Present:
Professor Chris Morash, Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer (Chair)
Professor Darryl Jones, Dean of Faculty of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences
Professor Gillian Martin, Senior Lecturer
Ms. Patricia Callaghan, Academic Secretary
Ms. Roisin Smith, Quality Officer
Professor John Walsh, Faculty of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences
Professor Peter Crooks, Faculty of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences
Professor Sheila Ryder, Faculty of Health Sciences
Professor Aonghus McNabola, Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science
Mrs. Jessie Kurtz, Deputy Librarian
Ms. Laura Conway-McAuley, IT Services
Education Officer, Students' Union

Dr Liz Donnellan, Quality Office (Secretary)

Apologies:
Professor Mary McCarron, Dean of Faculty of Health Sciences
Professor Vinny Cahill, Dean of Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics & Science
Professor Neville Cox, Dean of Graduate Studies
Ms. Geraldine Ruane, Chief Operating Officer
Professor David Lewis, Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science
Professor Catherine Darker, Faculty of Health Sciences
Ms. Victoria Butler, Secretary's Office
Vice-President, Graduate Students' Union

In attendance:
Professor Brian O'Connell, Dean of Dental Science (for item QC/16-17/044)
Professor Anne-Marie Healy, Head of School, Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences
(for item QC/16-17/045)
Dr Aidan Seery, Senior Tutor (for item QC/16-17/046)
Professor Siobhan Garrigan, Head of School, Confederal School of Religions, Peace Studies
and Theology (for item QC/16-17/047)

QC/16-17/042 Draft minutes of the meeting of the 9 March 2017

Under matters arising *(QC/16-17/033),* the Deputy Librarian requested that the wording of the update on item *(QC/16-17/026) AHSS Annual Faculty Quality Report* be amended to read *'The Library is addressing these issues by looking into patron-driven acquisition of hardcopy printed material and recommends working with legal deposit websites to see what resources need to be archived for future research.'*

The minute of item *QC/16-17/036 Annual Faculty Quality Report – HS* should read *'Currently IPL is optional for all but 3rd year medical, pharmacy and physiotherapy students…'.*

QC/16-17/043 Matters arising

(QC/16-17/024) Progress Report on the Disability Service – this was approved by Board on the 22 March 2017.

(QC/16-17/025) QQI Quality Assurance Guidelines for providers of Research Degree Programmes - has been published and is available on the QQI website.

(QC/16-17/026) Annual Faculty Quality Report for AHSS - the Deputy Librarian provided an update on the implications of the UK e-legal deposit system. She reported that from April 2013, UK legislation stipulates that legal deposit covers material published digitally and online as well as printed material. The legislation also stipulates that *'Materials collected through legal deposit, including archived websites, are accessible on-site at the Legal Deposit Libraries'* and pertains to the six legal deposit Libraries in Ireland and the UK. With regard to concerns about the impact of the 2013 legislation on the Humanities in terms of access to print monographs, she reported that the Library still receives print monograph journals. The Keeper is working on a patron-driven acquisition system, which has gone to tender. In the interim, print items that are only accessible electronically can be ordered through patron-driven acquisitions. Trinity's part in the digital library infrastructure, comprising the six Legal Deposit Libraries, will contribute to the archive of non-print published material, such as websites, blogs, e-journals and CD-ROMs for future generations. The Deputy Librarian concluded by reporting that the issue has been included on the Library risk register and that there are plans to convene a working group comprising of members of the Quality Committee to address the implications of the legislation.

The Vice-Provost suggested that it would be useful to circulate a summary of this information more widely in College in order that the statutory and legal basis for the restrictions on access to e-legal deposit material can be understood.

Action: The Deputy Librarian to consider how this information can be made more widely available across College.

(QC/16-17/034) BESS programme review – implementation update– this was approved by Council on the 5 April 2017.

(QC/16-17/035) Annual Faculty Quality Report – EMS – an updated AFQR which included revised figures for postgraduate taught course evaluation was circulated to the Committee as item B1. The Academic Secretary reported that there was no further update on the development of guidelines for the conduct of student focus groups, and that she will revert to the Quality Committee at a later date regarding this.

(QC/16-17/036) Annual Faculty Quality Report – HS - a representative from the Centre for English Language Learning and Teaching will be invited to attend a future meeting of the Committee.

(QC/16-17/037) Review of the School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences– this was approved by Council on the 5 April 2017.

QC/16-17/038 Virtual Learning Environment Policy (VLE) – the draft policy has been considered by the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee. A final version, incorporating recommendations from both Committees and reflecting the Quality Committee discussion of the 9 March, will go to Council for approval on the 10 May 2017.

(QC/16-17/039) Estates Strategy and Space Audit– a presentation by the Bursar was deferred to the May meeting.

(QC/16-17/041) Irish Survey of Student Engagement– the Quality Officer reported that the 2017 survey closed on the 26 March. 1,599 completed responses were received which accords with a 19% response rate, if all 2,037 students who commenced the survey completed it, a 25% response rate would have been achieved.

The Academic Secretary reported that a review of Trinity's Online Education provision has been undertaken and that the Reviewers' Report is being considered by the Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer and the new Director of IT Services.

QC/16-17/044   Review of the School of Dental Science

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer welcomed the Dean of Dental Science, Professor Brian O'Connell, to the meeting to speak to the review of the School of Dental Science, which took place from the 21-23 February 2017.

Professor O'Connell began by thanking School staff, staff from the Quality Office and the Faculty Dean for their input to the review. He also acknowledged the Reviewers' recognition of the dedicated staff working in the Dental Hospital, and thanked the Dental Hospital Board for its teaching facilities. He welcomed the Reviewers' endorsement of the School's strategic plan.

With regard to the School's taught programmes, the Dean reported that it was a challenge to provide the range and diversity of programmes currently on offer in the current financial environment and that in the future the School wants to focus on academic quality over growth for growth's sake.

The School has made progress in the development of a transparent funding model, as recommended by the Reviewers. Formal staff appraisal and job planning have been introduced in the School to address issues relating to conflicting priorities and work pressure for academic staff. The School will monitor the ongoing development of these processes to ensure that work is allocated equitably, while allowing staff to work to their strengths and ensuring that the School's strategic direction is supported.

With regard to curriculum congestion, it is hoped that the curriculum mapping exercise will address this.

The School has liaised with the new Associate Dean of Inter-Professional Learning with regard to identifying opportunities for incorporating Inter Professional Learning (IPL) more fully into the curriculum. He reported that barriers to IPL are often related to timetabling issues with students from different Schools/Disciplines.

The School in response to the Reviewers recommendations has reduced the number of research themes to four, which allows all staff areas of interest to be included. The four themes map to the College research themes and the school will monitor performance in these areas over the next few years. It is also planned that this rationalisation will facilitate collaboration with Trinity Research Institutes.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked the Dean. He noted that the Dental School is unique amongst Schools in Trinity in relation to the space that it occupies and its shared budget with the

Dental Hospital. The fact that the School and the Dental Hospital are distinct but related entities brings particular challenges, as does the highly regulated nature of the School's undergraduate curriculum and the high percentage (30%) of its students that are non–EU. He thanked the Dean and invited comment from the Committee.

In relation to the apparent lack of a formal promotions process for academic staff in the Dental School, the Dean reported that most academic staff in the hospital have a different promotion pathway as their contract is with the Dental Hospital Board (DHB) and they are funded by the Department of Education.

He reported that a promotion scheme for academic staff in the Dental Hospital was initiated 6-9 months ago, and will require assistance from College to implement.

A Committee member suggested that non-EU taught postgraduate students in the School might benefit from some pedagogical training offered by CAPSL. The Dean agreed that this would be useful as the School's three-year taught postgraduate programmes are popular with non-EU students and the core component in these programmes has been reduced in recent years as the academic quality of the entrants is increasingly more competitive.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer remarked that the streamlining of the School's research themes had the potential to increase opportunities for collaboration with colleagues in other Schools. With regard to the recommendation to introduce a staff-student forum, the VP/CAO cited the staff-student liaison committee operated in the School of Chemistry as an example of good practice. This was noted in the student evaluation section

In relation to the recommendation to introduce a workload model, the VP/CAO noted that it can be difficult to quantify workload in a clinical setting. Professor O'Connell reported that while staff tend to divide their time equally between clinical and academic work, individual strengths or interests may lie in one area rather than another, which poses no difficulty as long as everyone is making a suitable overall contribution in terms of workload.

With regard to the Reviewers' comments on the congestion within the undergraduate curriculum, the Dean reported that the curriculum mapping exercise should address this issue by identifying and removing duplication and redundancy. The Vice-President of the Students' Union expressed concern that it would be difficult for undergraduate Dental Science students to find time in the curriculum to engage fully with the Trinity Education Project (TEP) and Inter-Professional Learning opportunities. The Dean stressed that the School is supportive of the TEP, but suggested that it may not be realistic for undergraduate students to fully engage with it. He cited the capstone project as an example, suggesting that group projects would be a more practical way to meet this goal rather than facilitating individual student projects, and emphasised the need to protect free time in the curriculum as much as possible. The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer closed the discussion by noting that the Reviewers were impressed by the School's use of Problem Based Learning (PBL) as part of the blended learning offering in the Dental sciences programme.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked Professor O'Connell and closed the discussion.

QC/16-17/045   Implementation Plan for the School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer welcomed Professor Anne Marie Healy, Head of the School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences to speak to the Implementation Plan for the School, which was reviewed in December 2016.

Professor Healy reported that the School welcomed the Reviewers' recommendations, and reported that all, bar one, have been addressed. Approval from the Faculty Dean has been secured for a self-financing administrative post, but the School is currently reviewing its ability to fund this.

With regard to the College-level recommendations concerning revenue allocation, academic staff appointments and pump-priming research activities, Professor Healy stressed that these are dependent on the implementation of a new College-level resource allocation model.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked Professor Healy and noted that the report had highlighted the significant workload associated with the development of the Masters in Pharmacy programme.

With regard to the recommendation to appoint a junior administrator to carry out procurement tasks, a Committee member noted that the role of Chief Technical Officer (CTO) now incorporates a significant procurement function, which previously may not have been the case, and that this can impact on the CTO's primary role of supporting laboratory-based activities. Professor Healy reported that in the case of the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences there are historical reasons as to why the procurement function is still carried out by the Chief Technical Officer. She suggested that the new i-procurement system seems to have added to the administrative workload of this post and welcomed the recommendation to appoint an administrator to support this function, freeing up time for the CTO to support teaching and research labs.

Regarding the Reviewers' recommendation that the number of student contact hours be reduced to allow research in the School to flourish, the Senior Lecturer/Dean of Undergraduate Studies queried how this might be achieved without compromising the quality of the curriculum. The Head of School suggested that reducing student contact hours by, for example, doubling student numbers in small teaching groups would have a consequent impact on the student experience. She acknowledged, however, that the School is over teaching, and that this could be addressed by greater promotion of student-directed learning. The School Executive has set a target of a 20% reduction in contact hours on the Pharmacy programme and taught postgraduate programmes by the beginning of the 2018/19 academic year. The time saved in academic workload will give the School the opportunity to set-up a scheme of sabbaticals/leaves of absence for academic staff in order to boost their research engagement.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer welcomed the proposed rebalancing of student contact hours with research time, and agreed that this will allow talented researchers to flourish. He stressed the importance of 'teaching smarter' in order to free up time for research. Professor Healy reported that in previous years the accrediting body would stipulate the teaching hours for the undergraduate programme, and that staff numbers haven't kept pace with the development of new courses. She acknowledged that small group sessions are essential and, therefore, it isn't possible to rationalise across the board.

With regard to the Reviewers' recommendation that succession planning is undertaken, Professor Healy reported that a number of senior posts will be filled by early 2017/18 through recruitment and promotion, and that she is confident that this will provide an adequate pool of suitable candidates from which to appoint the next Head of School.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked Professor Healy and the Committee approved the Implementation Plan for consideration by Council, with the Quality Committee minutes**.**

QC/16-17/046 Report from the Working Group for the Tutorial Service
The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer welcomed the Senior Tutor, Dr Aidan Seery, to speak to the report of Tutorial Service Working Group.

Dr Seery reminded the Committee that the Tutorial Service had undergone a quality review in February 2016. The Reviewers' report was considered by Council in Trinity Term 2016, where it was agreed that a working group be established with representation beyond the Tutorial Service to analyse and report on key recommendations arising from the review before an Implementation Plan was produced. The working group was established in Hilary Term 2016, chaired by Professor Mark Bell from the School of Law. The group met on four occasions from February – April 2017. The Senior Tutor acknowledged Professor Bell for the efficiency with which he had chaired the Group and conducted the meetings.

Dr Seery reported that the Working Groups' recommendations were prefaced by the guiding principal of ensuring the sustainability of the Tutorial Service by recognising it as an integral part of the academic life of the College and of the professional development of academic staff. He hoped that this principle would receive the support of College Officers when the report goes to Council.

The first recommendation - that all newly-appointed staff would normally be required to commence a three-year term as a College Tutor during their first seven years in College - aims to address the problem of tutor numbers and recruitment. To date, service as a Tutor has been voluntary but the numbers of staff putting themselves forward for the role is insufficient to meet the needs of a growing student population, and the resulting large chambers makes the role unattractive to potential Tutors. The Working Group proposes that exceptions are made in the case of academic staff in their first year of employment and who are taking on senior management roles within their School e.g. Heads of School, Directors of Teaching and Learning etc. It is hoped that new Tutors would remain in post beyond the prescribed three year period and that, over time, being a College Tutor would become a normal expectation of all academic staff. Additionally, the report recommends that all staff would be encouraged to undertake a three year term as a College Tutor during each ten years of employment.

The working group identifies three steps to encourage Tutor recruitment among existing staff: (i) reduce chamber sizes, (ii) recognise the role of Tutor within local workload allocation systems and (iii) reward being a Tutor within assessment for promotion. The Senior Tutor reported that at present there are 235 tutors with an average chamber size of 51.5. Of these, 129 have chambers greater than 40 and 106 have chambers less than 40. The report recommends bringing the size of a normal chamber to 40, either by increasing or decreasing the tutee numbers. The Senior Tutor estimated that a maximum of 15 additional Tutors would be required in order to achieve this.

A reduced chamber size would provide Tutors with the time and space to develop their role beyond that of crisis management, and to engage more fully with their Tutees regarding their academic development. The report recommends that Tutors actively encourage their Tutees to meet with them at least once during each academic year.

Recommendations 6-8 seek to clarify the role of the Tutor as advocate, and address the Reviewers' concerns that students are being disenfranchised by the current system which does not support students to formulate and present their own cases. The Senior Tutor reported a strong wish by the Working Group to introduce an increased level of agency by students, whilst also being cognisant that one of the great benefits of the current system is the support provided for students who cannot speak for themselves. The Working Group proposes three recommendations to facilitate this: (i) Extensions - requests for extensions to the submission of course work should be made directly by the student to the programme director or relevant person, and not via their Tutor, (ii) Student cases - students should complete and submit applications to Student Cases via their Tutor, but only if the Tutor believes there is clear evidence of merit, and (iii) Appeals - Tutors should retain their role as an advocate for tutees within the appeals process.

Recommendation 9 relates to the creation in each School of the role of Lead Tutor, to ease pressure on the Senior Tutors Office, promote peer-support and the sharing of good practice amongst tutors and provide an alternative contact point for tutees experiencing difficulty accessing their tutor. The School Lead Tutor would have a smaller chamber size.

The Reviewers' Report identified the lack of a data system for the Tutorial Service as an issue to be addressed. The Working Group recommended the introduction of a data collection method (e.g. e-Portfolio) to allow Tutors to record brief notes on meetings with tutees. There is also a need to be able to generate statistics on the use of the Service for strategic planning purposes and in order to support requests for further funding.

The final recommendation relates to raising the visibility of the Tutorial Service through social media, podcasts and the further development of the Senior Tutors website.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked the Senior Tutor and invited comments from the Committee.

Committee members expressed concern that the recommendation for all new staff to undertake the role of Tutor within the first seven years of their appointment would place a disproportionate obligation on the new members of College staff. The Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences agreed and expressed the view that all academic staff members should be Tutors, regardless of tenure. He suggested that obliging new staff to undertake the role within the first seven years of their appointment would reinforce a belief that tutorship is taken on in early career to advance beyond the first stage of promotion, after which it is divested.

With regard to the recommendations regarding recognition of Tutorship in assessment for promotions and its inclusion in local workload models, Committee members noted that Tutorship is currently one of the main ways of demonstrating progression point in the promotions process and that the role of Tutor is already considered in some local workload allocation models, with no significant increase in Tutor numbers.

The Senior Tutor agreed that Tutorship is recognised at junior promotion level but suggested that more recognition was warranted at senior promotions level to encourage staff to stay on in the role beyond their initial years in College. The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer reported that a review of the senior promotions process, currently underway, would make the criteria for senior promotions more visible. The Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences agreed that being a Tutor is an advantage in promotions, but noted that currently there is no formal weighting mechanism for the role. The Senior Tutor acknowledged that recruitment of greater numbers of existing staff poses a difficulty, as while staff can be encouraged to take on the role, the report is not recommending mandatory appointment to the role.

The Senior Lecturer/Dean of Undergraduate Studies welcomed the Working Groups' proposals in relation to student cases, in particular the recommendation that applications continue to be made via the Tutor rather than by the student directly. She suggested that more transparent regulations would support Tutors in this regard.

With regard to the role of the Tutor as advocate, a Committee member stressed that this is a key function of the role which should not be diluted.

In response to a suggestion from the Deputy Librarian that engagement by the Senior Tutor with the College induction programme for new staff could provide a recruitment opportunity, Dr Seery reported that this was already being done. Mrs Kurtz further suggested that rather than exempting staff from the role during their first year in College, the role could be marketed as a way for staff to get to know how the College works. Additionally she suggested that more senior staff members could be

encouraged to take on the role by offering them a reduced chamber size. Finally, she proposed an award of Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer 'Tutor of the Year' similar to the Provost's Teaching Award, which would help to publicise the role amongst students and raise its profile with staff.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked the Committee and welcomed the proposal for a 'Tutor of the Year' award. A Committee member, noting the initial concerns that the Reviewers' report had reflected a marketised view of the College, praised the Working Groups' interpretation of the recommendations.

The Academic Secretary recommended that the Working Group should re-convene to discuss the points raised by the Committee before a final report is submitted to the June Council meeting for consideration, and the Senior Tutor agreed to relate this to the Working Group Chair.

QC/16-17/047 Draft report on Student Module Evaluation
The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer invited the Academic Secretary to speak to a report on Student Module Evaluation.

The Academic Secretary reminded the Committee that the implementation of the College policy on mandatory evaluation of undergraduate modules at local level has been raised on numerous occasions through the Annual Faculty Quality Reports and discussed at Quality Committee (QC 15/16-030) and University Council (Cl 16-17/037 (ii)). Issues around compliance with the policy and concerns regarding survey fatigue, survey timing, evaluation methods and perception of impartiality were discussed, all of which it was felt warranted further investigation. As a result of these discussions, staff in Trinity Teaching & Learning conducted some desktop research on existing practices in peer institutions as well as a high level literature review of research in the area. It was also recommended that the Academic Secretary and the Students' Union Education Officer visit schools to assess whether and how undergraduate modules were being evaluated. These visits took place in Michaelmas and Hilary Term 2016/17.

The Academic Secretary summarised the key findings of the report as follows:

- There are different levels of engagement with and interpretation of the module evaluation policy across College;
- There is a lack of awareness in schools that undergraduate module evaluation is compulsory and that schools have discretion on the approach used;
- There is a variety of module evaluation practices in place across the schools, and the majority of schools administer questionnaires, online or/and paper-based.
- There is a preference across schools for paper-based questionnaires, administered in-class (usually during the penultimate module), as the response rate for online surveys is low. The administration of paper-based questionnaires is, however, resource intensive, especially for large classes;
- High response rates to online and paper-based surveys are achieved where schools have invested effort and resources in the process e.g. the School of Mathematics has achieved response rates of 40-50% using its own online evaluation tool;
- Student representation at meetings and on committees is common practice, but may not be sufficient to adequately capture student feedback. In 2016/17, the School of Chemistry introduced a staff: student Liaison Committee which replaced module evaluations. Class reps and staff attend the meeting, which takes place three times a year, the agenda is set by the students and the student school convenor chairs the meeting, and administration is provided by the school;

- 'Clickers' are used in some courses in the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science and the Faulty of Health Science as a method of providing real time feedback to the lecturer, and there are plans to pilot it in 2017-18 on a College-wide trial basis;
- Feedback from both staff and students is an area that needs to be tackled across the board - the School of Social Sciences and Philosophy provides feedback to students via their webpage in a section titled 'You said…We did' and both positive and negative comments are addressed;
- Student anonymity in the evaluation process is an issue of concern for students;
- With regard to the timing of module evaluations, mid-module evaluation is preferred in the School of Mathematics as it provides an opportunity to identify and address current problems. There was little support for the implementation of this practice on top of existing methods of evaluation, however, and some Schools were not in favour of replacing end-of-module evaluation with mid-module evaluations because they value feedback on the totality of the module;
- The suggestion that students be involved in designing the evaluation questions was positively received by all the schools interviewed.

The report concluded by confirming that module evaluation is valued in Schools and that both the staff and students interviewed support its continuation.

The Academic Secretary outlined a number of proposals that have emerged from discussions with Schools for further consideration, namely:
i. Introduction of mid-module evaluations
ii. Establishment of student:staff liaison committees in all schools
iii. Facilitation of a culture of students-as-partners in their learning through greater dialogue and engagement.

The Vice-President of the Students' Union agreed that while mandatory evaluation should be retained, there is a need to look at closing the feedback loop, and at the timing and method of delivery of surveys. He stressed the importance of ensuring that the purpose of evaluations is explained before the survey so that students realise it is not a vehicle for complaint. He also recommended that training of student reps needs to be addressed.

The Academic Secretary suggested piloting different feedback methods in a number of Schools and reported that the School of English had already expressed an interest in utilising a meeting format rather than solely administering questionnaires to assess student satisfaction. Council approval would be required for this.

A Committee member expressed concern that the report did not address feedback processes and wondered whether some Schools rely solely on paper-based surveys as they don't have the infrastructure to support other methods. He suggested that information regarding different feedback processes and recommendations regarding the infrastructure to support them were required.

The Academic Secretary stressed that some Schools with large numbers of students are very committed to module surveys. She reported that others, however, require more guidance as they do not act on the feedback that they receive. She also noted that there are different level of supports for student evaluation across faculties and noted that the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences conducts module evalautions for schools. She stressed the importance of local ownership and volunteerd to advise any school on approaches and feedback processes.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked the Academic Secretary and suggested that a proposal re piloting different methods of student evaluation be forwarded to Council.

QC/16-17/048 Review of the Confederal School of Religions, Peace Studies and Theology
The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer welcomed the Head of the Confederal School of Religions, Peace Studies and Theology, Professor Siobhan Garrigan, to report on the quality review which took place in March 2017.

Professor Garrigan welcomed the report, which she noted accurately identifies the structural problems that have hampered the School's development and suggests specific and wide-scale structural reforms. She reported that the School's current structures were devised through a series of discussions between College and philanthropic donors, and that insufficient attention was paid in that process to the practical implications for the internal workings of the School. She stressed that College's co-operation in implementing the review recommendations will be required in negotiating with the Trusts and Advisory Board to change existing structures.

She welcomed the recommendation for a simple name and structure for the School that follows the norms of College. She also welcomed the recommendation for a single School budget and cost centre, and a single reporting line to the Head of School.

The recommendation to reorganize the School into six disciplines invites the School to both re-conceptualize and re-organize itself while allowing a discipline-specific mission to be maintained. She reported that for this structure to work, it will be vital that academic staff are not restricted to working in only one of the six disciplines and that many colleagues will straddle two (or more) disciplines.

The Reviewers recommend a unified UG degree structure on the basis of a "single entry, multiple exits" model. Professor Garrigan suggested that the successful implementation of this will be facilitated by the Trinity Education Project and will result in a reduction of duplication and the streamlining of administrative processes.

Professor Garrigan concluded by reporting that while she welcomes the report, implementation of its recommendations presents challenges in terms of managing staff concerns, re-negotiating legal agreements with the Trusts and maintaining staff morale through another period of change.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer thanked Professor Garrigan and invited comments from the Committee.

The Dean of Arts, Humanities and Social Science endorsed Professor Garrigan's response to the report. He acknowledged that this is a unique report arising from a unique situation, and strongly supported the implementation of all of the recommendations in full. He acknowledged that this will require negotiation of legal issues and there may be some resistance within the School. He emphasized that the three units within the School must work together to secure a future for the school.

The Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer welcomed the report and wholeheartedly endorsed the Reviewers' recommendations. He acknowledged the excellent work of the Review team, which worked effectively together, and invited comment from the Committee.

In the discussion that followed a query arose as to how easily the three disciplines will integrate into the new model. The Vice-Provost /Chief Academic Officer acknowledged that the restructuring will require the integration of six disciplines previously housed in three organizational units into one School. The Head of School suggested that a taskforce be convened to provide a pathway for implementation and to offer ways to achieve a united School. With regard to the title of the School, Professor Garrigan reported that there had been much discussion within the School as to the most appropriate name, which will address the Reviewers' wish for a succinct title whilst also capturing the essence of the areas covered in the School.

The VP/CAO agreed that the formulation of the collective vision of the School will be expressed in the name, and the Faculty Dean re-iterated the Reviewer's recommendation that the name be considered from the point of view of a potential student.

The Vice-Provost /Chief Academic Officer thanked the Head of School and the Committee recommended the report to Council for consideration.

QC/16-17/049 Any other business

The Chair referred the Committee to the Revised Annual Faculty Quality Report – Engineering, Mathematics and Science circulated for information.