreed joint criteria, mechanisms and standards for assessment and academic progress, minimum requirements for progression to the next year or phase, pass/fail regulations and descriptors for degree classes.
- Where the TCD contribution to a joint degree is 50% or more, consideration has to be given to enable students on this programme participation in the Scholarship Examinations.
- Marking schemes and degree classes need to be compatible and agreed conversion schemes need to be in operation across the consortium.
- As a principle, marks from partner institutions have to be accepted across the consortium.
- The appointment of External Examiners has to be agreed between all parties.

- Joint programmes need to establish and operate joint Examination Boards.
- The Co-ordinating Committee needs to act as arbitrator in cases of disagreement and/or identify and appoint a third party in that role.

5.7 Registration

- Models will vary for cooperations within Ireland and particularly the greater Dublin region and international ones.
- For Ireland and Dublin dual registration for the duration of the course will be the norm.
- For international cooperation students will register for the respective study periods at the participating institutions, with an arrangement similar to 'Erasmus out' for Trinity students while abroad.

5.8 Resources

- Student fees national programmes: Distribution of fee income and core grant will be on the basis of ECTS distribution. One institution will draw down the fee and the other will bill it for its share. The costs to the School for central services should reflect the proportion of time spent at the College.
- Student fees international programmes: Internationally Trinity will be at the high end of fee levels. Many European institutions do not charge any or minimal fees while fee levels in the developing world are by necessity much lower. Resource planning for the programme needs to accommodate this and design allocation mechanisms reflecting the differential cost and fee levels.
- Funding opportunities: In light of the fee issues and the additional costs for student mobility and the administration of the programme, international joint programmes are unlikely to be viable without outside funding. Proposals should make maximum use of outside funding or otherwise demonstrate the match between available funding and resource requirements.
- Strategic support: Discussions should be had between the School, the Faculty and the Centre on the allocation of strategic seed-funding for the start-up phase.

5.9 Student services and student support

International students require different forms and higher levels of student support, and provisions need to be made for those, including accommodation and mobility logistics.

5.10 Language policy

In the case of international programmes, language policy and language support policy needs to be covered in the course proposal, including minimum TEFL or EILTS English language requirements for incoming students.

5.11 Discipline

In the case of disciplinary offences (for example plagiarism) students should be subject to the disciplinary regulations of the institution at which the offence occurred, but at all stages of the process consultation with the Course Director and the other partners about the implications of offence and penalty are necessary. The same applies to fitness to practice issues.

5.12 Appeals procedures for joint degrees

- Appeal mechanisms need to be agreed between the partners. At a minimum it has to be ensured that there are no contradictions in the procedures.

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

- In the course proposal it has to be agreed which institutional procedures are followed in appeals against the overall degree.
- Individual module results (including year results) should be appealed at the respective institution where the credits for that element were obtained.
- The Working Party strongly advises against joint appeal boards, as a specific set of appeals procedures would need to be developed for each cooperation.

5.13 Degree certificates

- For joint degrees the institutions should issue one single parchment, bearing crests and signatures of both or all participating institutions.
- The language(s) of the degree certificate needs to be agreed.
- Prior to conferring, graduands must be approved by the Academic Councils of all participating institutions (in TCD: Board)

5.14 Diploma Supplement

As for all other degrees, a Diploma Supplement will have to be issued with a joint degree. It should clearly describe all parts of the degree and it should clearly indicate the institutions and/or study programmes at which the different parts of the degree have been earned.

5.15 Recognition and professional accreditation

For courses involving an element of professional accreditation, consultations with the professional bodies in all partner countries at the proposal stage need to ensure that the programme will meet the various accreditation criteria.

5.16 Graduation ceremonies - possible models:

- agreement on institution where ceremony takes place according to its usual format with representatives from the partner institutions
- formal ceremonies according to their usual format alternating between institutions with representatives from the partner institutions
- formal graduation at one institution with a possible second, less formal recognition ceremony at the other institution
- students graduate at the institution at which they first enrol
- students can elect at which institution to graduate

5.17 Student Records

To allow the College to fulfil its reporting obligations to the HEA protocols need to be developed on the sharing of the relevant information between international partners.

5.18 Alumni register

On graduation students will become alumni of both institutions and will be registered in the alumni registers of both. Alumni data will be shared between institutions.

6. **Specific issues to be considered for doctoral programmes**

In view of the Lisbon strategy and the government's aim to double the number of Ph.D.s across Europe and to internationalize doctoral studies, a lot of momentum can be observed for the creation

of joint doctoral programmes. In College the School of Health Sciences is currently developing such a programme, the International Doctorate in Global Health, Indigo.

We are rightly proud of the very high standards of the Trinity Ph.D. Our reputation as a research institution is inextricably linked to the calibre of our doctoral students. These standards must be maintained and safeguarded in cooperative ventures at doctoral level. In order to do this, the following specific issues will need to be agreed in joint doctoral programmes:

- Agreement on high and internationally recognised academic standards for the award of the degree, with a substantial level of original research.
- Common admissions requirements.
- Agreement between the partners on the duration of a Ph.D. programme, the nature and extent of taught components, procedures for the review of a student's progress and the necessary milestones on the road to completion.
- Formal joint supervision arrangements. International best practice is moving towards a panel of supervisors, with one from each institution where the student undertakes research and a further supervisor from another consortium member. Such arrangements require a high level of coordination and in many cases a harmonisation of practice in relation to research planning, methodology and theoretical framework and the nature and level of supervision, especially where supervisory cultures differ across systems.
- Common procedures for the examination process. This includes agreement as to the level of involvement of the supervisors in the examination process. Trinity's strong culture of non-involvement is not replicated across Europe.
- Mutually agreed appointments of External Examiners.
- IP policies, the right to the Intellectual Property resulting from the doctoral research.
- Authorship, especially in the case of joint authorship with the supervisor.
- Final institutional approval for theses must be given by the Dean of Graduate Studies and her counterpart in the partner institution(s).

Professor Jürgen Barkhoff
Registrar
16 June 2009

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Draft Terms of Reference

The Research Committee is an Academic Committee of Council and reports directly to Council.

1. Membership

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer (Chair)
 The Dean of Research (Deputy Chair)
 The Faculty Deans
 The Director (or Associate Director) of Trinity Research and Innovation
 The Dean of Graduate Studies
 One Council representative
 Four academic staff members recognised as leading Principal Investigators (nominated one each by the Faculty Deans and Dean of Research)
 President, Graduate Students' Union
 President, Trinity Research Staff Association
Others may be invited to be in attendance as appropriate by the Chair

2. Functions

The main functions of the Research Committee are:

- 2.1 To formulate policy on all research related matters which impact on the strategic objectives of the College¹.
- 2.2 To consider and make recommendations on matters of policy relating to research including matters referred to it by Council and other College committees.
- 2.3 To review and oversee the implementation on College's policy on research ethics.
- 2.4 To monitor, primarily through the feedback mechanism of the *Research Forum*², the relevance and efficacy of established policy - addressing shortcomings and anomalies so as to facilitate high quality research activities within the College structures.
- 2.5 To oversee quality assurance and improvement measures in respect of research activity, including the efficacy of research quality measures.

¹ Articulation of College's over-arching Research Strategy is the responsibility of the Dean of Research and the Faculty Deans, informed by School and Faculty Strategies and building on established and emergent strengths of the College. The Research Committee will operate with the understanding that the broad areas of Trinity's research strategy encompass the totality of the College's research activities, and facilitate all levels of investigation, down to the individual scholar. The Research Committee, in formulating policy, shall be cognisant that College policy must reflect best international practice and should support and facilitate all facets of research activity towards attainment of international excellence in the context of a holistic institution which pays equal and due regard to the individual scholar while cognisant of the importance of international differentiation, scale and achievement.

² The Research Forum is constituted by the Dean of Research (Chair) and the Directors of Research in the Schools and the Directors of Trinity Research Institutes.

- 2.6 To advise the Dean of Research in his role in reporting internally and externally on research and related matters.
- 2.7 To review Annual Reports relating to research matters and to make recommendations to Council.
- 2.8 To approve procedures for allocating research funds and monitor their implementation.
- 2.9 To establish Advisory Committees and Working Groups as required to develop and oversee policy in respect of research matters.
3. **Meetings, Quorum and Sub-Committees**
 - 3.1 The Research Committee shall meet once per term or more frequently if the business requiring its attention should so dictate.
 - 3.2 The quorum for meetings shall be 50% of the membership plus one.
 - 3.3 Other College Officers shall attend meetings by invitation for specific agenda items. The Committee may also invite any Officer of the College, or other person to attend any meeting(s) of the Committee, as it may from time to time consider desirable, to assist the Committee in the attainment of its objectives.
 - 3.3 The draft Minutes of the Research Committee shall be circulated to the University Council as soon as possible for noting and/or discussion/decision as necessary.
 - 3.5 In order to aid its operation the Committee may from time to time arrange for subgroups to consider specialist issues and bring forward recommendations to the Research Committee. These subgroups will involve members of the College community with relevant expertise and experience.
 - 3.6 Minutes of the Graduate Studies committee should be distributed to the Research Committee members, and vice-versa.
 - 3.7 The Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Committee shall be an Advisory Committee of the Research Committee.
4. **Authority**
 - 4.1 The Committee shall operate under delegated authority from the University Council.
 - 4.2 Through the Committee membership and the *Research Forum*, the Committee shall act as a channel of communication between the Council, the research community of College and the research administration, and shall report to Council with its considered recommendations pertaining to its remit as appropriate.
 - 4.3 The Committee may investigate any matter falling within its terms of reference, calling on whatever resources and information it considers necessary to so do.
 - 4.4 The Committee is authorised to seek any information it requires from any employee of College to enable it to discharge its responsibilities and shall have made available to it on a timely basis all information requested from any employee in a clear and well organised manner.
5. **Performance Evaluation**

- 5.1 The Research Committee shall, at least once a year, review its own performance and its terms of reference and shall report its conclusions and recommend any changes it considers necessary to the University Council.

Appendix 2 (ii) to CL/08-09/208

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE QUALITY COMMITTEE

The Quality Committee is a Compliance Committee of the University and reports to Board and Council. It is responsible for the creation of policy for the implementation of quality processes across academic and administrative areas of College and for overseeing their implementation.

1. Membership

Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer
 Director of the Centre for Academic Practice and Student Learning
 Academic Secretary
 Two representatives from each of the Faculties
 Two representatives from central administration and support services
 Students' Union representative - Education Officer
 Graduate Students' Union representative - Vice-President
 Administrative Officer, Quality Office, *Secretary*

2. Functions

The main functions of the Quality Committee are to:

- 2.1 Approve and oversee the implementation of quality policies arising from the College's Strategic Plan.
- 2.2 Review quality policies in line with the strategic planning process and legislative requirements, or as otherwise required.
- 2.3 Approve, in consultation with Schools and Administrative areas, procedures for quality reviews of Schools and Administrative areas.
- 2.4 Review and approve quality processes in respect of student assessment of programmes and modules.
- 2.5 Review quality review processes in respect of research measures.
- 2.6 Review on an annual basis, the effectiveness and outcomes of the quality review processes.
- 2.7 Keep under review the requirements of national policy regarding quality in education and ensure that College policy and procedures are consistent with them, where appropriate.
- 2.8 Advise on matters relating to Quality development that the Council, Graduate Studies Committee, Undergraduate Studies Committee, Research Committee, and other Committees as relevant, may refer to the Quality Committee.
- 2.9 Commission as necessary the development of new or review of existing policies in respect of quality assurance and improvement.

3. Meetings, Quorum and Sub-Committees

- 3.1 The Quality Committee is a Compliance Committee of Council and Board and shall meet once per term or more frequently if the business requiring its attention should so dictate.

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

- 3.3 The quorum for meetings shall be seven (50% of the membership plus one).
- 3.3 Other College Officers shall attend meetings by invitation for specific agenda items. The Committee may also invite any Officer of the College, or other person to attend any meeting(s) of the Committee, as it may from time to time consider desirable, to assist the Committee in the attainment of its objectives.
- 3.3 The draft Minutes of the Quality Committee shall be circulated to the University Council and the College Board as soon as possible for noting and/or discussion/decision as necessary.
- 3.6 In order to aid its operation the Committee may from time to time arrange for subgroups to consider specialist issues and bring forward recommendations to the Quality Committee. These subgroups will involve members of the College community with relevant expertise and experience.
- 4. Authority**
- 4.1 The Committee shall operate under delegated authority from the College Board.
- 4.2 The Committee may investigate any matter falling within its terms of reference, calling on whatever resources and information it considers necessary to so do.
- 4.4 The Committee is authorised to seek any information it requires from any employee of College to enable it to discharge its responsibilities and shall have made available to it on a timely basis all information requested from any employee in a clear and well organised manner.
- 5 Performance Evaluation**
- 5.1 The Quality Committee shall, at least once a year, review its own performance and its terms of reference and shall report its conclusions and recommend any changes it considers necessary to the University Council.

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

Trinity College Dublin

From: Admissions Officer
 To: University Council
 Date: 17th June 2009
 Subject: Scoring system for Revised A Level grades

The UK education system has been undergoing review over the past number of years (14 - 19 reform) resulting in number of significant reforms. One such reform is the revision upwards of the A Level specifications with the introduction of an A* grade to recognise exceptional performance. Teaching of the revised specifications began in September 2008 and the A* grade will be first awarded in 2010.

A Levels are comprised of advanced subsidiary (AS) and A2 units. The AS is a stand alone qualification and is worth half an A Level. It consists of two or three units, assessed at the standard expected for a student half way through an A Level course and contributes 50% of the full A Level. The A2 is the second half of the full A Level qualification. It consists of two or three units assessed at the standard expected for a student at the end of a full A Level qualification.

The scoring system used by TCD was last reviewed in 2004 following the recommendations of a UK Expert group established to carry out a benchmarking exercise for UCAS (Universities & Colleges Admissions Service) and the scoring system currently used is as follows:

Grade	A Level	AS Level
A	150	60
B	130	50
C	105	40
D	80	30

The introduction of the A* grade³ in effect means the splitting of the A grade (similar to Leaving Certificate A1 and A2). Heretofore the A grade was awarded to a student achieving an overall result of 80%+. From 2010 onwards a Grade A will continue to be awarded to students achieving an overall result of 80%+ but the new A* grade will be awarded to students who have achieved the following:

- Grade A overall (i.e. 80% of the maximum uniform marks for the whole A Level qualification) and
- 90% of the maximum uniform marks on the aggregate of the A2 units.

The introduction of the new A* grade requires the re-alignment of the CAO points awarded to A Levels and AS levels for students being admitted in the 2010 session and beyond.

TCD does not currently accept a Grade E awarded at either A or AS level. A Grade E is awarded to students achieving 40 - 49% which in the majority of examinations, including the Irish Leaving Certificate, is regarded as a pass. As a result and in order to bring us into line with other Universities both here and in the UK, it is recommended that this grade be included in the revised scoring system.

³ the A* grade will be awarded for the A Level qualification only and not for the AS qualification.

The revised scoring system being proposed is as follows:

Grade	A Level	AS Level
A*	150	
A	135	65
B	120	60
C	100	50
D	75	35
E	40	20

The points awarded to each grade continue to be benchmarked against the Leaving Certificate examination. When the scoring system currently in use was revised in 2004 the points awarded for AS level grades was benchmarked against Ordinary Leaving Certificate papers. However, all of the information in relation to the AS Level qualification states that while the AS level is a qualification in its own right the units taken are assessed at the standard expected for a student half way through an A Level course and contribute 50% of the full A Level. Therefore it is more appropriate that the points awarded to AS grades should be half that awarded to an A Level of a similar grade.

The revised scoring system is in line with those of all other Irish universities. I ask that Council approve this revised scoring system for students presenting A Level qualifications in 2010 and onwards.

Sue Power
Admissions Officer