



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

Trinity College Dublin
The University of Dublin

Quality Committee

26 January 2023, 2 - 4pm
College Boardroom, Trinity Business School

Quality Committee minutes	
Present	Professor Orla Sheils, Vice-Provost/Chief Academic Officer (Chair); Professor Brian O' Connell, Dean of Health Sciences (HS); Professor Gail McElroy, Dean of AHSS; Ms. Patricia Callaghan, Academic Secretary; Ms. Roisin Smith, Quality Officer; Professor David Shepherd, Senior Lecturer/Dean of Undergraduate Studies; Professor Martine Smith, Dean of Graduate Studies; Ms. Breda Walls, Director of Student Services; Ms. Vickey Butler, Assistant Secretary; Professor Jan de Vries; Mr. Patrick Magee, Corporate Services Division (CSD); Professor Dirk Van Damme.
Apologies	Ms. Julia Carmichael, Chief Risk Officer; Professor Sylvia Draper, Dean of STEM; Ms. Orla Cunningham, Chief Operating Officer; Professor Breiffni Fitzgerald, STEM representative; Professor Gizem Arikan, AHSS representative; Professor Jessie Kurtz, Deputy Librarian; Ms. Zoe Cummings, Education Officer, TCDSU.
In attendance	Dr Julie O' Donnell, Quality Officer, MIE; Dr Andrea Uí Chianáin, Programme Director PDE (FE)

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
QC/22-23/023 – Quality Committee minutes 1 December 2022	College is moving to an abridged form of minutes that highlight the key issues/pertinent points and outline the decisions/actions taken.	Decision QC/22-23/023.1: Minutes 1 December 2022 approved.
QC/22-23/024 – Matters arising	<p><i>QC/22-23/020 Quality Officer feedback on meeting of IUA Working Group 19 January 2023</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEM launch date deferred from March to September 2023. • Continue to await information on cost of the IEM to HEIs from DFHERIS. • Revised Codes and Policy for publication will be available mid Feb to March. • The Self-Assessment Handbook will be available Feb/Mar and HEIs will get an early draft. 	None.
QC/22-23/025 - Annual Quality Report to QQI 2021/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is considerable repetition between Parts A and B of the Report. A planned revision of the template for the AQR by QQI next year should attempt to address this, striking the right balance between comprehensiveness and succinctness. • Much of the information in the AQR was included in the ISER for the Institutional Review. It would be useful if, in future, the most recent AQR could be submitted <i>in lieu</i> of an ISER for an Institutional review. • The scope of the AQR extends beyond what is quality assurance, in the strictest sense of the word. • The title of section B is incorrect. • The Library and Information Policy Committee should be included in the Information and Data Management section. 	<p>Decision QC/22-23/025.1: The draft Annual Quality Report (AQR) to QQI 2021/22 was approved and recommended to Council for noting, pending incorporation of feedback from Committee members.</p> <p>Quality Officer, through attendance at IUA QOG, to reflect committee input in proposed review of AQR template.</p>
QC/22-23/026 Review of Professional Diploma in Further Education (PDE (FE)) at Marino Institute of Education (MIE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIE to clarify how the credits and teaching hours referred to in the report relate to ECTS. • MIE to provide an outline/map of the transition from the modules as they existed before the review to where they are now and any further planned changes. This can be in tabular format and will inform whether the changes need to be submitted for re-approval/re-validation. • The elements of the QIP that do not relate to programme structure can be approved. Those that relate to programme structure 	<p>Action: QC/22-23/026.1: MIE to clarify how the credits and teaching hours in the report relate to ECTS.</p> <p>Action: QC/22-23/026.2: MIE to map (in tabular format) the proposed changes in the structure, delivery and assessment of modules resulting from the review, and submit to the Quality</p>

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<p>(recommendation 9 – Programme Design and Delivery), however, they need to be addressed using the Trinity template for an Implementation Plan that outlines the recommendations, the planned actions to address them, the timeline for addressing them, and the responsibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Quality Officer will liaise with MIE on the format of the revised Implementation Plan. 	<p>Office for dissemination to the Dean of Graduate Studies and other relevant College Officers.</p> <p>Action: QC/22-23/026.3: MIE to re-submit an implementation plan that addresses the issues outlined in recommendation 9 to the QC, using the Trinity IP template. The Trinity Quality Officer to liaise with the MIE Quality Officer regarding this.</p> <p>Decision: QC/22-23/026.4: Sections of the QIP that address recommendations other than no.9 are approved, pending resubmission with timelines.</p>
QC/22-23/027 Quality Risk Register	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Quality Risk Register addresses risks related to institutional Quality and QA processes that are under the remit of the Quality Committee and Quality Office to monitor. Risks that relate to Quality, e.g., the S:S ratio, will appear on School and Faculty Risk Registers and are the responsibility of Heads of Schools and Faculty Deans to monitor and report on. • The classification of the majority of risks as ‘medium’ does not adequately reflect the level of risk. Risks that have agreed mitigation and where the implementation of those mitigations have proven effectiveness should be rated as low. • The risk level in an institutional context should also be considered, as the Quality Risk Register only views a risk through one lens. • The initial risk and inherent risk, and the mitigation strategies that have been put in place to address the risk should be considered and included in the presentation. • The SL provided input that the TEP related accreditation risk could be rated as Low 	<p>Decision: QC/22-23/027.1 The Quality Officer to consult with the Chief Risk Officer and members of the Quality Committee to finalise the risk ratings prior to re-submission to the Risk Office.</p> <p>Decision: QC/22-23/027.2 The revised register to be submitted to the March Quality Committee for Noting.</p>

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
QC/22-23/028 Summary of themes from Quality Reviews 2020 – 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The data may be skewed given the small number of recent reviews. Future themes reports should look at different ways of presenting the information. A focus on themes in recommendations arising from the review of similar areas/activities might provide more useful information than a comparison across all review types and could be a more valid comparison. 	Decision QC/22-23/028.1: The Committee noted the themes report. Action: QC/22-23/028.2 The next themes report should consider more valid ways to present the information, including grouping recommendations by review type, by theme.
QC/22-23/029 Any other business	The Quality Office will be reviewed from the 21-23 February 2023. Members are encouraged to accept the invitation to attend the meeting of the Quality Committee in the Review Schedule.	None.
QC/22-23/030 IUA working group response and Trinity response to the QQI White papers relevant to the International Education Mark (IEM)		Decision: QC/22-23/030.1 The Quality Committee noted the IUA working group response and Trinity response to the QQI White papers relevant to the International Education Mark (IEM).
QC/22-23/031 Revised Linked Provider Quality Review Procedure		Decision: QC/22-23/031.1 The Quality Committee noted the Revision to the Linked Provider Quality Review Procedure.
QC/22-23/032 Updated Implementation Plan for the joint B.Sc. (Hons) in Physiotherapy (SIT and TCD)		Decision: QC/22-23/032.1 The Quality Committee noted the updated IP for the joint B.Sc. (Hons) in Physiotherapy (SIT and TCD).