
Quality Review Procedure for Dual and Joint Degree Programmes leading to Trinity College Dublin, University of Dublin Awards.

1. Context

Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin (hereafter Trinity) has prescribed responsibilities under the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education & Training) Act 2012 with regards to education arrangements with other higher education institutions (HEIs) leading to dual and joint awards, listed on the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ).

Trinity is committed to exploring mutually beneficial education and research arrangements with HEIs nationally and internationally. Inter-institutional agreements are required to pay due attention to the quality assurance requirements of the relevant jurisdictions and of the partner institutions.

Trinity's '[Collaborative and Transational Education Partnership](#)' and '[Dual and Joint Awards](#)' policies underpin this quality review procedure. The Dual and Joint Awards policy defines:

- i. a dual programme of study consists of two separate but linked programmes of study normally delivered sequentially by the partner HEIs leading to Dual Awards.
- ii. a joint programme of study refers to an integrated curriculum that is designed, developed and delivered collaboratively by partner HEIs and leads to a Joint Award.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this procedure is to:

- i. meet the requirement under inter-institutional arrangements for a cyclical quality review of programmes leading to awards on the NFQ;
- ii. to take account of the different qualification frameworks, quality assurance frameworks and academic policies and procedures to be considered in the conduct of a review of a dual or joint award programme or suite of programmes;

- iii. to assure institutional partners, their stakeholders and the broader public that the quality and sustainability of education provision and the governance that guides that provision is in good standing with legal and governance frameworks in Ireland and in other jurisdictions in which partners operate.

3. Scope

This procedure applies to the quality review of programmes of education and research leading to dual and joint awards by Trinity and a partner HEI under an approved institutional arrangement.

The scope of the review is informed by the nature of the award programme (whether dual or joint) and the inter-institutional arrangements (academic and administrative) that support the delivery of the programme or suite of programmes.

The scope incorporates a focus on governance and management of the partnership at institutional and programme level including human, financial and infrastructure resources; responsibility for the programme structure and curricula and the quality assurance of academic standards, of teaching and learning; and the student experience.

From the perspective of the Irish regulatory context the scope includes at a minimum, alignment with the:

- i. *Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines (April 2016)* that apply to all higher education providers and incorporate the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015)* and:
- ii. QQI sector specific quality assurance guidelines for Designated Awarding Bodies;
- iii. QQI topic specific guidelines and codes, including the *Code of practice for the provision of programmes of education and training to international learners*, as appropriate;
- iv. Legal, financial and other governance/regulatory instruments that Trinity and its partner HEIs are required to be compliant with in Ireland and in other jurisdictions in which the programme is delivered including, e.g. Ministry of Education or equivalent requirements; accreditation body requirements and inter-institutional arrangements, e.g. contracts and approved programme proposals;

4. Principles

- 4.1. Awarding bodies are responsible for assuring the academic standards of elements of programmes or individual modules delivered in their name (and any associated credit awarded), regardless of where this takes place or who delivers it.
- 4.2. Programmes leading to dual and joint awards are delivered to the equivalent academic standard and quality assurance processes as that of programmes directly provided by the awarding body.

- 4.3. Trinity recognises the quality assurance procedures of Designated Awarding Bodies in Ireland, who being subject to the same regulatory, quality, and qualifications frameworks as Trinity, may initiate and/or lead a quality review of a programme or suite of programmes leading to dual or joint awards on the National Framework of Qualifications.
- 4.4. Trinity will adopt a risk – based approach as to the initiation and/or leadership of quality reviews where the delivery of the programme is in another jurisdiction. The risk assessment will be predicated on whether the dual and joint programme is being delivered in:
 - a. the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) where there are shared Quality Assurance Standards ([ESG 2015](#)) and complementary Qualification Frameworks ([European Qualifications Framework](#) (EFQ));
 - b. outside the EHEA, where a mapping of Quality Standards and Qualification Frameworks will inform whether Trinity can meet its statutory obligations through the other jurisdiction’s quality review process; and where gaps exist how these can be addressed.
- 4.5. An agreed Terms of Reference (ToR) will be negotiated for the conduct of the review by all partners to the arrangement (refer Appendix A).

5. Procedure where Trinity is the lead institution.

5.1. Notification

- 5.1.1. The timeframe for an initial quality review is informed by the approved inter-institutional arrangement.
- 5.1.2. The timing for each subsequent review will be guided by the seven-year review cycle prescribed by the QQI Act 2012; the maturation of inter-institutional arrangements; and any other external or internal strategic intent that may arise.

5.2. Payment

- 5.2.1. The direct and indirect costs associated with a quality review will be agreed in a schedule to the inter-institutional arrangement or will be negotiated between Trinity and the partner HEI at the time of notification.
- 5.2.2. Trinity offers remuneration to External Reviewers in the form of an honorarium (€1,250 which is subject to tax at source). External Reviewers can also claim expenses, which are not subject to tax).
- 5.2.3. Direct costs for reviews include flights, accommodation, airport transfers and evening meals.
- 5.2.4. Indirect costs are borne by the Trinity School and partner HEI e.g. resourcing costs to develop the Self-Assessment Report, conduct and analyse surveys and/or focus groups, on-site catering during the review visit.

5.3 Nomination and Selection of Reviewers.

- 5.3.1 The Trinity School and partner HEIs will be asked to bring forward nominations for External Reviewers. A minimum of sixteen external reviewer nominees will be considered depending on the scope and complexity of the educational provision.
- 5.3.2. Nominees should come from top-ranked Universities (QS world and subject ranking) and be balanced in terms of geography, gender and senior administrative experience in academic roles.
- 5.3.3. Academic nominees should be at professorial level and should not have any perceived or actual conflict of interest with the institution or programme to be reviewed i.e. close association with the institution or its staff in a personal or professional capacity (Refer Appendix D: Reviewer Nomination Form);
- 5.3.4. The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ESG 2015) Part 2, Standard 2.4 requires a student member to be included in the review panel. This will be negotiated with the partner HEI, where they are located outside the European Higher Education Area (EHEA).
- 5.3.5. Each partner will nominate an Internal Facilitator who act as advisors to the external review team during the on-site visit. Internal Facilitators are senior representatives of the partner institutions. Importantly, they do not have a role in writing or framing recommendations in the review report.
- 5.3.6. Trinity does not appoint members of faculty of cognate Schools within the College as active members of external review teams. Where the partner institutions' quality assurance procedures call for internal representation on external review teams, Trinity will seek to negotiate alternatives to this arrangement.
- 5.3.7. Nomination forms for external review team members will be returned to the Quality Office, Trinity College. The Quality Office will contact nominees to establish their willingness to participate in the review and request an up-to-date CV. All contact with the nominees is to be made via the Quality Office. The School and partner HEI are requested not to contact potential nominees with a view to canvassing their interest in participating in the review.
- 5.3.8. The Selection Panel will comprise senior management representatives from both HEI's e.g. signatories to the inter-institutional arrangement or their delegates, the Dean of the Trinity Faculty and the Head of the Trinity School with whom the relationship resides and their counterparts in the partner HEI, the Programme Director, and the Academic Secretary and the Quality Officer. The Selection Panel will be chaired by the Senior Lecturer (Dean of Undergraduate Studies) or Dean of Graduate Studies (as appropriate).
- 5.3.9. The Selection Panel will select three-four preferred external reviewers along with appropriate reserve candidates informed by the scope of the review as outlined above, the size, complexity and disciplinary focus of the education provision.

- 5.3.10. The Quality Office will contact the preferred candidates to formally invite them to participate in the review. If they are not available, the reserve candidates will be approached to participate.
- 5.3.11. Once the composition of the review team is confirmed, the Quality Office will liaise with the Trinity School/discipline and the partner HEI to identify suitable dates and align these with the reviewers' preferences.
- 5.3.12. If the review is to be located in Trinity or in Ireland, the Quality Office will arrange an independent note-taker to record meeting outputs. If the review is to be located in another jurisdiction, the assistance of the partner HEI will be sought to procure the services of an independent note-taker
- 5.3.13. The Quality Office in Trinity will provide a draft timeline to the Trinity School/discipline and partner HEI, based on the confirmed date of the review, detailing milestones to be achieved in the lead up to the quality review.

5.4 Self - Assessment Phase.

- 5.4.1 The agreed Terms of Reference (ToR) frame the self-assessment exercise, the content of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR), and appendices and the schedule of meetings for the review.
- 5.4.2 The SAR forms the principal source of information for the External Review team prior to their arrival on-site. The ToR and the SAR form the basis for discussion and exploration by the review team with representatives from both institutions, students and stakeholders in meetings held during the onsite visit.
- 5.4.3 Responsibility for the development of the SAR and engagement of internal and external stakeholder participation in the development of the SAR and in the review visit is the shared responsibility of the Trinity School and the partner HEI.
- 5.4.4 It is important that students are included as key internal stakeholders and that their feedback and input into the SAR is elicited through surveys, focus groups, and meetings with class representatives.
- 5.4.5 External stakeholders may include alumni, employers, professional practitioners, strategic partners who provide professional placement opportunities to students registered on the programme etc.
- 5.4.6 In order to ensure the SAR is fit-for-purpose, care should be taken to ensure that:
 - i. it has a strategic focus, is forward-looking, and provides an appraisal of the quality assurance processes that support all aspects of the partnership and the agreed Terms of Reference for the Review (Refer Appendix B).
 - ii. the main body of the SAR is between 30 -50 pages (excluding the appendices). It should include a description of the process used to develop the report and optimise the use of summary, graphical data (tables, graphs and process maps) and web-links where possible to communicate inputs, outputs and outcomes of quality assurance processes.

- iii. data included in the SAR is to be validated and sourced from institutional-approved sources (Refer Appendices C1-C3). The optimal period for data arrays is five years (depending on the number of cohorts that have graduated from the programme).
 - iv. any financial information provided in the SAR has been authorised and checked by institutional finance personnel prior to release.
 - v. it includes reference to governance frameworks (internal and external) for academic programme provision e.g. committees, policies/procedures/processes, standards, data collection, monitoring and reporting;
 - vi. it includes reference to quality enhancement e.g. action plans responding to accreditation review recommendations, external examiner reports, student and stakeholder feedback and other improvement themes/projects/initiatives.
- 5.4.7. The Quality Office will arrange for the SAR and appendices to be proofread as a final check of quality assurance prior to dissemination to the review team. If corrections are required, the SAR will be returned to the co-ordinating team to address. The time for this is included in the agreed timelines for the review (c.f. 5.3.13 above).
- 5.4.8. The development of the schedule of meetings is led by the Quality Office in consultation with the Trinity School/discipline and the partner HEI. The flow of the schedule is important in terms of facilitating a coherent and integrated understanding by the Review Team of matters relevant to the TOR. The agreed final schedule will be provided in accordance with agreed timelines provided by the Quality Office (c.f. 5.3.13 above).
- 5.4.9. Principles to be followed in the development of the schedule include:
- i. Key persons/representatives referred to in the SAR will be included in the schedule.
 - ii. Larger meetings (max 45 minutes in duration) with groups of representatives such as Governance, Management, Senior/Junior Teaching Staff, Students (UG/PG), Alumni, Stakeholders/Partners etc. is preferred over shorter meetings with 1-2 attendees. Forum-style meetings which allow for themed discussions with groups should be included where possible.
 - iii. Attendees are provided with sufficient notice of the date, time and venue of the meeting they will attend and details will be re-confirmed closer to the review date.
 - iv. A tour of relevant teaching and learning facilities is provided
 - v. A workable schedule from the perspective of the external review team is one where:
 - sufficient private reflection time is allocated to allow the team to process information between meetings;
 - sufficient time is allowed to transfer between meeting rooms or move between multiple campus sites, where required;

- time allocated to report writing is protected to allow the team to prepare for presentation of findings, prior to completion of the review.

5.4.10. The Trinity Quality Office will disseminate the final SAR and appendices and the review schedule to the Review Team in accordance with the agreed timelines.

5.4.11. A pre-review teleconference/video-conference call will be scheduled approximately 2-4 weeks prior to the on-site visit. Participation in the teleconference will include the external reviewers, representatives from the Trinity School/discipline and the partner HEI and the Trinity Quality Office. The purpose of the teleconference is to review the documentation received, respond to any request for clarification, additional information and agree any changes to the review schedule prior to the arrival of the review team for the on-site visit.

5.5 On-site visit.

5.5.1 As per 5.2.1, the direct and indirect costs associated with the on-site visit will be agreed / negotiated between Trinity and the partner HEI.

5.5.2 An appropriate base room is to be reserved for the review team's use during the on-site visit and additional breakout rooms (if required depending on the number of attendees) may be required to accommodate meetings on the review schedule.

5.5.3 The Trinity School and partner HEI share responsibility for ensuring attendance at meetings as per the agreed schedule, facilitating any request for a change to the schedule and responding to information requests communicated by the Internal Facilitator during the onsite review.

5.5.4 The onsite review culminates in a presentation/feedback session to review participants. This is highly recommended to provide transparency of review outcomes and the main themes to be pursued in the review report. The presentation can be in any format preferred by the review team i.e. verbal or power point presentation. It is not an interactive session but is intended to continue/maintain the momentum generated by the review until the final approved report is available.

5.6 Review Report.

5.6.1 The External Reviewers will be asked to submit a draft report that addresses the Terms of Reference to the Trinity Quality Office within three weeks of the site visit;

5.6.2 The Quality Office will forward a copy of the draft report to the responsible College Officer (Faculty Dean), the Head of School and Programme Director in Trinity and the corresponding representatives in the partner HEI. They will be asked to communicate any factual accuracy corrections to the Quality Office within two weeks of receipt of the draft report;

5.6.3 The Quality Office will communicate any factual accuracy comments to the reviewers, and request that a final report be submitted within a further two weeks;

- 5.6.4 The Quality Office will forward a copy of the final report to those persons nominated in 5.6.2 above and request that they confer on providing an individual or joint institutional response to the review report. The response should not address the recommendations individually, as this is the purpose of the Implementation Plan
- 5.6.5 The route for approval of the review report in the partner HEI will be discussed and determined in advance. Within Trinity, the review report will be considered in the first instance by the Quality Committee. Representative from the Trinity School and the partner HEI will be invited to attend the Quality Committee to present the review report.
- 5.6.6 Following Quality Committee, the review report and the responses will be forwarded to University Council for consideration and approval.
- 5.6.7 Following the report approval processes, the report will be published on the Trinity website (<https://www.tcd.ie/teaching-learning/quality/quality-assurance/reviews/reports.php>) in compliance with the QQI and ESG Guidelines. Where the partner HEI is another Irish or European Designating Awarding Body, they are also required to publish the report on their website. The requirement for HEIs in other jurisdictions to publish the report is contingent on the requirements in the jurisdiction.

5.7 Post Review Follow-up.

- 5.7.1 Following approval of the Review Report, the Trinity School/discipline and the partner HEI will be asked to draw-up an Implementation Plan (IP) to address the recommendations in the review report within an agreed timeframe, giving priority to any identified areas of non-compliance or conditions contained within the report.
- 5.7.2 Within Trinity, the IP will be submitted to the Quality Committee in the first instance and from there to University Council for approval. The approval process for the IP within the partner HEI will follow that determined in advance (refer 5.6.5 above).
- 5.7.3 Within twelve months of approval of the Implementation Plan, a formal Progress Report (PR) will be requested and within Trinity, the PR will be submitted to the Quality Committee, and then to Council for approval. The approval process for the PR within the partner HEI will follow that determined in advance (refer 5.6.5 above).

5.8 Evaluation of Review Process.

- 5.8.1 Following each review, the Quality Office will conduct an evaluation of the process seeking feedback from the perspective of the partner HEI and the external review team to inform the continuous quality improvement of the procedure and the process.

6. Responsibility

The responsibility for this procedure lies with the Quality Officer, Trinity College Dublin.

7. Legislation and Regulation

Ireland

- 7.1. [Quality & Qualifications Act 2012](#)
- 7.2. [Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines](#)
- 7.3. [Sector specific quality assurance guidelines for Designated Awarding bodies](#)
- 7.4. [Code of Practice for providers of education and training to international learners](#)

8. Related Documents

Trinity Policies

- 8.1. [Non-EU Collaborative and Transnational Education Partnership Policy](#)
- 8.2. [Dual and Joint Awards Policy](#)
- 8.3. [Education Recruitment Agents Policy](#)
- 8.4. [Quality Policy Statement](#)

9. Document Control

Date approved: University Council 29 May 2019

Date of next review date: June 2021

Appendix A: Draft Terms of Reference for the Quality Review of a programme of education and /or research, leading to a Dual or Joint University of Dublin Award.

Note: These Terms of Reference (ToR) may be customised to a specific partnership in negotiation with all parties

Context:

<Partner Institution>

Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin is Ireland's oldest University established in 1592, it is recognised as a Designated Awarding Body in the Universities Act 1997 and the Qualification & Quality Assurance (Education & Training) Act 2012.

Brief history of collaboration leading to signing of the MoU and legal agreements to establish a Joint/Dual Award programme.

Purpose

The purpose of the quality review is to:

1. meet the requirement of the <inter-institutional arrangement § x.x>, for a quality review of the <programme title leading to Award>
2. provide a structured opportunity for the institutional partners to reflect critically on their activities and plans for development of the programme (s) and/or partnership in the context of institutional strategic plans and other strategic initiatives;
3. to benefit from a constructive commentary by external reviewers that are experts in their field at a senior academic level and to benchmark the programme(s) against peer HEIs with respect to their education, training, research provision;
4. ensure that quality and standards in teaching, research and administration are being maintained and enhanced, and that any areas of concern are identified and addressed;
5. ensure compliance with the legislative and statutory requirements that govern the education provision of academic programmes by the institutional partners as legal entities in Ireland and, where relevant, in the other jurisdiction(s).

Terms of Reference

The Review Team is invited to assess and make recommendations to the institutional partners on the quality of the education provision, and specifically to:

1. assess the effectiveness of the <programme title> in the context of its joint or dual delivery by Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin and <partner institution> in accordance with the <inter-institutional arrangement> (month, year).
2. provide comment on the future direction of the programme in the context of both partners' institutional strategies, internal and external developments and, when necessary, to facilitate large scale changes or discontinuation of the programme.
3. review the curriculum and comment on the academic standards, the appropriateness of the programme learning outcomes and alignment with a Level

<x> Award on the Irish National Framework of Qualifications and a Level (x) on the < framework of partner jurisdiction>.

4. review and comment on the quality of Teaching and Learning on the programme, the integration of research-led teaching and assessment, and the quality of the student and stakeholder experience of the programme.
5. review the programme against the '[Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of Education and Training to International Learners](#)'.

Appendix B: Approach to the SAR based on the Terms of Reference for the Review

ToR 1/ ToR 2-Assessment of the effectiveness of the partnership as defined by the Inter-institutional Agreement and accountabilities as allocated in the Approved Programme Proposal

Questions for Reflection

- 1.1. Has the partnership delivered the expected benefits to the institutional partners envisaged at the time of initiation of the arrangement?
- 1.2. Have the partners to the arrangement adhered to the requirements of the Inter-institutional agreement and approved programme proposal? Consideration should be given to the effectiveness of governance and management structures and communication, student recruitment targets and quality of intake cohorts, financial underpinnings to the arrangement, resourcing (staff and infrastructure) necessary to deliver the curriculum to the agreed academic standards and assure the quality of teaching and learning and the student experience.
- 1.3. Are risks presented to the programme by other organisations e.g. changes in government priorities/direction, professional accreditation/registration bodies, professional placement partners? Who is responsible for management of external relationships that affect the partnership/programme? How are any risks being managed/mitigated?
- 1.4. Are changes to the inter-institutional arrangements being proposed as part of this review?

ToR 3 - To review the curriculum and comment on the academic standards, the appropriateness of the programme learning outcomes and alignment with a Level <x> Award on the Irish National Framework of Qualifications and a Level (x) on the < framework of partner jurisdiction>.

Questions for Reflection

- 3.1. *Dual Degrees*
 - a. which partner holds the position of First or Second Institution?
 - b. what is the minimum credit input by each partner to the dual award?
 - c. how many cohorts of students have made the transition between partner institutions?
 - d. has the experience of the linked curriculum in the first institution prepared students for their programme of study in the second institution?
 - e. has the experience of each institution's academic regulations as they pertain to each institution's individual curriculum and award operated as expected for students registered on the Dual Award programme?

- f. what, if any, issues have arisen in respect of the curriculum, programme regulations or triggering of the dual awards that need to be addressed as part of this review?

3.2. *Joint Awards*

- a. which partner is the administrative hub responsible for overall administrative coordination of the programme?
- b. where are students registered (in one institution or in both partner institutions)?
- c. which partner's regulations apply to students registered on the programme, and at what stage(s)?
- d. how is the curriculum content and structure integrated by both partners to deliver the curriculum of the prescribed academic standard and quality to students registered on the joint award programme?
- e. is the programme and curriculum content accredited by a professional or statutory accreditation body in either jurisdiction? Has the programme been subject to a recent accreditation review? If so, does the report indicate that the programme is in good standing with the accreditation authority? Is there an action plan to progress the recommendations from the review?
- f. is the programme subject to annual external examiner review? If so, what are the main themes arising out of external examiner reports? If recommendations have been made for changes to the curriculum, how have these been responded to by the institutional programme coordinators?
- g. Is the curriculum benchmarked with comparator institutions? If so, what elements of the curriculum are benchmarked, how does it perform and have any changes been made on the basis of benchmarking outcomes.

ToR 4- To review and comment on the quality of Teaching and Learning on the programme, the integration of research-led teaching and assessment, and the quality of the student and stakeholder experience of the programme

Questions for Reflection

- 4.1. Is a programmatic approach to the quality assurance of teaching and learning adopted by both partners to the programme regardless of which partner is responsible for the delivery?
- 4.2. Is there clarity on the roles and responsibilities of teaching and administrative staff that support teaching and learning, and the quality of the student experience across partner institutions? How are decisions recorded and communicated to ensure clarity or resolve issues as and when they arise?
- 4.3. Is there a shared understanding of academic standards, academic integrity, assessment methodologies, workload, rubrics, marking, grade moderation and grade equivalences across partner institutions?

- 4.4. Does the programme timetable provide sufficient time for student engagement in small group study, peer-to-peer learning, self –directed learning, research, co-curricular activities?
- 4.5. What are the trends in student progression, grade attainment, retention in the programme of study over time? Has actions been taken to address trends, and if so, have these actions been effective?
- 4.6. What monitoring or evaluation processes are conducted to assure the quality of teaching and learning on the programme from a student perspective?
- 4.7. What processes are employed to provide feedback to students in a timely way on the quality of their formative or summative assessment, to inform future learning?
- 4.8. What monitoring or evaluation processes are conducted to assure the quality of teaching and learning on the programme from an academic perspective?
- 4.9. What monitoring or evaluation processes are conducted to assure the quality of teaching and learning on the programme from a stakeholder perspective? Specifically how are the perspective of professional placement providers and employers engaged in the quality assurance of the programme?
- 4.10. How are the outcomes of the various quality assurance or evaluative processes integrated to inform the continuous enhancement of the programme and student and stakeholder perspective?
- 4.11. What arrangements are in place to securely transfer student data between partner institutions and to 3rd party processors e.g. External Examiners, Professional Bodies; Statutory Accreditation Bodies; Professional Placement partners in compliance with Data Protection legislation/regulation active in each jurisdiction e.g. EU-GDPR (May 2018).

ToR 5 - To review the programme against the Code of Practice for the provision of programme of education and training to International Learners.

Questions for Reflection

- 5.1. Do marketing and promotion materials provide clear and accurate information to potential applicants on the awarding bodies making the Award, on the title of the Award and on recognition of the Award by national qualification frameworks, professional registration and statutory accreditation bodies in the respective partners' jurisdictions?
- 5.2. If Education Recruitment Agents are used to facilitate recruitment and enrolment of applicants on the programme, is the quality of service provided by the agent quality assured by the responsible institution who has commissioned the Agent?

- 5.3. Is clarity provided on tuition and tuition-related fees and any additional costs for students including travel, accommodation and insurance costs borne by students transitioning between partner campuses in different jurisdictions?.
- 5.4. Are pastoral and academic support services available to students to assist them to adapt to their programme of study, to integrate into the student –body, and the learning environment including professional placement environments, if applicable to their programme of study.

Appendix C1: Self - Assessment Report Data and Appendices – institutional Level

Document	Trinity	Partner HEI
Strategic Plan	Strategic Plan 2014–2019	
Organogram	Trinity Structure	
Terms of Reference of Academic Committees	Academic Committees of Council	
Institutional Academic Policies	Academic Policies - Trinity Teaching and Learning - Trinity College Dublin	
Ranking Information (QS/THE/Shanghai/Regional/National)	Trinity Rankings	
Student Facts and Figures UG/PGT/PGR	Trinity at a Glance	
External Relations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - educational collaborative arrangements - employers/industry representatives - national regulatory bodies - professional accreditation bodies - national qualifications frameworks 	Trinity International Partnerships Trinity Industry Collaborations Trinity Employability and Employment Guide Qualifications & Quality Assurance Ireland Professional and Statutory Accredited Programmes National Qualifications Framework	
Prospectus	Trinity Undergraduate Prospectus Trinity Postgraduate Prospectus	
Institutional Quality Framework	Framework for Quality in Trinity College Dublin	

Appendix C2 Programme –related information checklist

No.	Item	Ref
1.	Approved programme proposal document (detailing Programme Learning Outcomes)	
2.	Terms of Reference of programme governance committee –schedule of meetings –sample agendas and minutes	
3.	Programme regulations	
4.	Programme handbook	
5.	School/programme webpage	
6.	Professional or statutory accreditation body requirements e.g. standards, competency/skills framework (if applicable)	
7.	Annual Calendar (Almanack) showing dates of the academic terms, and dates of all relevant events in the academic year and in the organisation of the programmes under review.	
8.	Marketing and recruitment brochures – information for applicants, recruitment agents.	
9.	Admissions policy, criteria, quota, entry requirements, English Language competency, Health, and Safety screening (if applicable). Opportunity for advanced entry into programme or internal transfers from other programmes	
10.	Curriculum description of the programme i.e. duration and structure in terms of years, semesters, modules, and credits using diagrams as appropriate. A table listing all of core, pre-requisite and elective modules for each year that are available for students on the programme.	
11.	Module descriptor comprising the following as a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • module code and title; • year of programme (or level of module); • semester in which the module is delivered; • identify pre-requisites, core and/or elective modules; • number of Credits assigned; • name of the Module Coordinator; 	

No.	Item	Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objectives/aims; • learning outcomes; • syllabus; • exam/Continuous Assessment (CA) breakdown; • total numbers of hours of lectures; • total numbers of hours of tutorials; • total numbers of hours of labs/practical sessions; • bibliography; • link to VLE <p>Modules that stretch over two semesters should be identified as such. Modules (such as projects or placements) that take place outside of semesters /standard teaching term should also be identified.</p>	
12.	<p>Examination and Assessment :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assessment regulations and the policy on marks and standards required for progression and attainment of Award; • the allocation of marks/grades to examinations, course work, projects, etc., for each module for each year/stage of the programme; • the percentage marks or grades required for the various levels of Honours and for a Pass; • a summary of the performance of students in the year/semester examinations for each of the past three years (to be provided in Table format); • the titles of all final year/capstone projects carried out by students in each of the past three graduating years; • how final year projects/internships/dissertations are assessed; • a printout of any assignment descriptions and/or instructions given to the students about completing the assignments; • examples (if possible) of work submitted for the assignments/capstone projects accompanied by marking sheets that indicate the marks allocated to various elements in the report and comments that justify the marks allocated; 	

No.	Item	Ref
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • timely and effective feedback on assessment (formative and summative), feedback processes –individual, group, peer. 	
13.	External examination policy, process, details of recommendations and response to/actions to address recommendations	
14.	Plagiarism Policy, processes/procedures supporting academic integrity, outcomes from and reporting on plagiarism cases	
15.	Student progression and retention statistics for each year of the programme since initiation, retention strategies, withdrawal statistics; appeals data and outcomes.	
16.	Student programme/module evaluation survey, process for administration, response rate, response actions and feedback to students	
17.	Applicable Professional/Statutory Accreditation Standards Body, recognition certificate, review report and action plan on implementation of recommendations	
18.	Quality assurance of professional placements (if applicable) including governance arrangements, learning contract, assessment, supervision, escalation of issues by student, by placement provider and response by programme to student, to placement provider (refer checklist in Appendix E)	
19.	Benchmarking data (if available e.g. subject ranking)	
20.	Achievement by UG Degree class (count and %) for cohorts who have graduated from the programme (First; 2:1; 2:2; Third class; Pass; Pass by compensation; Fail; Grade Point Average or equivalent)	
21.	Achievement of PG Degree Class (count and %) for cohorts who have graduated from the programme Doctoral (Level 10 NFQ) (PhD; Other Doctoral (list titles); Award of lower degree; Fail) Masters (Level 9 NFQ) including Taught Masters; Masters by Research	
22.	Graduate attributes	
23.	Employment data post graduation (if available)	

Table C3 Resourcing

No.	Item	Y/N
1	<p>Student Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Healthcare - Counselling - Career - Other 	
2	<p>Student Learning Supports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - English language - Academic writing - Student Mentoring/ Peer Support - Other 	
3	<p>Student Information System</p> <p>– student records, timetable, exams, fee –payment, graduation, commencements, transcripts, parchments, data-protection/data-security.</p>	
4	<p>Staffing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CVs for academic, technical and support staff linked to the programmes under review; for academic staff this should include workload, project supervision, publications, research supervision, clinical practice (if applicable), grant income; - List showing highest qualification achieved by academic staff involved in the delivery of the programme together with the name of the Awarding Body for each qualification listed; - Gender profile and employment status of teaching faculty (F/T permanent; P/T permanent; Contract of indefinite duration; Adjunct, Clinical Tutor) 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff:Student ratios on the programme, in the School, Faculty/College/Cluster/Institution - Staff development initiatives 	
5	<p>Financial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainability of funding for the programme - Tutorial fees policy - Student Hardship cases 	
6	<p>Physical infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teaching and Learning Environment- lecture theatres, tutorial rooms, seminar rooms on and off-campus –centralised booking system, fit-for-purpose for demand and specification. - Teaching and learning equipment – language laboratories, science laboratories, clinical teaching simulation suite/specialist equipment, equipment upgrade /maintenance - Library resources – physical and online repositories - Virtual Learning Environment, other learning technologies e.g. Turnitin; Podcast; Video; online resources - Office /administration space - Student social space - Sports and recreational space. 	



Trinity College Dublin

Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath

The University of Dublin

APPENDIX D: NOMINATION OF EXTERNAL REVIEWER FOR ACADEMIC REVIEWS

One form is to be completed for each nominee by the Head of School/Programme Director

NAME OF SCHOOL/PROGRAMME TO BE REVIEWED:

(Specify if the Programme leads to a Collaborative; Dual or Joint Award and the name of the academic partner institution).

In completing this form, the following should be noted:

- **Nominees should have had no formal links with the College in the last 5 years (e.g. acted as an external examiner, auditor, reviewer, collaborator, been through the College's recruitment process etc.);**
- **Nominees should have no professional or personal links with staff of the School/Programme under review;**
- **Nominees should include representatives from the university and service/professional sectors where appropriate, with at least one coming from within Ireland. The composition of the nomination list should be balanced in terms of geography, gender, and experience;**
- **Nominees should come from top-ranked Universities (QS World and Subject Rankings), comparable to Trinity in terms of institution.**
- **Nominees should be of international standing in their field with some senior administrative experience if possible;**
- **A minimum of sixteen nominees should be provided by the School /Programme (with more being required for multidisciplinary Schools/Programmes) in order to allow the Working Group to select their first preference candidates as well as a number of reserve candidates;**
- **There should be no contact with the nominees by the School/Programme under review;**

NAME AND POSITION OF PROPOSED REVIEWER:

FACULTY AND SCHOOL:

CONTACT ADDRESS, EMAIL AND TELEPHONE NUMBER:

In order that the appropriate information can be sourced to inform the Selection Panel, please provide a link to the proposed nominee's:

- (i) home institution website;**
- (ii) academic profile webpage;**
- (iii) research profile webpage.**

I certify that the information given above is to the best of my knowledge correct and that the nominee has had no formal links with the School/Programme during the last five years.

Signed : _____ (Head of School/Programme
Director)

Signed : _____ (Faculty Dean)

Please complete this form and email it to Quality.Officer@tcd.ie

Appendix E: Sample Checklist for Professional Placements / Off-campus Learning

Purpose: The purpose of this checklist is to provide Schools/Programmes with a means to quality assure off-campus learning /professional placements..

Context: In general professional programmes are accredited by Professional & Statutory Accreditation Bodies. However April 2016, QQI, the statutory body for quality in Irish Higher Education incorporated a requirement in the QQI Core Statutory QA Guidelines (§5.4) to quality assure professional placements/off-campus learning

The context for professional placements/off-campus learning differs across disciplines and across faculties in Trinity, in Ireland and in other jurisdictions.

Professional Placements may be established under a statutory framework; be subject to formal Memorandum of Understanding or be historical or voluntary in nature.

1.1 Governance of Professional Placements/Off-Campus Learning (including Erasmus/Internships etc.)

Please provide a short synopsis of the School/Programme (UG/PG) Professional Placements/Off-campus Learning, addressing the following:

<p><i>What governance arrangements support the establishment of Professional Placements/off-campus learning partnerships in the School/Programmes, e.g. legal statutory; formal Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)/Service Level Agreement (SLA), historical; voluntary; other?</i></p>	
<p><i>Indicate the number of (i) placement providers; (ii) off-campus learning partnerships including the total number approved to take students and those who are currently hosting students</i></p>	
<p><i>Indicate the number of (i) placement sites; (ii) off-campus learning partnership sites.</i></p>	
<p><i>Are there documented criteria for selection acceptance and removal of a placement provider/off-campus learning partner? If so, what are they? Where are they documented?</i></p>	

<i>Is there a designated liaison point between the School /Programme and the placement/off-campus learning provider?</i>	
<i>Are there agreed communication protocols for dispute resolution/issue escalation? If so, what are they? Where are they documented?</i>	
<i>Are students covered by College's Risk and Insurance or by the Provider while on placement in Ireland?</i>	
<i>What Risk and Insurance procedures apply for students travelling overseas?</i>	
<i>Records on governance arrangements and review are maintained in accordance with the College Record Management Policy or Partner HEI</i>	

1.2 Quality Assurance

Please provide an overview of quality assurance processes that support professional placements/off campus learning:

<i>Is there a cycle of review to ensure governance arrangements are reviewed and updated to reflect any change in arrangements?</i>	
<i>Is there a cycle of visits to/evaluations of placement providers/off-campus learning sites to ensure the learning environment is fit-for-purpose, if so, how often do these visits/evaluations occur?</i>	
<i>Are there processes around the selection and training of, and role description for on-site tutors/mentors supervisors/preceptors?</i>	

<i>For Erasmus Exchanges has curriculum mapping been conducted to assure equivalence of academic standards in respect of the curriculum, assessment and examinations?</i>	
<i>Are learning resources available to students on professional placements quality assured to ensure they are fit-for-purpose?</i>	
<i>Is feedback from students collected on the placement / off campus learning experience e.g. Survey Monkey, focus groups, site-visits, student reps etc?</i>	
<i>What methods are used for giving feedback to students on issues they have raised regarding their placement / off-campus learning experience?</i>	
<i>What methods are used to gather feedback from placement providers /off-campus learning partners on their experience of Trinity students on placements?</i>	
<i>What methods are used for giving feedback to placement providers/ off-campus learning partners on student experience?</i>	

1.3 Do Policies/Procedures/Protocols exist at School/Programme level for:

<i>Student request for change of tutor/ preceptor/ mentor/supervisor?</i>	
<i>Student request for deferral of placement?</i>	
<i>Fitness to Practice Policy?</i>	
<i>Student complaints/ dispute/grievance resolution?</i>	
<i>Student attendance/ absences?</i>	

<i>Student request for special accommodation related to professional placement?</i>	
---	--

1.4 Teaching & Learning on Professional Placements/Off-Campus Learning (inc Erasmus/Internships etc)

<i>Are the expected learning outcomes/competencies expected from placement/off campus learning arrangements documented? Where?</i>	
<i>Is there a formal student learning contract/compact?</i>	
<i>Is there a documented assessment strategy, defined progression requirements?</i>	
<i>Is information on placements/off – campus learning arrangements available in student/programme handbooks, or on the School or programme website?</i>	
<i>Do students receive appropriate orientation/i n d u c t i o n that includes Health & Safety, and student conduct while on professional placement/off-campus learning?</i>	

1.5 Action Plan

Using the following template, what actions have been identified by the School or Programme in respect of quality assurance of Professional Placements/Off-campus Learning to be addressed.

Number	Action Required	Responsibility	Due date	Dependency	Review Status
1	Description	Person or Position Title		With other Actions required or Approval from e.g. HoS, Professional Body, Partner.	In-progress Completed Overdue