Programme Review Procedures

1. Context

Trinity College Dublin, the University of Dublin, as a Designated Awarding Body is required under the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act 2012 to ensure: §43. (3) that each Award is recognised within the National Framework of Qualifications; §43. (4) that a learner acquires the standard of knowledge, skill or competence associated with the level of award within the Framework before the award is made.

The Programme Review Procedure enables Trinity to meet the above requirements and to outline the specific elements of the quality review process for programmes at Trinity.

This procedure should be read in conjunction with the General Procedures for Quality Reviews. It reflects the requirements of the QQI Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines (April 2016); the Research Degree Programme Guidelines (March 2017); the Blended Learning Programme Guidelines (March 2018); the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG Part 1 May 2015).

It also reflects information requested under the College's action plan in response to the 2nd HEA Gender Equality Report (Nov 2022) and the College's Diversity & Inclusion Strategy and provides links to relevant academic policies.

2. Purpose

2.1 These procedures set out broad guidelines for the preparation and conduct of programme reviews in Trinity College Dublin.

2.2 The purpose of the review is:

- to facilitate a critical self-assessment of the programme by the Programme Director, management committee and school(s) involved in its delivery;
- to provide an opportunity for the overall evaluation of the programme, with a range of inputs and analyses including feedback from students, employers, and professional bodies;
- to benefit from constructive commentary by external reviewers to College who are experts in their field at a senior academic level;
- to provide an opportunity to review the content, relevance, curriculum design and delivery of the programme in the light of national and international comparators.

3. Scope

3.1 This procedure applies to programmes of education provided:

- across schools and faculties that may, as a result of their multi-school nature, fall outside other quality review processes, e.g. School Reviews;

- across schools and faculties that are not subject to an accreditation review by a professional and statutory accreditation body.

3.2. Validated programmes delivered by a Trinity linked provider are out of scope of this procedure. Linked Providers under the QQI Act 2012 are required to establish their own quality assurance procedures, that are approved by Trinity as the Designating Awarding Body under § 33 (a-c) of the Act.

3.3. The quality review of Dual and Joint Award programmes delivered under a formal arrangement with partners nationally or internationally, are out of scope of this procedure. Please refer to the Dual and Joint Awards Procedure.

4. Benefits

Programme reviews:

4.1 Allow for the periodic review of an academic programme's curriculum, teaching and learning to assess:

4.1.1 alignment with Trinity's academic standards, curriculum principles, Graduate Attributes and Assessment Framework;

4.1.2 continuing alignment with Trinity's Award descriptors and those of the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ);

4.1.3 alignment with the policies, codes and guidelines set out under the Quality and Qualifications (Education and Training) Act 2012, e.g. Access, Transfer and Progression; Code of Practice for provision of programmes of education and training to International Learners; and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015).

4.2　Assess whether students are attaining the range of knowledge, skills and competencies to prepare them for opportunities in further study; or in their career, whether that be in employment or as entrepreneurs.

4.3　Fulfil the University's commitment to the cyclical quality assurance of programmes of education and training.

5.　Procedure

5.1　The Quality Office will write to the Head of School and/or the programme Director in Trinity Term, 18 months prior to the review, to notify them that the programme is scheduled for review and to request nominations for reviewers.

5.2　The school/programme is asked not to contact potential nominees to garner their interest in participating in a quality review, as this will be undertaken by the Quality Office. In considering nominees, it is important that no nominee has a close association with the School or its staff in a personal or professional capacity within a timeframe of 5 years. This is to avoid the perception of or an actual conflict of interest.

5.3　The list of nominees is informed by the scope of the review and the Terms of Reference for the review (Appendix 1). Nominees should be balanced in terms of geography, gender and experience. (see General Review Procedures §5.5 for further details). They should come from top-ranked Universities (QS World Rankings) comparable to Trinity in terms of institutional size, comprehensiveness of provision, research intensive etc. Where relevant, nominees should comprise representatives from the business/professional sectors, e.g. employer representative, student/graduate representative.

5.4　The Reviewer Nomination Form should provide sufficient background information about the nominee to allow an informed decision to be made by the Selection Panel. If background information is not available on the internet or through other public information sources, candidates will be contacted by the Quality Office to request a curriculum vitae.

5.5　Prior to submitting the completed nomination forms to the Quality Office, the list of potential nominees should by reviewed by the Faculty Dean for shortlisting. On receipt of shortlisted nominees, the Quality Office will provide the short-list to the Selection Panel, who will select three to four reviewers and reserve candidates.

5.6　The Quality Office will liaise with selected candidates to confirm the composition of the review team, and liaise with the school/programme and with the relevant College Officers to identify suitable dates and align these with the Reviewers' preferences.

5.7   An Internal Facilitator will be appointed by the Quality Office, in consultation with the school/programme. Information on the appointment and role of the Internal Facilitator can be found on the Quality Office website.

5.8   Please refer to §5.3 of the General Review Procedures for representation of College Officers in Programme Reviews. Note that where the Faculty Dean is a member of the programme under review, the nomination of a Pro-Dean will be sought from the Faculty Dean. The Pro-Dean cannot be a member of a School with which the programme is associated but may be from another School within the Faculty. The nominated Pro-Dean must be approved by the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer before the appointment is confirmed.

5.9   The Pro-Dean represents the role of the Dean at the meetings with College Officers and the review team but does not have a role in responding to or implementing the report. The Faculty Dean is expected to meet with the Review Team with respect to programme finances.

Development of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR), the Terms of Reference for the review, and the Review Schedule

5.10   It is recommended that a co-ordinating group be established to plan and manage the activities leading up to the Review. The co-ordinating group should be chaired by the Programme Director and/or Head of School and may include the Heads of Discipline (for multidiscipline programmes), Directors of Teaching & Learning, senior administrative, technical /support staff.

5.11   Elements of a programme review that need to be addressed by the co-ordinating group include:

- a student evaluation survey;

- a staff evaluation survey for academic staff teaching on the programme, including adjunct staff, teaching assistants/demonstrators, seminar tutors;

- focus groups with academics, administrators, students, graduates and employers to conduct a SWOT analysis of the programme;

- data analysis, collation and reporting over a five-year period of key programme, finance and student performance metrics;

- a Self – Assessment Report (SAR) to be provided to the External Review team six weeks prior to the on-site visit (refer Appendix 2);

- invitations to students, staff, internal and external stakeholders to participate in meetings with the external review team;

- room bookings and catering for the on-site visit by a panel of External Reviewers for 2-3 days (other than those arrangements made by the Quality Office)

- an entry presentation by the Programme Director to the panel of External Reviewers.

5.12   Agree on the content of the student evaluation survey and the cohorts of students to participate. The Quality Office will work with School and programme administrators to agree dates and times for administration of the survey and administer the survey to students. The survey is to be administered manually in order to optimise response rates. The Quality Office will also arrange for the statistical analysis of the survey.

5.13   Agree on the content of the staff survey and the staff cohorts to participate, e.g. staff from the School, adjunct staff, graduate teaching assistants, tutors etc. The Quality Office will work with school and programme administrators to agree dates and times for administration of the survey and will lead the administration effort. The Quality Office will also arrange for the statistical analysis of the survey.

5.14   The co-ordinating group nominates representatives to participate in focus groups to conduct the SWOT analysis of the programme and provide contact details of graduates and employers that may be appropriate participants. Employer details can be obtained from, among other sources, the First Destination Survey available on the Careers Advisory Service website;

5.15   The co-ordinating group will confirm contact details for external examiners active on the programme. The Quality Office will write to external examiners to notify them of the planned programme review in advance of the examining period preceding the review with a request for the timely return of the Annual Report.

5.16   The requirements for data analysis and collation of student and programme data for the previous five-year period is outlined in Appendix 3. Note that within Trinity:

(i)   the Faculty Dean and Faculty Finance Partner must sign off on programme finance data for inclusion in the Self–Assessment Report (SAR);

(ii)   student number data should be based on HEA returns. Approved figures can be found in the Senior Lecturer, Dean of Graduate Studies and Academic Registry Annual Reports;

(iii) staff data must be based on data verified and provided by Human Resources e.g. junior/senior staff ratios, student/staff ratios (see also AR Annual Report) etc.;

(iv) supports available from the Library for academic areas undergoing a review can be found on the [Library website support pages](#).

5.17   A SWOT analysis should be conducted with various internal audiences including student and staff groupings, relevant partner schools and any research centres or associated colleges/collaborative partners with whom the School has links/partnerships. The purpose of the SWOT is to facilitate a critical assessment and self-review of the programme and its relevance to the School and College strategy. Tips on conducting a SWOT analysis can be found on the Quality Office website. The Five Phases of Quality Assurance Tool (Maastrich University) found on the Quality Office website may be a place to start the discussion within the School.

5.18   The outcomes of the SWOT analysis and analysis of data on the various programme activities inform the development of the SAR. This may include outcomes of professional and statutory accreditation reviews, international recruitment, student module evaluation, relevant data from the National Student Survey.ie and the International Student Barometer (ISB) surveys over a period of five years.

5.19   The SAR forms the principal source of information for the External Review team prior to their arrival on site. It situates the programme within the relevant schools, Faculty and broader University strategic environs. It should therefore have a strategic focus, be forward looking, and provide a critical appraisal of the programme and the quality assurance processes that support the programme. Responsibility for the development of the SAR and engagement of internal and external inputs rests with the co-ordinating group.

5.20   The main body of the SAR should be between 30-60 pages, excluding the appendices, and conform to Trinity's visual identity handbook v2 in terms of how the University is referenced. The SAR is organised under the following chapter headings (for detailed guidance refer to Appendix 3):

- Introduction
- Strategic context
- Programme governance and management
- Programme structure
- Curriculum
- Student numbers
- Quality Assurance
- The student experience
- Programme administration

- Finance and resources

5.21   The Quality Office will work with the Head of School/Programme Director and the Faculty Dean to agree a draft Terms of Reference (TOR) for the review. A generic Terms of Reference for programme reviews can be found in Appendix 1. The review team will respond to the TOR in the Review Report.

5.22   The Quality Office will lead the process for development of the schedule in agreement with the Programme Director and School/Programme Administrative Manager. The principles to be followed in the development of the schedule of meetings can be found in the General Procedures for Quality Reviews. There is an expectation that stakeholders discussed/referred to in the SAR will be invited to participate in the schedule of meetings for the site visit.

5.23   Student and graduate participation/representation is an expectation of quality reviews in the Irish Higher Education System and a College requirement under the Student Partnership Policy.

5.24   The final draft of the SAR with appendices and the schedule are to be submitted to the Quality Office six weeks prior to the review date. The Quality Office will arrange for proofreading of the final draft prior to its dissemination to the review team.

5.25   The School/Programme staff must not make any arrangement to meet with individual members of the review team during their time in College for the purpose of the review. Reviewers are asked to comply with a Code of Conduct for Reviewers which can be found on the Quality Officer website.

Further advice on co-ordinating a review and tips on conducting a review can be found on the Quality Office website.

Follow-up Processes

5.26   Detail on post review processes can be found in the General Procedures for Quality Reviews. In summary:

5.26.1 The draft review report is due to be submitted within three weeks of the site visit. Feedback on factual accuracy is provided by the Programme/School and the Faculty Dean and is made available to the review team for submission of a final report within a further three weeks.

5.26.2 The Programme Director/Head of School and the Faculty Dean are invited to formally respond to the final report and review recommendations. The report, along with formal responses from the Programme Director/Head of

School and the Faculty Dean, are considered by the Quality Committee and then by the University Council.

5.26.3 An Implementation Plan is then prepared (see template in [General Procedures for Quality Review](#)s) and submitted to the Quality Committee and to the University Council.

5.26.4 Within twelve months of Council approval of the Implementation Plan a Progress Report is submitted to the Quality Committee, and then to Council.

Appendix 1 General Terms of Reference for Programme Reviews

The Terms of Reference outlined below are generic to any programme and may be further specified prior to a quality review in agreement with the Programme Director/Director of Teaching & Learning/Head of School/Faculty Dean.

The review team is invited to assess and make recommendations to the University under the following categories:

(i)   to provide assurance to the University Council, students and other external stakeholders that the academic standards on the programme align with the relevant level on the National Framework of Qualifications;

(ii)   to assess the strategic direction of the programme in the context of School and College strategy, internal and external developments and, when necessary, to facilitate large-scale changes or discontinuation.

(iii) to review the effectiveness of the programme's governance, management and administration structures in delivering and supporting the achievement of its strategy and mission;

(iv)   to assess the quality of the programme's teaching and learning provision, learning resources and learning environment, both internal and external to campus, that underpin the delivery of the curriculum and the attainment of the Trinity graduate attributes;

(v)   to review the resources available to the programme to deliver on its academic mission such as financial, facilities, human.

Appendix 2: Approach to the Self-Assessment Report (SAR)

The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) provides the opportunity for the programme management to reflect on the internal quality assurance and improvement approaches that support the programme, and its contribution to School and College strategy, to students and stakeholders, and to the public.

The content of the SAR and appendices will be shaped by the scope of the review and the Terms of Reference as agreed by the Head of School/Programme Director and Faculty Dean. Options for the focus of the review include:

- a *standard* review: this looks at the quality assurance processes that support all aspects of a programme's governance, management, teaching, operations, administration and resourcing;
- a *strategic* review: this provides an opportunity to focus on a specific strategy or challenge that is impacting on the programme. The differentiating feature of this type of review is that it sets a specific action for the review team and context for the recommendations arising from the review report.

Criterion for a good SAR:
- fulfils the purpose as the principal source of information for the External Review Team;
- it responds to the agreed Terms of Reference for the review;
- locates the programme within the relevant school(s), Faculty and broader University strategic environs;
- has a strategic focus, is forward looking, and provide a critical appraisal of the programme and the quality assurance processes that support the programme.

Chapter 1:   Introduction:

The introductory chapter should set the context of the programme at the time of the review. It should address the following and act in part as an executive summary to the report:

- a short introduction to Trinity College Dublin, the history and evolution of the programme, the internal and external environment in which the programme is operating and the impact of same;
- a brief overview of the consultative/evaluation process undertaken to complete the SAR;
- the key areas the School/programme would like the review team to focus on in the review, as identified for example using a SWOT analysis by focus groups, survey outcomes and linking to the Terms of Reference;
- a concise update on the implementation of recommendations arising from any previous reviews of the programme, as per table 1 below, and comment on whether these recommendations continue to impact on the programme.
- If the programme has been subject to external review by e.g. an accreditation body, reference to the cycle of reviews should be made in the introductory chapter.

Table 1: Update on recommendations arising from previous reviews

Recommendation	Status C-I-NP	Comment by School

Key: C-completed; I-incomplete; NP-not progressed/did not agree with recommendation

Appendices for the introductory chapter should include the following student data and numbers: student profile, to include gender; CAO points; admission/enrolment statistics including EU vs non-EU entry routes i.e. CAO vs non-CAO routes such as TAP, HEAR, DARE, Mature, International Foundation Programme, Direct entry; exam results and attainment of Award by Class quotas; and progression, retention and completion rates.

2. Strategic context

This chapter should outline how the programme supports the School's strategic development, links to the College Strategic Plan and Strategic Initiatives and, if an undergraduate programme, how it has adapted to the requirements of the Trinity Education Project (TEP) (Core Std 3.1, ESG 1.2).

Of interest to the review team are:

- an assessment of whether the programme is achieving its objectives;
- alignment of the programme with the School and College strategic direction;

- links to relevant College-wide initiatives such as the Living Research Excellence Strategy; Global Relations Strategy, the E3 project, HCI, Micro-credentials and Athena Swan Awards.
- if an undergraduate programme, an assessment of how well the programme has adapted to the requirements of the TEP;
- identification of risks or trends (national and international) such as the emergence of competitor programmes, difficulties attaining clinical sites for required professional placements, risks associated with partnerships and, if undergraduate, the risks associated with the implementation of TEP;
- action plans responding to external reviews, external examiner reports;
- any strategic proposals on which reviewer opinion is to be sought.

3. Programme organisation and management

This chapter should outline the quality assurance processes that support the leadership, management and operations of the programme. Key inclusions in the Appendices are an organisational chart indicating staff holding key accountabilities for the programme e.g. Programme Director, module coordinators, year convenors, instructional designer if blended or on-line programme and the various schools/faculties from which teaching staff are drawn; the Terms of Reference for and membership of programme-level decision-making structures/committees, including a gender and diversity profile of membership, and how these structures are linked to School, Faculty and College-level decision making structures.

Of interest to the review team is:
- the effectiveness of the programme's organisational, management and decision-making structures/committees;
- the effectiveness of the relationships among schools who deliver the programme and, for multidiscipline programmes, across faculties and with collaborative partners;
- any perceived or potential risks to the programme and how these are being managed;
- how teaching is managed on the programme: staff composition within the School and across partner schools, those providing 'service teaching' into the programme and staff in teaching support roles, graduate teaching assistants etc;
- if the programme has blended or online elements, how the design and delivery of these elements are quality assured (BLG Std 4.2);
- how staff are kept informed of changes in regulations, policies and procedures and how the outcome of key programme, Faculty and College-level decision–making processes relating to the programme are disseminated within the School (*Core Std 4.2)*;

- the extent to which students and external stakeholders e.g. employers/industry, collaborative partners are involved in programme decision-making e.g. student representation on programme committees, partnerships' governance structures;
- actions taken by the School with respect to the [Student Partnership Policy](#).

4.   Programme structure

This chapter should outline how the programme is structured, and provide an analysis of its effectiveness. The Programme Handbook should be included in the Appendices.

Of interest to the review team is:

- an evaluation of the programme structure *(Core Std 3.2, ESG Std 1.4).* For undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, provide an outline of entry and exit pathways, progression and awards requirements and programme learning outcomes, the balance of face to face, blended or online delivery (BLG Stds 4.1, 4.2). Does the programme structure provide opportunities for placements, internships, field study and study abroad. What, if any, impact has Professional and/or Statutory Accreditation Bodies had in respect of the programme structure?

- if the programme is at undergraduate level*,* what TEP programme architecture applies? Has the programme included a 20 ECTS capstone project in the final year? Has the School/Programme received Council approved derogations in respect of the programme architecture or Progression and Award regulations?

- an assessment of the programme recruitment and admissions process *(Core Std 3.2, ESG Std 1.4).* Outline the programme entry requirements, including any specific programme pre-requisites, access routes for widening participation, recognition of prior formal, informal and non-formal learning as per the College Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Policy, recognition of foreign qualifications (NAIRC-Lisbon Recognition convention) *(ESG Std 1.4)*, and the recruitment processes used to secure international students (Education Agents; Articulation Arrangements; Exchange Arrangements etc).

5.   Curriculum

This chapter should evaluate the curriculum and assess whether it is fit-for-purpose in terms of the relevant level of the National Framework of Qualifications, the programme learning outcomes and the requirements of the relevant professional body. If undergraduate, the alignment of the programme curriculum with the requirements of the Trinity Education Project (TEP) should be assessed.

Of interest to the review team is:

- an outline of the syllabus for the duration of the programme by year, semester, module and credit and an evaluation of its effectiveness and comparison to similar programmes nationally and internationally.

- how the learning experience on the programme is enhanced through pedagogically-informed teaching methods, use of appropriate teaching strategies, incorporation of generic or transferable skills and integrative and reflective learning into assignments *(Core Std 3.2, 5.2, ESG Std 1.2 & 1.3)*. Include reference to, for example, the use of different modes of curriculum delivery and pedagogical approaches, the incorporation of transferable skills, new technologies and student-led teaching into the curriculum, the facilitation of small group learning, the use of polling apps, e-portfolios, blended (BLG Std 4.2) and on-line learning resources.

- whether there are opportunities to incorporate research-led teaching into the curriculum? Connections with University research themes, e.g. through Trinity Electives, to Trinity Research Institutes, Trinity Research Centres and the research interests of schools/academics associated with the Programme.

- what is the approach to assessment and examination used on the Programme (Core Std 6.1, ESG 1.3) e.g. assessment of, for and as Learning? If undergraduate, how are the assessment methods aligned with the TEP Assessment Framework and the attainment of Graduate Attributes? (Provide a copy of any mapping exercises in the Appendices).

- what is the assessment and examination workload on the Programme? Outline by year the balance of summative, formative and continuous assessment methods used, the use of projects including capstone projects, internships/placements/study abroad, OSCE's etc.

- how is feedback on assessed work provided to students on the Programme *(Core Std 6.1, ESG 1.3)*, as per the College's Return of Coursework Policy. Does the School have a standard feedback procedure and how is adherence to this procedure and the above policy monitored? Is feedback on assessment provided via the VLE or Turnitin?

- what internal processes are in place to support the integrity of the Programme assessment and examination process *(Core Std 6.1)* including:

  - internal processes around the development and security of examination questions e.g. encryption, secure storage and transfer, the provision of model answers and rubrics and the process for incorporation of feedback from external examiners regarding examination questions and other forms of assessment;
  - measures to reduce the predictability of exam questions by students;

- adherence by programme staff to internal guidelines and criteria for marking to include grade descriptors, consistency and transparency of marks, use of marking sheets, the process for resolution of internal marks, moderation of grades, annotation of scripts, anonymity of exam scripts, access by students to exam scripts;
- practices regarding assessment and marking of individual and group projects;
- the maintenance of records e.g. external examiners, exam scripts;
- the publication of results.

(Note the review team will review samples of examination questions/scripts and marking criteria/guidelines during the site visit).

- does the curriculum provide for off-campus learning (*Core Std 5.4*) e.g. opportunities to study abroad, to undertake internships and professional placements? Outline the quality assurance frameworks that govern these opportunities (sample checklist in Appendix 4);

- challenges in relation to the curriculum and the impact of same *e.g.* costs/overheads associated with 'wet' projects; supervision models for capstone projects; staff:student ratio or number of practical hours prescribed by professional statutory accreditation bodies or associations etc;

- how is the curriculum reviewed? *(Core Std 3.3, ESG Std 1.9)*. Outline the frequency, key individuals or committees with overall responsibility for the conduct of programme approvals or reviews, including professional bodies, and how student and external stake-holders views are incorporated into the process;

- how does the School address plagiarism? Is there a School policy regarding the use of Turnitin that is implemented on the Programme? Are students referred to the Trinity Plagiarism Policy? Does the Programme handbook contain Trinity's specified section on plagiarism? Are students required to complete a signed declaration to be submitted with all assessed coursework, declaring that they have completed the online tutorial and that the assignment/ coursework submitted by them is their own work? (See School Review Procedures, pg 13)

6. Student numbers

Include data on the following:

- student quotas;

- enrolment numbers and statistics: TAP, HEAR, DARE Mature Student Dispensation Scheme, Recognition of Prior learning, FETEC, International students;

- progression figures by year;

- student retention;

- moderatorship subject preferences and numbers (if applicable);

- final year project numbers;

- examination results by year;

- mobility statistics: student exchanges, study abroad, placements, internships, articulation agreements, dual/joint awards, other forms of partnership.

7.   Quality Assurance

This chapter should outline the process for assuring the quality of the programme. Of interest to the review team is:

- the process for the initial approval of the programme, the trigger for its development e.g. competitive tender; any substantive changes to the programme since its approval and the process for the approval of same;

- where does responsibility for quality assurance of the programme lie? What processes exist to consider the outcomes of the National Student Survey.ie, the International Student Barometer (ISB), the National Student Survey.ie PGR and the Graduate Outcomes Survey? Where does responsibility lie for responding to and taking action on External Examiners recommendations, accreditation body reports, feedback from advisory bodies and employer representatives (e.g. Programme Director and/or Committee, Director of Teaching and Learning)?

- the processes in place to assure the quality of teaching on the programme (*Core Std 4.3*, *ESG Std 1.5*), such as training of Teaching Assistants and Demonstrators, staff induction programmes, peer mentoring and opportunities for continuous professional development, recognition through Deans Awards, Provost Teaching Awards etc.

- what supports are in place to build capacity and competence of staff involved in the assessment of learners e.g. to ensure consistent practice and protect the standard of Awards? If students engage in projects off-campus e.g. internships/placements, what steps are taken to communicate to non-Trinity staff, the expected standard of marking and assessments e.g. grade descriptors and guides for the allocation of marks for projects conducted overseas as recommended by External Examiners?

- processes to quality assure the design and delivery of online or blended learning components, learning resources, flipped classrooms (if applicable) (BLG Std 4.2)?

- what supports are in place to manage and quality assure external contributions to teaching and learning on the programme e.g. Adjuncts, Guest Speakers?

- what supports are in place to develop the teaching practice of Graduate Teaching Assistants acting in the role of Teaching Assistants/Demonstrators /Seminar Tutors? Does the School encourage GTA to complete the online module Teaching and Supporting Learning, either 'for-credit' or in 'self-directed' format.

- the extent to which the College's academic policies, quality framework and tools e.g. the Partnership Toolkit are embedded in the management of the programme and adhered to by staff, students, and other relevant stakeholders:
  - Is feedback to students provided to students within College recommend timeframe 20 days (UG) and 30 days (PG) - Return of Coursework Policy.
  - Is the programme compliant with the College requirements to evaluate 100% of UG modules once a year and/or evaluate PGT programmes. Is feedback provided to students on the outcomes /actions taken in response to their feedback.
  - If plagiarism or breaches of academic integrity are detected e.g. data falsification, is action taken in accordance with Plagiarism Policy and/or Policy on Good Research Practice.
  - If applicable to the programme of study, how are students made aware of the College Safety Statement? How is the implementation of a School or Programme Safety Statement implemented and monitored at local level?
  - If the School or Programme engage the services of Education Recruitment Agents, does the quality assurance and monitoring of such Agents comply with the Education Recruitment Agents Policy.
  - Does the Programme Handbook meet the minimum core content as prescribed by the Programme Handbook Policy. Is the Programme Handbook available to students prior to the start of the academic year? Are students aware of where the Programme Handbooks is published/ where it can be accessed (in Blackboard, on the School/ Programme websites; in the School/Course Office?
  - Is the minimum content specification for taught modules available on Blackboard as per the College VLE Policy?
  - Do arrangements for the exchange of student personal data to third parties comply with the requirements of EU-GDPR regulation (May 2018). In particular where students' assessed work is transferred to External Examiner, does that transfer follow the approved Procedure for the Transfer of Student Assessed Work to External Examiners. Are External examiners provided with Advisory Guidelines on EU-GDPR.
  - If the research conducted by the School or Programme meets the definition of 'health research' under the 2018 Health Research Regulation (required as of 7th August 2019) has the School/Programme taken the necessary steps to (i) anonymise personal data of research participants (ii) seek explicit consent that meets the standard set by the EU General Data Protection Regulation; (iii) have an approved Consent Declaration in place.

8. Student experience

The opportunities provided to enhance the student experience (Core Std 7.1, ESG Std 1.6) through:

- provision of School–level student supports e.g. student induction processes for international, visiting or Erasmus students; student services; provision of student facilities/amenties; referring students to teaching and learning supports (e.g. Maths helpdesk, S2D, SLD) or approving requests for reasonable accommodations in line with the College Reasonable Accommodations Policy and Code of Practice ;

- provision of opportunities to be involved in the research activity of the School e.g. through attendance at seminars, conferences and by undertaking projects and internships.

- provision of College-level teaching and learning supports, including IT and Library, and student services;

- student complaints process, frequency of, analyses of and resolution timeframes for student complaints;

- relevant programme level outcomes from the National Student Survey (UG & PGT), National Student Survey (PGR) and International Student Barometer (ISB);

- monitoring of particular cohorts of students in respect of programme experience e.g. students entering via alternate access routes (TAP; International Foundation Programme), advanced entry, articulation arrangements, dual diploma or degrees, students returning from study abroad, internships or professional placements (refer Appendix 4).

9. Programme Administration

This section should outline the quality assurance processes that support the effectiveness of the administration of the programme including key systems and processes employed by staff to deliver its operations and respond to user, stakeholder and College needs.

Of interest to the review team is:

- administrative structures, systems and resources (administrative, technical and support staff) that support the operation and management of the programme e.g. Processes to support assessment and examinations including the Court of Examiners, and Court of First Appeal, support for external review cycles, systems to manage the

administration of cross-discipline programmes, provision of advice on module selection, exit pathways to Awards etc.

- documents that support the efficient and effective administration of the programme (*Core Std 1.2,* ESG Std 1.2) e.g. handbooks, module descriptors, policies, procedures, standard operating procedures/protocols, health checks, Garda vetting, academic cycle of programme administration, recruitment activities and events e.g. open days, school visits, education fairs.

- information management and compliance (*Core Std 8.1-8.7,* ESG Std 1.7) protocols on providing information to students/staff in accessible formats in accordance with the Accessible Information Policy e.g. programme handbooks, on managing data (storage, security and disposal) in accordance with the College information compliance requirements, the Records Management Policy and the VLE Policy.

- attendance requirements if the programme has mandatory student attendance requirements how are these monitored and reported upon?

- maintenance and review of service-level agreements for specialist equipment, facilities necessary for attainment of skills and competencies by students on the programme; or with education partners providing field-study opportunities or professional placement opportunities to students on the programme?

- an assessment of the main challenges facing the administration of the programme and how these challenges are being addressed.

10.   Finance and resources

This section should outline the resources (financial, human and physical) available to run the programme and outline future funding requirements (ESG 1.6).

Of interest to the review team is:

- the income/funding source and operating budget for the programme: include an assessment of its sustainability in light of the current funding envelope, future growth targets and professional statutory body requirements that apply (if applicable);

- the staffing levels associated with the programme and an assessment of whether they adequate to support for example dissertations or final year (capstone) projects; postgraduate supervision, instructional design of online or blended learning resources, include the current and projected staff:student ratios and junior:senior ratio for the programme.

- profile of academic staff teaching on the programme: highest level of qualification achieved, publications/research grant income, workload in respect of project supervision/research supervision;

- the facilities and equipment provided for students in order to support their learning e.g. fitness-for-purpose of formal and informal teaching spaces, laboratory spaces, specialist equipment, clinical facilities, PGR student workspace, library collections etc.

Appendix 3: Suggested data for inclusion in the SAR

Data Requirements	Source
Chapter 1-Introduction • Organisational chart including reporting lines for the programme • Student Profile (including gender breakdown): Programme quotas, CAO points, admission/enrolment statistics (EU vs non-EU, entry routes (CAO vs non-CAO routes (TAP, HEAR, DARE, Mature, Direct entry)), progression, retention and completion rates, exam results and attainment of Award by Class.	• Programme/School administrator Academic Registry/SITS
Chapter 2 – Strategic context • School Strategic Plan, Teaching & Learning Strategy and Research Strategy showing alignment with, contribution to and impact of College strategies e.g. Global Relations Strategy, On-line Education Strategy, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy, Athena Swan targets. • School Risk Register • Accreditation Reports and action plans • HEA competitive tender process, if applicable	See web links • Programme/School administrator Global Officer or Trinity Global (non-EU); Academic Registry (EU)
Chapter 3 - Organisation/management • Terms of Reference for programme decision making/Committee structure and links to principal committees of College • Profile of management, leadership and committee members (internal/external, gender/diversity) organisation chart/ organogram • Name and title of position holders such as module co-ordinators, and those providing 'service teaching' into the programme and in teaching support roles or as instructional design of blended/online programmes.	• Programme/School administrator
Chapter 4 – Programme structure • Handbooks providing details of the programme structure, programme learning outcomes, module descriptors, relevant TEP architecture if UG, progression paths and award routes, Capstone Projects blended/online components, internships, professional placements study abroad. • Entry requirements, recruitment process, RPL policy	• Programme/School administrator

Chapter 5 - Curriculum • Outline of syllabus by year, semester, modules and credits; • Profile of programme delivery methods i.e. proportion of modules/programmes having an on-line/blended learning component • Providers of placements/internships etc. • Programme handbook, module descriptors, learning outcomes, reading list; • If UG, outcome of mapping exercise to TEP assessment and graduate attributes (Note: access to VLE by external review team maybe requested).	• AR Annual Reports Admission Office/Academic Registry • School administrator
Chapter 6 – Student numbers • Quotas • Enrolment • Progression by year • Retention • Moderatorship subject preferences and numbers (if applicable) • Final year project numbers • Examination results by year • Direct entry numbers versus omnibus entry numbers –class sizes • Other entry modes • Recognition of prior learning, FETEC, International students.	• Programme/School Administrator • Quality Office • Quality Office • Programme/School administrator

Chapter 7- Quality Assurance
 • Module and programme evaluations by students
 • Survey data:
    - Irish Survey of Student Engagement (ISSE)
    - Postgraduate Research Survey (PGR)
    - International Student Barometer (ISB)
    - First Destination Survey (FDR)
 • Data from other student feedback mechanisms e.g. staff:student liaison committees
 • Student evaluation of off-campus learning e.g. placements, internships, Erasmus exchanges etc.
 • Feedback from advisory bodies and employer representatives External examiner reports/recommendations
 • External Review Reports (if applicable)
 • Disciplinary (Plagiarism) and Appeal data (Progression)
 • Outcome of School's internal mapping of curriculum, assessment and workload undertaken as part of the TEP Project, if undergraduate
 • Progression and retention data
 • Degree attainment by grade, degree classification
	• Programme administrator
	
	 • Quality Office
	 • Quality Office
	 • Global Officer Coordinator
	 • Careers Office
	 • Programme administrator
	 • Programme administrator or Directors of T&L
	 • Quality Office
	 • SITS
	 • Programme administrator

	• Academic Registry Annual Report • School administrators
Chapter 8 – Student Experience • Detail of student induction processes for international, visiting or Erasmus students; • Information provided in handbooks directing students to support services, facilities/amenties; • List opportunities for students to attend seminars, conferences; • List opportunities for students to undertaking projects and internships; • An outline of student complaints and appeals processes, and where they are published.	• Programme administrator
Chapter 9 – Programme Administration: • Copies of processes and procedures supporting courts of examiners, publishing marks, entering marks in SITS, supplemental examinations etc., standard operating procedures/protocols, academic cycle of programme administration, recruitment activities and events • Copies of certification against quality standards such as ISO or AAALAC (Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International) Accreditation or requirements of professional and/or regulatory bodies; • Service level agreements with units in College such as Comparative Medicine, Centre for Microscopy and Analysis, the Hazardous Materials Facility etc; • MOUs with external partners/collaborators	• School administrator
Chapter 10 – Finance & resources (Finance/funding information) • Summary financial statement (income and expenditure) outlining the programme's source of income, funding streams, budget and expenditure; • BBM data for the relevant Schools • Prizes/awards received;	- Programme/School administrator, Head of School, Faculty Finance Partner and Finance Service Division
Chapter 10 – *Finance & resources (Staffing on the programme)* • Staff category by Gender (Academic, Admin, Research, Technical, Support) • FTEs • Within staff category, analysis by grade level and gender (Academic Staff by Asst. Professor, Assoc. Professor, Professor In, Professor of • Contract type by gender (Fulltime/Part time, fixed term, permanent and indefinite duration staff) • Staff breakdown by Age bracket, nationality, junior vs senior	• Breakdown from HR: -Gender -Division/Faculty, School and Cost Centre -Payscale -Employee status either contract or - Permanent/Indefinite and Full/Part time

Other staffing data • Staff:Student Ratio (FTSE data) • Staff development opportunities and profile of uptake • Profile of staff applying for and achieving promotion by gender, grade, age-band and contract type (full-time/part-time status) • Profile of staff availing of flexible work arrangements • Staff qualifications, publications, grant income, workload, project supervision, research supervision, consulting projects, patents in last 5 yrs.	-Age bracket -Nationality • RSS • HR Staff Office • Faculty HR Partner Faculty administrator
Chapter 10 – Finance and funding (Programme Infrastructure) • Maps showing facilities and space allocation for programme delivery • Available resources/equipment/facilities (e.g. Laboratory equipment) • Maintenance and replacement schedule • Service level agreements with KPI's and reviews of attainment	• Estates and Facilities • Programme administrator

Appendix 4: Sample Checklist for Professional Placements/Off-campus Learning

Purpose: The purpose of this checklist is to provide schools with a means to quality assure off-campus learning /professional placements. In general, professional programmes are accredited by Professional & Statutory Accreditation Bodies. The QQI Core Statutory QA Guidelines (§5.4) includes a requirement to quality assure professional placements/off-campus learning.

Context: The context for professional placements/off-campus learning differs across disciplines and across faculties. Placements may be established under a statutory framework, e.g. Pharmacy (APPEL); be historical or voluntary in nature e.g. clinical placements mediated through the Health Service Executive; placements in community or non-government sectors.

4.1 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:

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?	
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	
Indicate the number of (i) placement sites; (ii) off-campus learning partnership sites.	
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?	

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

4.2 Quality Assurance

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

Is there a cycle of review to ensure governance arrangements are reviewed and updated to reflect any change in arrangements?	
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?	
Are there processes around the selection and training of, and role description for on-site tutors/mentors supervisors/preceptors?	
For Erasmus Exchanges has curriculum mapping been conducted to assure equivalence of academic standards in respect	

of the curriculum, assessment and examinations?	
Are learning resources available to students on professional placements quality assured to ensure they are fit-for-purpose?	
Is feedback from students collected on the placement / off campus learning experience e.g. Survey Monkey, focus groups, site-visits, student reps etc?	
What methods are used for giving feedback to students on issues they have raised regarding their placement / off-campus learning experience?	
What methods are used to gather feedback from placement providers /off-campus learning partners on their experience of Trinity students on placements?	
What methods are used for giving feedback to placement providers/ off-campus learning partners on student experience?	

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

Student request for change of tutor/ preceptor/ mentor/supervisor?	
Student request for deferral of placement?	
Fitness to Practice Policy?	
Student complaints/ dispute/grievance resolution?	
Student attendance/ absences?	
Student request for special accommodation related to professional placement?	
Transfer of Student Personal Data between the School and the placement provider in compliance with EU-GDPR Regulations	

4.4 Teaching & Learning on Professional Placements/Off-Campus Learning (including Erasmus/Internships etc)

Are the expected learning outcomes/competencies expected from placement/off campus learning arrangements documented? Where?	
Is there a formal student learning contract/compact?	
Is there a documented assessment strategy, defined progression requirements?	
Is information on placements/off – campus learning arrangements available in student/programme handbooks, or on the School or programme website?	
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?	

4.5 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