



**Trinity College Dublin**  
Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath  
The University of Dublin

**Report to Council on the  
Review of Histories & Humanities**

**13- 15 March 2017**

**External Reviewers:**

Professor Kathleen Coleman, Harvard University  
Professor Jane Hawkes, University of York  
Professor Roger Mason, University of St Andrews

**Internal Facilitator:** Professor Gail McElroy, School of Social Sciences and Philosophy

## **Table of Contents**

1.	Reviewers' Report	1
2.	Response from the Head of School	9
3.	Response from the Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences	12

# 1. Review Report

## Introduction

The on-site visit to Trinity College 13–15 March 2017 was a fascinating experience for the reviewers, and Helen Condon and her team are to be warmly commended on their meticulous attention to detail and the extraordinary effort that they invested in all the arrangements. We were supplied with ample documentation in advance. The School’s Self Assessment Document was particularly impressive in its range and level of detail; we especially appreciated the extended paragraphs in yellow boxes illustrating the particular contribution of a member of staff under individual headings, which added colour and texture to the densely detailed narrative. We also found the conference call with College administrators a week in advance of the visit to be helpful in clarifying questions arising from the documentation.

The visit itself comprised sixteen separate meetings with College officers, academic staff, administrative staff, librarians, postgraduate students, and undergraduates, and a very comprehensive and enlightening tour of the premises allocated to the School. In the larger meetings, including those with students, it was a little hard to track who was who; large sticky labels with names and Departments on people’s chests (printed for legibility across a large table!) would have been useful. At our request, an extra meeting was arranged with Heads of Department on the last day, to complement our session with them early in the visit when we were still collecting impressions and formulating questions.

Some of the conversations necessarily felt a little rushed, although the only one where the time allocated was notably inadequate was the half-hour with the very impressive subject librarian, Seán Hughes, and some of his colleagues; the Library, being the laboratory of the School of Histories and Humanities, required at least double the amount of time allocated to it, since we didn’t even get as far as the fabled Long Room, and yet what we did see raised a myriad questions that deserved extended discussion. Overall, however, the visit covered a great deal of ground very economically. Having Professor McElroy at our side throughout was of inestimable benefit, and the notes taken by Yseult Thornley were an unusual luxury. Our report follows, structured according to the “Outcomes of a School Review” that were listed in the Terms of Reference with which we were supplied.

## 1. School Strategy

The School of Histories and Humanities (SHH) has a well-articulated five-year strategic plan, summarised in the Self Assessment Document (§9.4.1–12), which sets out its strategy for maintaining and enhancing its international reputation in teaching and research. We endorse in full the strategic goals that inform the 12 points listed there relating to space, staffing, fund raising, teaching provision, and research profile.

Many of these points are addressed individually and in more detail in the appropriate sections below. Here we would simply express our general concern that School and College planning processes do not appear to be cohesive or transparent. This is most clearly and immediately evident in the hand-to-mouth nature of current budgetary arrangements (see §4.8, below), but it is also apparent in respect of issues such as staffing. It is not clear, for example, that hiring policies driven by the Research Themes initiative in the College take proper account of strategic planning in the School.

In our view, greater co-ordination of School and College planning, and greater transparency in the planning process, is essential both to maintaining morale in the School and to enabling it to maintain its international reputation in teaching and research.

## **2. Teaching and Learning**

### **2.1 Undergraduate Programs**

In assessing the undergraduate programs, we were conscious that the Trinity Education Project will bring large changes. We hope that our appraisal and recommendations may help to shape the implementation of TEP, too.

We were pleased to see that there is a clear sense of progression through the four years from Junior Fresh to Senior Sophister. This momentum is maintained also in degrees such as Ancient History & Archaeology and Classical Civilization, where the Senior Fresh and Junior Sophister students are taught together but expectations and assignments for the students in each year are different. We note that year-long modules (including dissertation modules) facilitate progression in terms of specialist knowledge, understanding, and skills, and we urge that these be retained at sophister level under any new TEP arrangements.

Coming from institutions where continuous assessment is a regular component of the final grade, we wondered whether the effort (and expense) of putting so much emphasis on traditional closed-book exams and the concomitant role of external examiners is the best way of fostering the skills that students should acquire at college level. Students themselves voiced the opinion that the emphasis on exams is at the expense of practice in writing. We would therefore encourage the School and the College to consider increasing the proportion of continuous assessment. We sensed some anxiety among staff about assessing group projects, and we take the point that in order to grade communal work fairly, one needs to be able to identify individual contributions, but by such strategies as requiring students to write an account of their role in the overall project it is possible to assess the parts as well as the whole.

We have a number of other suggestions that may be most clearly set out as bullet points:

- We recommend stricter adherence to College policies for return of written work.
- We advocate staff training to maximize the potential of Blackboard as a teaching aid.
- We suspect that under TEP the single week set aside for exams in each semester will be too little, even if exams are reduced in favor of an increase in continuous assessment (see above).
- The capping of course enrollment needs to be fully transparent, so that adequate plans can be made for staffing, and students know whether their enrollment will be automatic or not.
- More communication about essay deadlines in inter-disciplinary degrees is desirable, to help students manage their time.

- Office hours should be advertised prominently on-line.
- We recommend giving provisional marks for assessed work in the Senior Sophister year (with the *caveat* that the marks are provisional and subject to change by the Board of Examiners).
- Departments should respond publicly to student feedback in some general way, to give credibility to the process of course evaluation by showing that the staff take it seriously and therefore expect that students' comments will be constructive and well-informed.
- We advocate greater emphasis on transferable skills, e.g., by training students to give presentations.
- Noting the large amount of duplication in the handbooks for different degree programs, we recommend centralizing on the School website all material that is common to the degrees offered.
- We recommend a room audit, so that some of the rooms that are too small for effective teaching might be re-purposed as study space for postgraduates or allocated to Glasnevin lecturers to hold office hours. for which these lecturers currently have to scramble to find accommodation.

## 2.2 Postgraduate Taught Degrees (MPhil)

The introduction of taught MPhil degrees is a laudable initiative that has succeeded in generating income, thanks to considerable investment of staff time and effort. There is a clear appetite for taught postgraduate degrees, especially in the American market, where a liberal arts education is far less specialized than an undergraduate degree in Europe, leaving a gap to be bridged en route to a doctoral degree or a job in the “real world.” All but one of the MPhil students whom we met were American. Our general sense was that they should be supplied with more guidance and oversight, such as they would receive in the American system, both before registration and throughout the degree, by, e.g.:

- making more information accessible on-line before registration;
- supplying swifter feedback on written work;
- making the MPhil research methods modules more cohesive (especially in Gender and History of Art);
- emphasizing to the students that the MPhil teaches them transferable skills and is not intended purely as a stepping-stone to a research degree.

We also recommend re-visiting the requirement that MPhil students attend the regular seminar series addressed by visiting speakers. If this is continued, each speaker needs to be made aware how the students will be assessed for this requirement, so that the speaker delivers the material that the students will need for the assessment exercise in an appropriate manner.

We heard also that there are disproportionate levels between full-time and part-time fees; some re-calibration seems desirable.

Study space and communal space for MPhil students is an urgent desideratum. There are almost no common spaces for them. At the very least, desk-space should be guaranteed for each student who is admitted, since these programs have been set up to

attract non-EU students, but on arrival they discover that there are virtually no facilities for them. In particular, library access is seriously inadequate (see §4.7, below).

We note that the School has laudable intentions of extending the range of MPhil programs it offers, including exploring PGT on-line courses, but we would recommend caution with initiatives that will compound existing deficiencies in staffing, space, and library resources.

### **2.3 Postgraduate Research Degrees**

As with the MPhil students, postgraduate students pursuing research degrees urgently need better facilities. Current arrangements are manifestly inequitable, the facilities in TRIARC, the Centre for Medieval History, and the Long Room Hub being far superior to the rest. Furthermore, while the MPhil students take classes together and form a cohort, the PhD students suffer from a very marked sense of isolation—to a degree that raises considerable concern in some instances. Improved facilities could counter this feeling, but other things could be done, too, such as:

- instituting a “buddy system,” whereby already in the summer preceding matriculation an incoming student is put in electronic contact with a more senior graduate student who is willing to “mentor” the new recruit;
- advertising more widely, and further in advance, the launching event in September to welcome new research students and integrate them into the School—an excellent initiative, of which some of the students to whom we spoke seemed to be unaware.

Funding for students should be increased. We suggest reviewing the College benefactions to see whether any of them can be re-purposed to provide financial relief at the graduate level. These could then be advertised through the Long Room Hub. We also heard of financial hardship caused by the retrospective reimbursement of travel expenses for attending conferences, etc.; we recommend that travel funds be allocated in advance. We were also distressed to hear that while travel to read a paper at a conference is rated “A1”, travel for such purposes as consulting archives or conducting fieldwork is rated “B2” and is therefore virtually never funded. In a School of Histories and Humanities, primary research in archives or in the field is absolutely fundamental, and should be supported as a matter of the highest priority.

Finally, as with the MPhil students, we sensed a lack of clarity concerning professional skills and development (how to compile a CV, how to handle an interview, etc.). We realise that training is offered annually in April, but maybe a programme of sessions spread across the year would be more effective.

### **3. Research strategy**

The SHH research centres and all three college-wide research themes are very productive, but college-level strategy does not mesh with school-level strategies, particularly in staffing and hires.

Summer fund-raising activities and the administrative burden throughout the year are compromising research productivity and making it absolutely crucial to preserve existing provisions for sabbatical leave.

#### **4. Resources available to the School to deliver on its academic mission, including staffing, facilities/space and finances**

A severe risk has emerged: staff are under undue and untenable stress to maintain their extraordinary excellence in teaching, research, and service. We perceived a crisis of morale.

##### **4.1 Classics**

Funding for a 10-year position in Byzantine Studies and a subvention for the Regius Chair of Greek have already been secured. These two positions must be filled as a matter of the most urgent priority. An historical emphasis for the Byzantine position would create exciting synergies with medieval studies across the School.

##### **4.2 History of Art**

No position in the Department of History of Art is currently filled above the level of Associate Professor. Two positions are urgently needed in order for the School to maintain its exceptionally high reputation in teaching, learning, and research in History of Art. A professorial-level position is urgently needed to provide academic leadership and give the Department visibility in three spheres: within the College; nationally; and internationally. At least one of the positions should be in modern or contemporary art, to replace the current incumbent, whose retirement is imminent.

Furthermore, there is no single-honor program in History of Art within the island of Ireland. This should rightly be provided by Trinity, whose location in Dublin gives access to the public sector that is unmatched elsewhere in Ireland. It therefore has the potential to generate massive amounts of income through increased numbers of undergraduates and synergy with the National Museum of Ireland and other world-class collections (e.g., the Chester Beatty Library).

##### **4.3 Centre for Gender and Women's Studies**

It is essential to preserve the Centre for Gender and Women's Studies. As recommended in the previous review (2009), this will mean immediate provision of a second post. This post must be in the area of 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup>-century gender studies. This is essential for three reasons: (1) the College has already signed up to SAGE, which requires gender studies, and Athena SWAN, which mandates gender equality; (2) such a post would also provide excellent opportunities for the College to interface with the public, e.g., on radio/TV/social media; (3) modern/contemporary is a clearly established demand of incoming students.

##### **4.4 History**

The loss of seven senior professors over a five-year period (2015–2020) poses a clear threat to the international reputation of the Department, and replacements are essential to ensure that it can maintain its current research output and teaching profile. Thus far, only one replacement at professorial level is guaranteed (the Lecky Chair of

History); and while two other assistant professors are in place or guaranteed, only one of these is exchequer-funded. Another two junior posts are to be filled through revenue generated by the School (though in one case not for two years), while the future of three posts remains undecided and uncertain. Steps need to be taken to ensure that these posts are filled as they fall vacant, simply in order to maintain current staffing levels. It is unreasonable to expect the School to continue to fund such replacements, particularly if it is agreed that in certain key areas, such as Modern Irish History, a professorial appointment is required.

In addition, five members of the History Department are on fixed-term contracts; subject to meeting the standard criteria, they should be mainstreamed as soon as possible. Concerning the articulation of the various Departments within the School, as well as the additional post in Women and Gender Studies mentioned above, the School might consider the advantages of making an appointment in late modern history with a gender emphasis.

We note that all the senior professors who are retiring are male, and recommend that in making new appointments, the opportunity is taken to redress the gender imbalance in staffing, particularly at senior level.

#### **4.5 Administrative staffing**

The administrative staff of the School clearly work very hard, but SHH is desperately under-resourced in this area. The serious lack of administrative support demonstrably inhibits the School's ability to deliver on its academic mission. This must be addressed immediately. Stress levels among the administrators are exacerbated by the lack of a clear career progression and perceptions of inequality in relation to Central Administration. The Departmental administrators are crucial to the functioning of the Departments and should be recognized and rewarded, and supported by increased administrative capacity at School level.

#### **4.6 Facilities**

We thoroughly endorse the School's urgent desire for co-location. It is remarkable that the constituent Departments have created such a strong corporate identity and *esprit de corps* when they are scattered over at least four separate locations. In terms of teaching, research, and administration, this fragmentation is remarkably inefficient. Some of the teaching rooms are not fit for the purpose but could perhaps be reallocated as postgraduate study space with careful attention to occupancy (see §2.1, above). The provision of digital audio-visual facilities should be improved by installing larger screens in all teaching facilities, including the otherwise beautifully equipped lecture theatre in the Long Room Hub. The digitizing of the slide collection in History of Art should be completed without delay. We urge also the reinstatement of the library subscription to the ARTstor Digital Library, a database of images that serves multiple disciplines beyond the immediate confines of History of Art.

#### **4.7 Library**

The Trinity College Library is a world treasure, with priceless holdings in manuscripts and early printed books. It also enjoys the privilege of being one of six legal deposit



libraries in Britain and Ireland; but this is a liability as well as an asset, since all those books have to be catalogued, shelved, and delivered to readers and, what is more, the eminence afforded by the status of a legal deposit library has distracted the College from building up collections of material published elsewhere, notably in North America and on the European continent. Furthermore, we heard repeatedly from undergraduates, graduate students, and staff alike that access and services are inadequate, although we want to stress that the subject librarian received unanimous praise for his expertise and responsiveness. We recommend that the following issues be addressed without delay:

- Access needs to be improved. In particular, the Library is closed all day on Sundays. It is not sufficient to open parts of the Ussher Library as study space, while the books and journals remain inaccessible under lock and key.
- It is urgent that desk space and electrical sockets for laptop use be expanded, especially in Berkeley Library.
- We strongly recommend that training in the use of the library catalogue be provided for—and required of—students at all levels, both undergraduate and postgraduate.
- The contract for electronic resources on legal deposit should be re-negotiated as a matter of critical urgency, since research cannot be adequately conducted under the current restrictions, whereby those materials can only be accessed on specific terminals within the Library itself.
- We recommend standardizing the payment of Interlibrary Loan charges for graduate students across the School and simultaneously raising the number of loans that will be covered. We further recommend that ILL requests by undergraduates be surveyed, to see whether it is feasible for the School or the College to relieve them, too, of this burden.
- We recommend increasing the limit on the number of books that can be borrowed, raising the number for undergraduates from 4 to 10, for postgraduates from 10 to 30, and for staff from 20 to 50.
- The current restriction on taking digital photographs of manuscripts cripples the capacity of scholars to use these materials in their research. We recommend that digital photography be allowed upon signature of a waiver form restricting the use of such photographs to research only.
- The unique holdings of the Trinity Library should attract scholars from all over the world. We recommend major investment in the curating of these collections (including the staff to curate them), so that they become properly known and properly used.
- We suggest targeting non-anglophone collections as a funding opportunity for philanthropic giving.

#### **4.8 Finances**

The School has been enormously successful in generating income, but it is not clear that it is incentivized appropriately. The funds should be invested in the fund-generators, in keeping with Irish and international practice. There are obvious issues with long-term planning, which come back to poor communication between College and School and a notable absence of financial transparency. Furthermore, the multipliers on grant income should be equalized across Schools. We strongly support

the Dean's initiative to introduce multi-annual budgeting. Summer Schools should charge more. The Semester Start-Up Program should be preserved when TEP is introduced; this might require a slight re-adjustment of the Start-Up timetable. At the same time, we are disturbed to see such funds being treated as replacements for exchequer funding, rather than as incremental funding for such initiatives as postgraduate fellowships.

## **5. School Governance, Management, and Administrative Structures**

The School, as a management, administrative, and intellectual unit, works extremely well in supporting each Department and in enabling combined cross-departmental activities that are directed towards achieving the strategy and mission of the School in respect of teaching, learning, and research within the College and at national and international levels. This is largely due to the commitment of the Head of School and the administrative support staff.

It is clear that at the level of Head of Department, certain administrative roles could be more centralized by being carried out on-line (e.g., module selection; student feedback). It is also clear that:

- A recent initiative whereby the current Head of School provides induction for each incoming Head of Department has proven invaluable and should most definitely be continued.
- The Heads of Department would welcome the opportunity to meet regularly but informally, as a group, with the Head of School. This would have the advantage of helping to maintain communications with regard to departmental developments vis-à-vis the School and to inter-departmental initiatives (e.g., in relation to Research Themes and the staffing opportunities that are thereby generated).
- We were glad to see that the administrative duties of Heads of Department, and of other roles with heavy administrative burdens, currently qualify the incumbents for reduced teaching loads. Even so, we have the impression that these burdens are immense, and we therefore recommend that the situation be monitored with a view to increasing this teaching relief still further.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Coleman, Harvard University  
Jane Hawkes, University of York  
Roger Mason, University of St Andrews

30 April 2017

## **2. Response from the School of Histories & Humanities**

### **Introduction**

The School of Histories & Humanities wishes to thank the Review Team for its intense and constructive engagement with the School. The team's questioning was highly focussed, perceptive and probing, and the School welcomes the reviewers' report. Their suggestions on the School's strategic trajectory and on the ways in which the School could improve its delivery of teaching to both undergraduate and graduate students are welcome and helpful. These matters will be addressed in detail in due course, in the School's implementation plan. The School would, meanwhile, also like to acknowledge the vital contribution made by Professor Gail McElroy: she was exemplary in her role as internal facilitator. This initial response was discussed and approved by the School's Executive Committee on 5 May 2017.

### **Strategy**

The School welcomes the reviewers' endorsement of its strategic plan and strategic goals. It welcomes the highly positive overall assessment of the School's activities and the reviewers' recognition of the 'extraordinary excellence in teaching, research and service' delivered by colleagues – and it shares the reviewers' concern regarding a crisis of morale arising from the growing pressures on staff. The School hopes that senior management will acknowledge how well the School is performing in difficult circumstances; and that, although there are many ways in which our activities can be refined and improved, the School fully deserves the plaudits it has received from the reviewers.

### **Research**

The School welcomes the ringing endorsement of its research activities, but shares the concern expressed by the reviewers that, when considering their own development, the College's Research Themes have not taken proper account of the School's strategic planning. It was alarming that the first indication the School had of staffing plans in one of its associated Research Themes emerged *during* one of the meetings with the reviewers: this cannot be an acceptable *modus operandi* if the School, the Research Themes and College are to maximise their research potential and their international standing. The School would suggest that greater communication and coordination is required on this matter; and that Research Theme leaders should, through a formal process with Schools, discuss fully philanthropic and other initiatives relating to staffing in associated Schools.

### **Postgraduate Teaching & Learning**

Concerns regarding space for postgraduate students are discussed below. The School is aware that a recalibration of full- and part-time fees is required and that investment is needed in studentships.

### **Undergraduate Teaching & Learning**

The School will address specific points made by the reviewers with regard to both undergraduate and postgraduate teaching in its implementation plan. It accepts fully that we must look more closely at the nature of our, in some instances, rather old-fashioned assessments and that we will engage positively with other suggestions for change, the most radical of which is the recommendation that a Single Honor degree be introduced in Art History: we have, for some time, been considering whether this can be done,

and if so how best it might be achieved. Meanwhile, the School notes the importance which the reviewers place on the retention of year-long Sophister modules. Since the visit concluded, the proposal to abolish 20-ECTS year-long Sophister modules seems to have gained traction in College. The School believes that it would be regrettable and retrogressive to reject the reviewers' recommendations on this matter and it notes that Russell Group competitors in the disciplines offered by the School offer modules of this sort at the Sophister level. The School considers that to abolish year-long Sophister modules would have a significantly detrimental impact on how Trinity degrees in Classics, History and History of Art would be regarded externally.

### **Finance**

The reviewers recognise the complexities of budgetary allocations and they would no doubt welcome, as the School does, the proposal currently being devised by the Vice Provost to bring greater clarity and transparency to budgetary matters. The reviewers note that the School has been enormously successful at generating income but express concern that this is not incentivised appropriately and that income generated is (by force of circumstance) used as a replacement for exchequer funding. The School shares this concern. It has been suggested that the new financial model will make provision for all of a School's core salary costs to be covered in the budgetary allocations. The School would welcome this enormously, as it would incentivise the School's income generation, by enabling the School to spend its additional resource on, for instance, postgraduate studentships rather than core staffing needs.

### **Staffing**

The reviewers comment at length on the academic and administrative staffing crisis which the School is facing. The School broadly supports the recommendations which the reviewers make. It awaits the paperwork required to advance the Greek and Byzantine positions but it has already agreed that the further particulars for the latter post will include reference to 'creat[ing] exciting synergies with medieval studies across the School'. The need to reinforce staffing levels in History of Art and in History has already been made in the submission delivered to Faculty. With regard to Gender & Women's Studies, the failure to act upon the recommendations included in the last Review is highly regrettable and the need for additional staffing in this area has also been taken account of in the staffing submission to Faculty. The School notes too the shortage of administrative staff identified by the reviewers.

While recognising that the financial situation remains very difficult, the School is very concerned that the delays in clarifying the new budgetary situation have made for uncertainty in the approval of staffing plans, which in turn has had a detrimental impact on the planning of teaching next year.

### **Space**

The reviewers make several comments on space. Sound reasons are provided for why they 'thoroughly endorse' co-location of the School. They note that 'some teaching rooms are not fit for purpose'. They note that space for postgraduate students is very limited, and almost non-existent for M Phil students. The School recognises that some of these concerns will be addressed by the initiative which the Bursar is currently spearheading for a modest refurbishment of the Arts Building, but the essence of much of the criticism is that the School simply does not have enough appropriate space for its activities. To resolve this, especially if co-location is to be achieved, will require courageous and difficult decision-making at a Faculty level, and the School is prepared to work closely with the Faculty Dean in identifying how this might best be achieved. The facilities which graduate students located in TRLH, TRIARC, CGWS, the Medieval History Research Centre and Environmental History currently enjoy must not be compromised;

instead the ambition must be to establish similar facilities for other PGR and for all PGT students – which, the School would suggest, can in turn be used in its marketing to boost postgraduate recruitment.

### **Library**

The comments on the Library are a matter of great concern to the School and the School suggests that the Librarian should be fully involved in discussions of the Review Report and the implementation plan.

### **Conclusion**

There is nothing in the report which the School would reject out of hand. Many specific matters raised by the reviewers were already under consideration in the School and the School will address everything else within its competence as soon as possible. Many of the matters raised in the report cannot, however, be resolved by the School alone and the School looks forward to engaging constructively with the Faculty Dean, the leaders of associated Research Themes, the Librarian, and other appropriate college officers to address the recommendations arising from the report. A detailed implementation plan will in due course outline the timeframe for implementation.

David Ditchburn

*Head of School, May 2017*

### 3. Response from the Faculty Dean

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Quality Office  
**FROM:** Professor Darryl Jones, Dean AHSS  
**DATE:** 12 May 2017  
**SUBJECT:** School of Histories and Humanities review – Dean’s response

---

I would like to begin by thanking the reviewers, Professors Kathleen Coleman, Jane Hawkes, and Roger Mason, who approached the task of reviewing the activities and situation of a large and complex School with generosity and sympathy. Their report makes many useful observations and recommendations, large and small. I can only comment on a few of them here. Indeed, some of the recommendations, such as those to do with Library services, fall outside of my responsibility.

The reviewers begin by endorsing the School’s ‘well-articulated five-year strategic plan’, and recommends ‘greater co-ordination in School and College planning’ (p. 1). This is happening. All School strategic plans are currently being assessed, with a view to ensuring that they are harmonized with the over all College Strategic Plan.

Understandably, the reviewers have much to say about staffing. I share the reviewers’ concerns about a potential ‘crisis of morale’ (p. 5). Both the Faculty and the School are doing everything within our power to address this. Part of this stems from inadequate and insecure budgets over the past years. At College level, the Planning Group has been working on a new budgetary model, which is intended to provide the kind of multi-annual stability to which the Review refers (p. 8).

I note the Review’s concern about the loss of seven professorial staff in History through retirement in the past five years (p. 5). I have been well aware of this since becoming Dean, and the last Faculty strategic staffing plan took steps to address this problem, as far as possible. There have been several new appointments in History over the past two years, including two Ussher Assistant Professors (in Medieval and in Environmental History). Most of these professorial retirements were of personal chairs or Professors In – it would not be usual practice to replace such retirements at professorial level. The Lecky Chair of

**An tOllamh Darryl Jones**  
*Déan*

Dámh na nEalaíon, na nDaonnachtaí agus na  
nEolaíochtaí Sóisialta,  
Coláiste na Tríonóide,  
Baile Átha Cliath 2, Éire

**Professor Darryl Jones**  
*Dean*

Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Trinity College,  
Dublin 2, Ireland

T + 353 (0)1 896 1200

artshss@tcd.ie  
<http://ahss.tcd.ie/>

History has been filled this year, and the Faculty intends to fill the Bank of Ireland Chair of Modern Irish History on the retirement of its current holder. Relatively speaking, and given the conditions under which we operate, History has done well in staffing terms over the past years. The Faculty has also taken steps to address the concern about the mainstreaming of staff on temporary contracts (p. 6). One such mainstreaming exercise in History has successfully taken place over the past weeks.

I strongly agree with the reviewers' observation that 'It is essential to preserve the Centre for Gender and Women's Studies', and its more general observation about the under-representation of women at senior levels, particularly in History.



**An tOllamh Darryl Jones**  
*Déan*

Dámh na nEalaíon, na nDaonnachtaí agus na  
nEolaíochtaí Sóisialta,  
Coláiste na Tríonóide,  
Baile Átha Cliath 2, Éire

**Professor Darryl Jones**  
*Dean*

Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Trinity College,  
Dublin 2, Ireland

T + 353 (0)1 896 1200

artshss@tcd.ie  
<http://ahss.tcd.ie/>