

Incorporating any amendments approved at subsequent Council meetings

The University of Dublin

Trinity College

A meeting of the University Council was held on Tuesday 1 February 2005 at 11.15 am in the Board Room.

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

SECTION A

- CL/04-05/086 Minutes** The minutes of the meeting of the 12 January 2005 were approved and signed. An extract from the draft minutes of 19th January 2005 was circulated for information.
- CL/04-05/087 Matters Arising from the Minutes** There were no matters arising.
- CL/04-05/088 Structures - Academic Re-organisation** A discussion paper from the Senior Lecturer on Faculties and Deans dated 28 January 2005 had been circulated. The Provost introduced this item noting that the paper had been prepared taking into account discussions by Council, Board, the Deans' Committee, and the paper from the group of academics that had been referred to at the previous meeting. The circulated paper highlighted the extent of progress achieved to-date, the level of consensus that was emerging, and the remaining issues to be resolved concerning academic re-organisation.

The Senior Lecturer introduced the paper, commenting that it was arranged in two parts: the first part outlined those areas where agreements and near-agreements had been achieved, and the second proposed a framework to advance discussions on central issues where consensus had yet to be reached.

The Senior Lecturer invited attention to Item 3 in the document which set out where agreement had already been reached (i - iii below) and where there appeared to be consensus (iv - vii):

- i) The devolution of academic and resource planning and of decision-making and associated accountability
- ii) The implementation of a transparent, logical, academically-based resource allocation mechanism
- iii) The freedom of existing Departments to retain their departmental titles where they deem this appropriate
- iv) The manner of appointment of a Head of School should encompass three options with the most appropriate one being chosen as best suits the particular circumstances of a School
- v) Faculties, in some appropriate form, should be a part of the new structures
- vi) Those departments that have agreed on a formal proposal for the formation of a School should be encouraged to proceed to preliminary planning, pending final decision by Board and Council, after which the issue of the formation of interim school executives will be addressed
- vii) Some synthesis of Model II, Model III and Model III 'variant', is most likely to lead to a resolution of the significant differences in opinion across the academic community on the merits of structures involving schools-only on the one hand, or embodying faculties on the other.

Council would be invited to consider endorsing points (iv) to (vii), thereby creating space for discussion on the remaining areas where agreement had yet to be reached.

The Senior Lecturer commented that in relation to point (vii) above, following discussion with the Deans' Committee and taking account of comments made at a recent meeting to discuss the proposed Faculty-based ARAM, a more developed model has emerged, and it was this model, Model V, that Council was being asked to consider.

The Senior Lecturer then elaborated on the development of Model V, noting that it had been advanced on the basis of maintaining the consensus addressed above, while at the same time recognising the differences between Models II and III and Model III 'variant'. The differences revolved around the following issues:

- a) The determination of the Faculty or the School as the point to which resources and associated planning and decision-making are devolved
- b) The role of Head of School or Faculty Dean as budget holder
- c) The extent of the role of Faculty Dean as decision-maker
- d) Whether departments that are not part of integrated schools should be 'located' in federated schools, or positioned as departments within a Faculty with the Dean as budget holder
- e) The role of the Dean as intermediary between Schools and College.

Model V attempted to resolve these differences, bearing in mind the importance of achieving consensus and avoiding division within College and also the need to put in place structural arrangements that best serve the College's interest. Central features of deanship and faculty were outlined in the paper with the Dean having a facilitative and representational role. The Dean would be an 'honest broker' between schools and between schools and central College decision-making and would be crucial in the transition period of implementation of the ARAM and the proposed new structures. The suggested functions of the Faculty included the administration of common entry undergraduate courses and of joint postgraduate activity, and the provision of specialist administrative support services.

It was suggested that Faculties should consist of integrated and federated schools, as appropriate, where federated schools operate much as existing faculties do, with constituent departments, but with the Head of the School as the budget holder and the

ARAM operating in a formulaic manner to each department except where this is overridden by the School Executive for good reason.

The Senior Lecturer noted that the suggestions in the discussion paper with regard to the role of the Dean and the functions of the Faculty were based on the assumption that Faculties may contain both integrated and federated schools and that academic and resource planning and budget holding is devolved to schools. He stressed that the devolution of academic and resource planning and budget holding to schools is at the heart of what is proposed and it was important that it should not be clouded by issues of nomenclature. It was suggested that the role of the Dean as honest broker should be consistent across all Faculties and that if Deans represent all Schools, whether integrated or federated, they act as equals, uncompromised by budget-holding considerations. An alternative of having a Faculty Dean who has both a facilitative role and an executive role would divide the role of Dean and create the potential for confusion.

The single substantive issue of contention that remained related to whether departments that are not members of an integrated school are positioned as departments within a Faculty or as members of a federated school within a Faculty. Council noted the diagrammatical representation of a possible configuration of initial schools and also that the number and composition of Faculties will require further discussion. The Senior Lecturer emphasised the areas of convergence and stressed the need to focus attention on areas of divergence and reach consensus in moving forward.

The Provost thanked the Senior Lecturer for introducing the paper and invited comments from Council. In the discussion, the view was expressed that federated schools constitute an unnecessary layer in the structure and that rather than having a federated School, individual departments who do not propose or do not have the opportunity to join an integrated school should be viewed as Schools and treated as such. It was suggested that in a federated school, departments in a strong financial position may have to support others in the school and that this was inappropriate. The Senior Lecturer commented that the ARAM will bring transparency to resource allocation and that within the ARAM, the budgets for academic units will be determined in accordance with the principles agreed by the Board. The means of supporting departments in difficulty will be through the transition process and the advice and support of Deans in implementing the transition process will be crucial.

The Senior Lecturer acknowledged that there was a perception that membership of a federated school was not an attractive option and sought the views of Council on why this was the case. The Bursar invited Council to consider whether there was a significant difference between a federated school with the Head of School as budget holder, and a federated faculty where the Dean was budget holder. In the discussion, the importance of academic coherence was stressed, and it was noted that those units with academic coherence were likely to work well.

Council noted the advice of the Dean of Science that the Faculty of Science had voted in favour of the retention of the Faculty. The Dean also commented that there were few proposals emerging for integrated schools in Science.

It was suggested that there was not necessarily a need for uniform structures, as currently there was a level of diversity in existing structures. The Senior Lecturer reiterated the need to design structures on which consensus could be reached and which will also serve the College's best interest in the future.

The issue of the Dean in the role of 'honest broker' was raised by several members and the view expressed that it would be difficult for a Dean to exert authority if s/he does

not have budgetary control. It was also suggested it would create difficulties if the Dean were to have both a facilitative and representational role and an executive role. The Senior Lecturer commented that Deans currently exert significant power and influence, without significant budgetary control. In the proposed Model V, they would be the nexus between College and Schools and between policy and action. He reiterated the importance of Deans representing all Schools, whether integrated or federated, uncompromised by budget-holding considerations. It was noted that the role of the Dean as an honest broker and a mediator was considered highly valuable and essential in the Health Sciences, particularly in the context of interaction with external bodies.

In response to a question regarding the extent of involvement of the Dean in budget allocation for schools offering common entry programmes, the Dean of Engineering and Systems Sciences explained the mechanism by which his Faculty was proposing to deal with this matter. Funds would be devolved directly to Schools without any dilution at Faculty level. It was proposed that the common entry programme would have an Executive Committee drawn from the two schools that will agree an addendum to the ARAM. This would define the student FTE/funding allocation between the two schools in the Faculty. Resources would be driven to the two schools and the Dean would retain the role of honest broker.

The Senior Lecturer clarified that the budget holder for an academic unit would have responsibility for the totality of funding in the unit including the budget for all full-time posts, the departmental non-pay and equipment budgets, and part-time pay budgets. In response to a question, he confirmed that the ARAM would identify resources available to a School and that decisions in relation to allocation of resources within a School was a matter for the Head of School in consultation with the School Executive.

Student members indicated that it would be important to ensure that students in smaller schools would not be disadvantaged in any way. There was some concern that the Two-subject Moderatorship (TSM) course might become a general arts course and that its unique strength would be lost. In addition, it was felt that the implications for common entry/joint courses were unclear. The Senior Lecturer commented that he was not aware of any implications for the TSM programme arising from what was proposed, although the re-organisation of academic structures may offer opportunities for improvement and development across all programmes. He added that through representation at appropriate levels within the School structure, students would be in a position to contribute to the discussions on these issues.

The Senior Lecturer stated that the linkage between Deans and the Executive Officer Group would be returned to when there was more clarity regarding the proposed new academic structures. He noted that it would also be necessary to review membership of various committees including the University Council and principal committees. The Bursar commented that consideration would also have to be given to creating a formal mechanism to link Heads of School with central College decision-making.

In relation to the number and composition of Faculties, the Senior Lecturer stated that the issue remained open pending further progress on new academic structures.

Council noted that proposals regarding the establishment of a strategic fund would be brought forward later in Hilary Term.

It was noted that the process for appointment of Dean had not been addressed in the circulated paper. The Senior Lecturer advised that the matter had received preliminary discussion by the Deans and it had been agreed that this matter would be returned to at a later meeting.

In response to a question from the Vice-President of the Graduate Students' Union on the registration charge, the Bursar indicated that he would contact the Vice-President directly on this matter.

The Education Officer of the Students' Union suggested that consideration be given to holding a joint meeting of Board and Council to discuss further the issues relating to academic re-organisation. The Provost clarified that while a joint meeting could be held for discussion purposes, the final decision would be made by the Board.

In concluding the discussion, the Provost noted the issues where agreement had been reached, and invited Council's endorsement of items (iv) to (vii) as stated above. In relation to item (iv), the Senior Lecturer undertook to clarify how and by whom the decision is made on the manner of appointment of a Head of School. Regarding item (vi), it was noted that Board had agreed that no final decisions on structures would be taken until February 2005.

Council gave its formal endorsement to items (iv) to (vii) above. The Senior Lecturer thanked the Deans for their assistance and advice in drafting the paper for consideration by Council and he invited members of Council to contact him with any further comments.

Signed

Date