

*Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings*

**The University of Dublin**

**Trinity College**

**A meeting of the University Council was held on Wednesday 12 January 2005 at 11.15 am in the Board Room.**

<i>Present</i>	Provost, Vice-Provost, Senior Lecturer, Registrar, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Arts (Humanities), Dr P C Conroy, Dean of Arts (Letters), Professor D M Singleton, Dr E V Patten, Dean of Business, Economic and Social Studies, Dr M L Brennan, Dr M L Rhodes, Dean of Engineering and Systems Sciences, Dr S P Wilson, Dr A Kokaram, Dean of Health Sciences, Professor C M Begley, Dean of Science, Professor P Coxon, Dr N Marples, Dr C Benson, Ms F M Haffey, Mr C Larkin, Mr D McCormack, Mr D Mac Síthigh, Mr A Payne, Dean of Dental Affairs.
<i>Apologies</i>	Senior Tutor, Professor E O'Halpin, Dr A W Kelly, Ms D McClean, Ms F Van Der Puil, Mr J Bertram.
<i>In attendance</i>	Librarian, Secretary, Academic Secretary.
<i>Student observers</i>	Ms M McMahan, Ms K Gibson.
<i>By invitation</i>	Bursar, Dean of Research.

A member of Council attending for the first time made the statutory declaration

**SECTION A**

**CL/04-05/067 Roadmap for decision on ARAM and Structures** A memorandum from the Provost to the Board dated 8<sup>th</sup> December 2004 had been circulated together with a draft minute of the Board's discussion of 14<sup>th</sup> December 2004.

The memorandum set out a revised schedule for discussion and decision-making which extended into February 2005 and had been approved by the Board. In introducing the memorandum, the Provost indicated that it was necessary to balance the need to provide sufficient time for consultation and debate with the need to avoid the disenchantment of those who have made progress in developing new structures. He noted that the scheduled date for implementation was September 2005 and indicated that in the current national and international environment, it was appropriate that the College should move as expeditiously as possible.

A member of Council indicated his view that a significant proportion of those in College would like the process to slow down. The Senior Lecturer commented that about two-thirds of departments in College were engaged in the continuing discussions about schools. He also noted that it was difficult to generalise about sentiment regarding the changes as there appeared to be considerable agreement about some aspects and less about others.

In response to an issue raised by the Dean of Arts (Letters), Council noted that every effort would be made to allow staff recruitment for 2005-06 to proceed by the end of February.

**CL/04-05/068 An Academically-based Resource Allocation Model** A paper from the Bursar dated 7<sup>th</sup> December 2004 on the Key Features of an Academically-based Resource Allocation Model (ARAM) had been circulated together with a draft minute of the Board's discussion of 14<sup>th</sup> December. In addition, Council had been circulated with a second paper entitled 'Further Features of an Academically-based Resource Allocation Model - Proposals: Paper 2'.

In relation to Paper 1, the Bursar noted that the first version of this paper had been considered by Board and Council and other fora, and had been updated based on comments and observations received from the College community and following further consideration by the Task Force. Paper 1 focussed mainly on the allocation of state income while Paper 2 considered all other income together with the cost elements.

In introducing Paper 1, the Bursar elaborated on aspects of the paper under the following headings

- The key principles that will shape the model, as set out on page 2
- The weightings for teaching, research, and strategic/special factors (recommendations 1-7)
- The weightings by student type in relation to the teaching budget (recommendations 8-13). It was noted that recommendation 14 referred to the distribution of fee income for non-EU students and postgraduate courses and was dealt with in Paper 2.
- The proxy measures to be used for research output, taking account of both quality and quantity. The Bursar commented that he had received significant feedback on this aspect of the model and it had been discussed on two occasions by the Research Committee. It was noted that the proxy measures for research output would be reviewed within one year of implementation of the ARAM.

In relation to the Further Proposals, the Bursar noted that preliminary information on the outcomes of the model would be sent to heads of academic units and others as soon as possible. A further paper would be developed in relation to the transition period. The Bursar also invited Council's attention to the principle articulated in recommendation 25 which stated that an academic unit should not be permitted to adopt unilateral measures which could cause unacceptable financial consequences for another academic unit.

In the discussion, it was suggested that the introduction of a resource allocation model was likely to result in financial issues having increased significance and that these might outweigh academic considerations. The Senior Lecturer stated that the introduction of the ARAM would bring transparency in resource allocation and he noted that there would be a transition period of at least three years to full implementation of the model. In addition, a Strategic Fund would be available to which academic units could apply for support. It was also suggested that the scope available to academic units to respond to the introduction of the ARAM was limited and it was noted that this limitation would affect smaller departments in particular. In terms of opportunities available to departments to improve their funding position, the Bursar indicated that this would be considered in the paper on the transition period which would be brought forward shortly by the Task Force.

In relation to the recruitment of international students, the College had indicated in the Strategic Plan its intention to increase the number of international students as part of its objective to diversify the student body. The model proposed significant financial incentive to academic units in terms of the recruitment of international students. Concerns were expressed regarding the need to provide additional support in College for international postgraduate students. The Registrar assured Council that close links had been developed between International Student Affairs and the Graduate Studies Office and that efforts were being made to improve the support available to international students.

Other issues arising in the discussion included the following:

- The recommendations of the Provost and Executive Officers regarding the distribution of the Strategic Fund (recommendation 2) would be submitted to the Board for approval.
- The individual academic's contribution to the discipline through involvement in international bodies should be recognized in the model, as well as contribution to the community, both within and outside College.
- It was suggested that consideration be given to allowing deviations from the four 'subject weights' outlined in the paper, and clarification was sought on whether high failure rates might be considered as a basis for increased subject weighting. The Bursar stated that while it was recognized that deviations should be considered (recommendation 5), the Task Force had proposed that the number of deviations should be minimal and be based only on there being a compelling case.
- The Strategic Fund may have both a developmental and contingency aspect during the transition years.
- The Task Force was committed to providing information on the outcomes from the model and this would be provided once the model was developed and agreed.
- In relation to recommendation 18, the Bursar indicated that proposals would be brought forward in due course regarding the scaling to be applied in groups of disciplines to reflect differences in the need for and availability of research funding.
- While the subject weight for the clinical stages of medicine and dentistry was 4.0, the paper recommended that a weighting of 1.7 be applied and that the difference should be sought from sources other than the core recurrent budget. The Bursar commented that the weighting of 4.0 was a reflection of the costs in these areas and was currently applied in other funding models.

The Bursar then proceeded to introduce Paper 2, which had been circulated in a supplementary circulation. It examined each major income source and each cost category and made proposals as to how they might be treated as part of the ARAM.

It was proposed that all income from sources other than the core recurrent budget should flow directly to the relevant academic unit. The other sources of income were: fees for postgraduate students; fees for undergraduate non-EU students; income directly attributable to academic units i.e. targeted funded posts; funded research; and monies allocated from the Strategic Fund. It was noted that the income from sources other than the core recurrent budget may represent a significant element of an academic unit's discretionary funding.

Costs were divided into direct and indirect costs. Direct costs will account for between 55 and 65 percent of total costs and included the pay costs of academic, technical and administrative staff, and all non-pay costs.

Indirect costs will account for approximately 35 to 45 percent of the total costs of an academic unit and include the following elements

- *Space* It was proposed that the present method for assigning the running costs of space, as used in the unit cost exercise, should be continued for the present. This involved assigning the average running cost per square metre of useable space in College to the space occupied by an academic unit. It was noted that consideration had yet to be given to how increases in overall College space would be funded.
- *Use of IS Services* No change was proposed in the present method for allocating costs, as set out in the circulated paper.
- *Use of Library and other Academic Services* It was proposed that each academic unit should pay for library and academic services on the basis of its student FTE for taught courses, its weighted student FTE for research students, and its weighted staff FTE.
- *Use of Administrative Services* The distribution of costs under this heading would be based on a weighted student FTE, with EU students having a weighting of 1.0 and non-EU students having a weighting of 1.5. Proposals in relation to the assignment of costs of administrative services for externally funded research activity would be brought forward before the end of the academic year.
- *General Educational Expenses* These included costs associated with postgraduate awards, examinations, and other activity, and it was proposed that they be distributed on the basis of unweighted student FTEs.
- *Use of Student Services and Miscellaneous Expenses* Costs would be assigned on the basis of a weighted FTE for each unit, with EU students attracting a weighting of 1.0 and non-EU students having a weight of 1.5.

The Bursar noted that many of the recommendations in relation to the assignment of indirect costs reflected existing practice in the unit cost exercise.

The Bursar also invited attention to the issues identified in Section IV of his paper which highlighted a number of matters that had yet to be dealt with. These included (i) the level of costs in support areas, and the need to optimize value for money in terms of the level and quality of support; (ii) the need to have robust data and to provide adequate management information systems to support the ARAM and the devolution of financial decision-making to academic units; (iii) the preparation of a paper to deal with issues that will arise during the transition period.

The following were among the points raised in the discussion

- Academic units will be charged for both their direct and indirect costs and will not have the option of declining to contribute to the costs of support services.
- A query was raised in relation to distribution of the student charge and the Bursar undertook to clarify this for the next meeting.
- The Librarian noted that income to the Library is enhanced through income generating activities, and sought clarification on how this would be treated in the ARAM.
- In relation to proposals regarding the costs of space, it was suggested that the location of accommodation (e.g. on or off the College Green campus) should be considered when this aspect of costs was being reviewed by the Task Force.
- The Research Committee was currently considering issues associated with the generation of income from commercial activity in academic units.
- The Vice-Provost advised that a Working Party on Administrative and Support Structures had been established by the Board and its remit included making recommendations in relation to the appropriate administrative and support structures to be put in place to support the new academic structures. The Working Party was scheduled to report by the end of Hilary Term.

***Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings***

- The use of shared pool teaching space would be recorded by the Senior Lecturer's Office and costs assigned to reflect usage.
- In the context of assigning costs of the Library using staff FTEs and other data, the Bursar undertook to clarify the situation regarding the calculation of FTEs for part-time academic staff.
- All income to an academic unit would be reported to the head of the academic unit as budget holder, as is currently the case with Heads of Department. Within that, it was hoped that existing flexibilities could continue - e.g. whereby a postgraduate course co-ordinator has oversight of the budget associated with a course.
- The Dean of Research advised that all sources of research income would be included in the model - funding from public grant funding bodies, from commercial sources, and internal research funding allocated through the Research Committee.

In concluding the discussion, the Provost indicated that Paper 2 would be considered by the Board at its meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2005, and that Council would have the opportunity to discuss it further at its next meeting. The Bursar invited members of Council to forward comments to him by email.

#### CL/04-05/069 Other Business

- (i) **Chair in Geriatric Medicine** Council noted and approved a tabled memorandum from the Dean of Health Sciences dated 11<sup>th</sup> January 2005 which sought approval for the establishment of a Chair in Geriatric Medicine, funded in full by St James's Hospital.

Council also noted and approved the membership of the search committee, as follows:

Provost  
 Dean of Health Sciences  
 Professor D Coakley  
 Professor R M J Byrne  
 Dr B Walsh (St James's Hospital)  
 Mr J O'Brien (CEO St James's Hospital)  
 External Assessors (2)

- (ii) **Chair in Computer Science (1973)** Council noted and approved a tabled memorandum from the College Secretary which proposed the following membership of the Chair in Computer Science (1973):

Provost  
 Senior Lecturer  
 Dean of Engineering and Systems Sciences  
 Professor J Haslett  
 Professor S M Greene  
 Professor J B Grimson  
 Dr D M A Abrahamson  
 External Assessors (2)

- (iii) **Chair of Psychiatry (1968) (see Actum 50/H of 26 May 2004)** : Council noted and approved the following revised membership of the search committee for this appointment, as advised by the College Secretary.

Provost  
 Dean of Health Sciences  
 Professor D P A Kelleher  
 Professor M Fitzgerald  
 Professor P McKeon  
 Dr T N Mitchell  
 Dr A M O'Dwyer  
 External Assessors (2) (advised on 13 October 2004)

A third External Assessor was approved by Council.

- (iv) **Chair in Obstetrics and Gynaecology (1966)** The Council approved additional representatives from the College, St James's Hospital, the Coombe Women's Hospital and the Rotunda Hospital, the full membership as follows:

Provost  
 Dean of Health Sciences  
**TCD representatives**  
 Professor P Crowley  
 Professor J Ohlmeyer  
 Professor D P A Kelleher  
**St James's Hospital representatives**  
 Dr T N Mitchell  
 Dr E McGuinness  
 Professor J Reynolds  
**Coombe Women's Hospital representatives**  
 Mr T O'Higgins (Chairman, CWH Board)  
 Dr J Drumm  
 Professor J O'Leary  
**Rotunda Hospital representatives**  
 Professor M Geary  
 Dr M Darling

Signed .....

Date .....