

TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN



PROVOST'S REPORT TO COUNCIL ON THE REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES, LITERATURES AND CULTURAL STUDIES

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the outcome of a review of the School of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies. An external peer review visitation was undertaken from the 5th – 7th November 2008 by Professor Andrew Barker, University of Edinburgh, Professor Lesley Milne, University of Nottingham and Professor Philip Swanson, University of Sheffield. The internal facilitator was Professor David Taylor, School of Natural Sciences, Trinity College Dublin.

The report is based on (i) feedback from the external Reviewers received on the 2nd February 2009, (ii) a submission from the School of Languages, Literatures & Cultural Studies received on the 18th March 2009 and (iii) a submission from the Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences received on the 19th March 2009.

The main purpose of the School review is (a) to provide a structured opportunity for the School to reflect on its activities and plans for development, while benefiting from a constructive commentary by senior colleagues external to College; and, (b) to ensure that quality and standards in teaching, research and administration are being maintained and enhanced and that areas of concern in this regard are identified and addressed. Each School in College is reviewed systematically once every seven years.

The School of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies (LLCS) at Trinity College Dublin was formed in 2006 and brings together the departments of French, Germanic Studies, Hispanic Studies, Italian, Irish and Celtic Languages, Russian and Slavonic Studies, and the Centre for European Studies.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE SCHOOL

2.1 Aims and Objectives of the School

Building on existing strengths, by the middle of the next decade the School aims to be:

- A world-class provider of high quality research-led undergraduate and postgraduate education in languages, literatures and cultures, and European Studies;
- A world-class centre for research, postgraduate study and training within and across discipline and language boundaries;
- Able to manage its own affairs through a combination of (a) responsive governance structure, (b) a dynamic approach to developments in teaching and learning, and (c) a funding formula that takes account of the requirements of advanced academic work in languages, literatures and cultures;
- Able to promote areas of strength and success whilst also supporting areas experiencing temporary difficulties;
- Responsive to emergent, including interdisciplinary research themes and course programme opportunities whilst having the resources and independence to resist short-term changes in perception of the importance of languages and cultures;
- A reference point to Undergraduate, Postgraduate, Postdoctoral, Visiting Research Fellows and leading research institutes with an interest in European Studies.

2.2 Programmes to which the School provides teaching

Undergraduate:

- o European Studies (B.A.)
- o Two subject moderatorship (T.S.M.)
- o Business Studies and a Language (B.B.S. (Lang))
- o Computer Science, Linguistics and a Language (C.S.L.L.)
- o Law (LL.B.)
- o Law and a Language (LL.B.(Ling. Franc) or LL.B. (Ling. Germ))
- o Germanic Languages (B.A.)
- o Early and Modern Irish (B.A.)
- o Irish Studies (B.A.)

Postgraduate:

- o M. Phil in Early Irish
- o M. Phil in Textual and Visual Studies
- o M. Phil in German Literature with Language Pedagogy
- o M. Phil in Literary Translation
- o M. Phil in Medieval Language, Literature and Culture
- o M. Phil in Comparative Literature
- o Diploma in Old Irish

The School is currently developing a new M.Phil in European Studies, a key element of its Strategic Plan.

2.3 Research

Research in the School is central to Strand 4 of the College's Research Strategy: 'Contributing to a deeper understanding of culture and the creative arts in Ireland and the World.' More specifically, most of the activities fall within the sub-sections 'Irish Studies' and 'The Construction of Europe.' Staff in the School participate in eleven International Research Networks.

Key research areas of members of staff in the School include:

- o Comparative and historical linguistics;
- o Cross-cultural communication and sociolinguists;
- o Cultural identities in literature and other discourses;
- o Literary criticism; critical and cultural theory;
- o Poetics and narratology;
- o Text editing and interpretation;
- o Textual and visual studies;
- o Translational Studies.

2.4 Summary Statistical Profile of the School for the Academic Year 2007/08¹

Full-time Staff FTE	Undergraduate FTE	Postgraduate FTE	School Staff: Student Ratio	Faculty Staff: Student Ratio
43²	496	70	13	19

Figures from Senior Lecturer's Annual Report approved by Council at its meeting on 14th January 2009

¹ The staff FTEs include all Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers funded from the core HEA grant, or from self-financing courses, and all part-time and occasional staff and demonstrators, converted to an FTE, who are funded from core grant or from self-financing courses.

² This total includes 5.4 FTSE for language assistants and 3.92 for other part-time staff who are not in a position to undertake research, postgraduate supervision or major administrative or management roles in the School.

2.5 Accommodation and Facilities (Physical Resources)

The School is located in the Arts Building where most of its staff are based and most of its teaching is delivered. The School's dedicated accommodation includes 58 offices and 10 centrally booked seminar teaching rooms in the Arts Building. Several postgraduate students, working on a project for the Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies, are accommodated in Foster Place, outside the campus perimeter. The School also has access to Senior Lecturer 'pool' rooms for teaching. These rooms are booked through the timetabling system on a 'first-come, first-served' basis. Pressure on room space, particularly for teaching activities, but also for office accommodation, is increasingly becoming a problem. The School is rationalising its teaching programmes to cope with staffing shortages and several cohorts of students from different programmes are now often taught together. This has created a demand for an increased number of medium sized teaching rooms holding 30-50 students, which are not available. The College is currently attempting to address this issue.

3. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW REPORT

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The Reviewers state that *“the study of languages, literatures and cultures at Trinity College Dublin has a long and distinguished history”* and that the tradition of excellence in teaching and research in these areas continues today. They felt reassured that *“the University remains committed to its support for a wide portfolio of European languages, which, with the exception (largely) of Irish, is similar to that offered in comparator institutions in the UK.”* They note that *“the School still bears many of the hallmarks of its constituent departments”* despite the moves towards *“standardization and harmonization.”* It also carries a heavy debt due in part, the Reviewers feel, to the effects of the ARAM and also as a result of the 5% cut in the University's budget arising from the worsening economic climate. In this difficult financial environment, the Reviewers feel that *“the continuing success and international renown of languages at TCD depend upon the School adopting methods and structures which acknowledge current economic realities.”* The Reviewers suggest that *“a properly integrated School structure would reduce the amount of administration, the duplication of effort and the proliferation of meetings about which many members of staff complain.”* They feel that the *“imminent moves towards semesterisation and modularization present great opportunities which, if grasped, will leave the School in a far stronger position than that which it presently enjoys.”*

3.1 RESEARCH

The Reviewers remark that *“present levels of research quality/productivity in SLLCS are very respectable, with excellent work being done in some quarters,”* and they note that a recent external review concluded that the School could be regarded as *“research intensive.”* In order to maintain this, the Reviewers recommend the introduction of a *“more effective research management system”* which would be able to monitor research productivity and adjust workloads accordingly. While the Reviewers commend the fact that *“the notion of the individual scholar/researcher continues to be given pride of place in the School,”* they welcome moves towards greater research cooperation and groupings that are now being explored. They were surprised, however, at the lack of awareness of younger researchers of the need to apply for external funding as a core activity and recommend that *“it is in the longer term interests especially of more junior staff to acquire expertise in the complexities of bidding for external funding.”* They suggest that *“a stronger mentoring system for early career staff is required, possibly involving colleagues from outside the School and /or utilizing the expertise that may be made available via the Long Room Hub initiative.”* They also feel that the introduction of *“a proper system of regular research leave”*, similar to that in the UK where staff are eligible for research leave after every 6th or 7th semester would be a step in the right direction. The Reviewers recommend that all Schools, especially those in the Humanities, plan for such a system.

The Reviewers acknowledge that TCD's ambition to achieve 100% research compatibility with comparators in the UK may be difficult to achieve given the *"gap in relative funding between the two sectors."* In addition, they note that *"the present punitive ARAM does the School few favours"*, at times appearing to impede what the University expects SLLCS to achieve. The fact that the ARAM *"takes no direct account of research performance (in particular, research quality)"* marks a sharp divergence from standard UK practice and is not, they feel, in the best interests of SLLCS. In terms of overall research management, the Reviewers suggest that there is *"significant room for a more pro-active input from the Director of Research."* They recommend that the College *"give consideration to introducing some form of peer review for monitoring research quality"* as the purely metrics-based allocation model of research income does not favour the Humanities.

3.1.1 Taught Postgraduate Courses

The Reviewers acknowledge that the proposed consolidation/increase in the number of taught postgraduate courses will only be achievable through *"rationalization of the undergraduate curriculum."* They recommend that comparative teaching loads across subject areas at both undergraduate and postgraduate level should be undertaken as a priority. They also recommend building on the subject areas which are currently enjoying success, i.e. Literary Translation, Comparative Literature and Irish, and comment on the need to fully exploit the Library's *"outstanding holdings in medieval and Irish Literature."* They also recommend that consideration be given to suspending those M.Phils with little uptake and deploying the staff resources elsewhere. They highlight a number of issues which they feel warrant immediate action – the issue of late acceptances from the Graduate Studies Office and the ensuing visa problems for non EU students; the provision of library services for foreign language students and the ability of staff to impede the recall of books by students. The Reviewers suggest that the Director of Teaching and Learning Postgraduate should automatically receive external examiners' reports from all departments in the School and should be more proactive in stimulating co-operation across the School. They feel that *"proactive leadership from an empowered Director of Postgraduate Teaching and Learning, reporting within a unified School structure, would lead to considerable streamlining of current practices."*

3.1.2 Postgraduate Research Students

The Reviewers feel that *"healthy numbers of research students are central to the success of the School,"* and while postgraduate research student numbers are *"decent"*, they feel that there is scope for growth. They emphasise the importance of providing *"proper training in research methods"* for research students, and recommend that students are made aware that they can participate in all departmental research seminars and have some access to funds enabling research trips and participation in conferences. As part of their overall training for a career in academia, the Reviewers recommend that where feasible, research students should have *"the opportunity to teach on undergraduate courses,"* a widespread practice in comparator UK institutions.

The Reviewers suggest that consideration be given to *"reform of the single supervisor system through the introduction of a second supervisor or of a Research Support Group, so that research students, and supervisors, have some access to a wider range of views, approaches and support."* They also feel that *"supervisors and supervisees would be more protected if formal records were kept of supervision sessions."*

3.2. UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Reviewers note that *"language students at TCD presently enjoy considerably more contact hours of teaching than in comparator UK institutions"* and that *"this advantage is compounded by many students receiving tuition over four academic years in the home university, rather than the three years current in the vast majority of UK language departments, in which the 3rd Year is usually spent abroad."* The Reviewers note *"an anomalous lack of uniformity... in the learning experience of language students at TCD."* TSM students spend two months abroad in their chosen language whilst students of European Studies automatically spend a full academic year abroad, the latter being more akin to the UK model. The Reviewers recommend that all undergraduate students in the School spend Year 3 of their programme abroad. This, they feel, would mean that (a) TCD language graduates would be more comparable with their UK counterparts, (b) potential research time would be freed-up for members of staff whose teaching loads often appear to be heavier than in comparator UK universities, and (c) there would be some

financial savings accruing to the School from the reduction in the number of classes taught. While acknowledging that Irish is an exception, they nonetheless suggest that there “*could be scope for a 3rd year spent away from TCD should students wish to gain added expertise in Scots Gaelic, Welsh (or perhaps even Breton!)*.”

The Reviewers are of the view that the Junior Sophister Year rather than the Senior Freshman Year is the best time for a year abroad. With regard to variations in teaching loads between colleagues, they report that the absence of a proper and transparent workload time allocation model “*needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency, given its inevitable negative impact upon the time available to some colleagues for research and professional development*” and “*given the centrality of research performance for internal promotion and external mobility prospects.*” The Reviewers recommend that a proper workload allocation model should be introduced which would cover not only teaching but also time dedicated to administration and other College/University duties. The introduction of such a model, they feel, would “*be a clear aid to financial planning, as it would identify areas of actual rather than perceived activity.*” There is a strong argument for introducing it consistently at Faculty level. With regard to teaching loads, the Reviewers suggest that these “*should be related to student numbers and types of teaching rather than simply hours taught.*” They believe that the introduction of semesters and modules offers the opportunity for a “*root and branch overhaul of the curriculum design.*”

The Reviewers wonder whether “*the present arrangements in the Irish degree might need to be modified to permit more time for refining students’ command of the contemporary language*”, given the inadequacies in modern Irish amongst students outlined in the School’s self-assessment document. Developing more time in the curriculum to refine students’ command of contemporary Irish, would, the Reviewers feel, be at the cost of medieval Irish. The Reviewers suggest that it might be opportune to re-introduce *ab initio* classes in German and French as languages are experiencing a decline in applications, noting that the resource implications of this would be addressed at least in part through time saved if a 3rd year abroad policy were to be introduced. The Reviewers question whether the School should continue to provide dedicated language courses for students taking the Law and Business degrees and suggest that “*rationalisation of language provision across the School in the context of modularisation could conceivably lead to the present Law and Business degrees being also offered to students of the other languages offered in SLLCS*”. This, they feel, “*would be a welcome development and in the spirit of the opportunities ensuing from working in a School.*”

Noting that the introduction of semesters and modules is “*enormously labour-intensive,*” the Reviewers recommend that “*consideration be given to buying out a member of staff for an entire academic year, with the sole purpose of re-designing the School’s offerings to ensure standardisation and commonality*” with “*one member of staff from each academic unit being designated to work alongside the bought-out colleague.*” In the interests of efficiency and harmonisation of the student experience in the School, the Reviewers advise the School “*to introduce a common School Handbook in which a common marking scale with descriptors is advertised, and with which all constituent departments are required to comply in full.*” They also recommend the setting up of a “*School Teaching and Learning Committee with membership drawn from staff in each Department and possibly student representatives,*” and that this Committee should report directly to the School Executive.

3.3 RESOURCES

3.3.1 Staffing

The Reviewers applaud the “*expertise, enthusiasm and commitment of the staff of SLLCS*” but note that the lengthy restructuring process has led to ‘*change fatigue*’ and that “*the psychological effects of the massive ARAM deficit have not been good for morale.*” They feel that “*within the Departments of SLLCS, there are some major imbalances in staffing levels*” and recommend that consideration be given to increasing the number of staff in Hispanic Studies, given its popularity. They also recommend that as the only Irish provider of Russian and Slavonic languages at Third Level in Ireland, consideration should be given to increasing staff numbers in this area should finances permit.

The Reviewers report that *“there appears to be no coherent structure in the allocation of ancillary teaching support across the language areas”* and express concern that these essential members of the teaching staff shoulder sometimes enormous workloads with apparently *“no compulsory training provision, little obvious career progression, no support for continuing professional development or research”* in poor physical working conditions. The Reviewers recommend that a School-level review take place to address this segment of the workforce and suggest that *“the College may wish to examine the contractual status of such workers in the light of EU law.”*

The Reviewers were *“greatly impressed by the dedication shown by all the Executive Officers (EOs) to their respective departments”* noting that they obviously get great job satisfaction despite *“the absence of proper job descriptions, heavy workloads and poor progression prospects.”* The Reviewers note that many of the School’s administrative structures remain as they were under the previous departmental system which has led to problems with timetabling and accessing student records. They acknowledge, however, that some of these issues can only be addressed at College level through the implementation of improved central IT systems support. They believe that the School is *“seriously underprovided in terms of administrative support”* and suggest that *“the present arrangements are not in the best interests of either students or administrative staff, for whom...there appear to be relatively narrow career development opportunities.”* They recommend that *“a single office be set up which is staffed from at least 10.00-12.20 and from 2.00 – 4.30 every day, and that EOs rejig and widen their present remits.”* They note that with the *“increased commonalities ensuing from modularization there will be far greater harmonization between the differing languages than presently obtains, meaning that EOs will be able to respond to the needs of students across a wider range of language areas.”* This would facilitate a move from a departmentally-based administration model to a function-based one, and would, for example, free up administrative support for ERASMUS/SOCRATES students. The Reviewers suggest that much of the routine administration associated with these students could be devolved from individual academics to administrative staff, thus freeing up time for research and teaching. This, they feel, would create greater flexibility and may also open up avenues for career progression for the EOs. Within this function-based model, the Reviewers believe that there may be a case for some additional flexibility in the case of Irish. They suggest that *“at least one member of support staff should be Irish speaking and responsible for certain areas of activity relating to Irish”* but that such an individual would also have other function-based responsibilities.

3.3.2 Space

The Reviewers acknowledge that space is at a premium and suggest that reorganisation of the administrative support for the School might free up some space, as would a reform of the curriculum to facilitate a 3rd year abroad. They note complaints from some students regarding *“the cramped and airless teaching spaces”* in the Arts Building. While it is not clear to the Reviewers whether the Long Room Hub will help to alleviate the space problem, they welcome the project as a facility for research support.

3.4 ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURES AND MANAGEMENT

The Reviewers acknowledge the *“problems and tensions ensuing when previously autonomous departments find themselves in a new and sometimes unwanted academic structure.”* While there is *“no escaping the reality that a successful School will inevitably reduce the scope for independence of action previously enjoyed in the constituent departments,”* the Reviewers are confident that it is perfectly possible for subject autonomy and distinctiveness to be protected within the context of a School. In fact, they suggest that *“the efficiencies ensuing from rationalized organizational and planning structures should allow individual disciplines...to blossom.”*

While the Reviewers accept the logic of the School’s subject-area structure, they expressed surprise that in some areas *“departments still receive individually allocated budgets,”* they note *“that this is a structural matter that needs to be addressed at College as well as School level.”* They believe that this *“is not helpful to the cohesive development of the School,”* and add that *“in all equivalent UK Schools, the School is itself a Cost Centre. This allows for greater flexibility in the use of funding, in particular the*

targeting of funding towards specific areas of need or strategic importance.” The Reviewers believe that unless the School is the Cost Centre, it is unlikely that the full benefits of reorganisation can be achieved.

The Reviewers feel that the School should *“be restructured along a clearer line-management model, with models of responsibility and accountability more clearly delineated.”* They suggest that consideration should be given to establishing an advisory group to support the Head, complementing the much larger School Executive Committee. They note that there are many such models of such structures available, but recognise that any model needs to be adapted to the specifics of local circumstances. They add that the College may wish *“to consider whether election to managerial positions remains the most appropriate method for building effective structures.”*

3.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, the Reviewers offer the following recommendations:

- 3.5.1 *If possible, all students in SLLCS (apart from Irish) follow a model similar to that of the European Studies model and spend their 3^d year abroad.*
- 3.5.2 *A member of staff (e.g. the Director of UG Teaching and Learning) should be bought out for an entire academic year, to re-design the School’s offerings, ensuring standardisation and commonality. S/he should be appropriately empowered to lead change.*
- 3.5.3 *A more formal School management and committee structure should be introduced. This would include enhanced authority for the Head of School and, for example, the introduction of an integrated School undergraduate Learning and Teaching Committee (alongside similar structures for Research and Postgraduate affairs).*
- 3.5.4 *A workload time allocation model should be adopted across the School.*
- 3.5.5 *Reorganisation of the role and accommodation of EOs, preferably with a strongly function-based model.*
- 3.5.6 *Harmonization of teaching patterns, marking and assessment across the School.*
- 3.5.7 *The School becomes a Cost Centre.*
- 3.5.8 *Reform the punitive resource allocation model for SLLCS, especially in regard of recruitment of non-EU PG students and the lack of recognition given to quality of research outputs.*

4. RESPONSES FROM THE SCHOOL AND THE DEAN OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

The School thanks the Reviewers for their report, and although *“some of the comments and suggestions do not take full account of the particular circumstances of a school of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies in an Irish University generally and in TCD specifically,* the School welcomes the many constructive ideas which merit serious and careful consideration. The School states that *“many of the structural changes which the report recommends, if implemented, would require careful planning and full consultation, as well as, in some cases, fundamental change in policy and/or practice at College level.”* The School and the Dean welcome confirmation from the Reviewers of the *“expertise, enthusiasm and commitment”* of its staff and the high quality of its graduates and the Dean looks forward to a growth in the research excellence observed by the Reviewers in some quarters.

With regard to the recommendation that all students in the School spend year 3 of their programme abroad, the Head of School notes that currently *“apart from TSM students, all students of foreign*

languages in the School already follow courses that include a built-in JS year abroad,” and proposes that the School support in principle the idea that this facility be offered as an optional (but not a compulsory) element for language students within TSM. While *“a structure in which the entire JS cohort went abroad might, as the Reviewers suggest, offer savings in staff time and space costs,”* the Head of School believes that these savings would be limited *“as the TSM structure would not actually permit the complete excision of JS teaching as suggested.”* An additional obstacle to implementing this recommendation, the School believes, is the difficulty in guaranteeing *“appropriate teaching and assessment”* in every relevant subject at every partner institution. The Head of School suggests that *“modularisation may offer further opportunities to increase student choice whilst ensuring that the academic quality of the degree is not compromised.”* The Dean of the Faculty suggests that *“the Director of TSM be invited to consider models that would facilitate more language students spending a year abroad”* and the Dean considers whether *“a comprehensive review of our TSM structure”* is due.

Regarding the Reviewers’ recommendation that a member of staff be bought out for an entire year to redesign the School’s curriculum with a view to ensuring standardization and commonality, the Head of School undertakes to *“continue the process already begun of standardizing and harmonizing programmes, assessment patterns and criteria”* with a view to protecting rather than undermining subject autonomy and distinctiveness at discipline level. The School is also willing to explore the expansion of the role of the Director of Teaching and Learning Undergraduate with regard to reviewing the curriculum and suggests that *“given the School’s financial position, any buy-out would require College funding.”* The Dean proposes to offer practical support to enable the standardization and harmonization of programmes *“should a convincing case be put forward.”*

The Head of School reports that *“the School is moving towards the establishment of an Undergraduate Teaching and Learning Committee”* to realise the benefits for the teaching and learning process that might be gained through further harmonization of programmes and practices. This Committee would also enable the School Executive to concentrate on more strategic issues. The Head of School notes that *“the School has sought hitherto to proceed by consensus,”* and is willing to consider changes to its governance structure to support its core principles of the pursuit of excellence in teaching, learning and research in its constituent disciplines.

There is general acceptance in the School that the development of a workload allocation model for the School should be actively explored and the Dean would like to see an *“appropriate workload planning system in all Schools.”* The School aims to develop a model that takes account of the distinctive responsibilities of teaching, supervision, research and academic administration in a School with differentials between types and levels of teaching and marking loads in languages courses. The Head of School reports that proposals for such a model will be brought to the School Executive in Trinity Term 2009.

With regard to the recommendation to reorganize the role and accommodation of Executive Officers in the School, the Head of School reports *“an emphatic majority view in the School for retaining a departmental structure with assigned Executive Officers, a view supported by student representatives, support staff and most academic staff.”* He suggests that the acknowledged gaps in the provision of some services could be addressed through co-operation and sharing of practice, and states that this will be actively explored with view to incorporating any changes which are demonstrably in the interests of those concerned. The Dean is conscious of the particular issues of reporting lines for support staff in multidiscipline Schools and suggests that it would be timely for these to be now dealt with at a College level, bearing in mind both the concerns of staff and the benefits to the day-to-day running of Schools.

Concerning the recommendation to harmonise teaching patterns, marking and assessment across the School, the School supports and will seek to implement this recommendation, subject to the wish to sustain the autonomy, distinctiveness and identity of disciplines. The School welcomes the recommendation that the School should become a “cost centre,” and supports a more rational allocation of costs incurred and income earned at School level. While the School feels that the proposed reform of the *“punitive resource allocation model”* suggested by the Reviewers should be addressed at College level, it welcomes *“a more supportive academic resource allocation model,”* which would support its goal

of sustaining and improving the quality of the School's work in teaching, learning, and research. The Faculty Dean believes that while a new Resource Planning Model would address the issues of the allocation of costs and research metrics, he cautions that "*this alone is unlikely to lead to any very substantial diminution in the School's chronic deficit.*"

5. RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL AND BOARD

In light of the review report and the responses from the School of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies and the Faculty Dean it is recommended that:

1. The School of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies working closely with the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Science, and other relevant Academic Officers, should consider the detailed recommendations of the Review Report and draw up an implementation plan³ for Council approval;
2. College should:
 - a. ensure adequate support and structures for early career staff mentoring,
 - b. ensure adequate support for career progression and continuing professional development for ancillary teaching support staff,
 - c. conduct a comprehensive review of the Two-Subject Moderatorship programme.

Provost
25th March 2009

³ See *Procedures and Protocol for Quality Review of Schools 2008/09* at <http://www.tcd.ie/vp-cao/qu/qopdf/adrpack2.pdf>