



Quality Committee	
<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>23 November 2023</b>
<b>Present</b>	Professor Orla Sheils, Vice Provost/Chief Academic Officer (Chair); Ms. Patricia Callaghan, Academic Secretary; Ms. Roisin Smith, Quality Officer; Professor Gail Mc Elroy, Dean of AHSS; Professor Sylvia Draper, Dean of STEM; Professor Brian O'Connell, Dean of Health Sciences; Professor Martine Smith, Dean of Graduate Studies; Professor David Shepherd, Senior Lecturer; Ms. Orla Cunningham, Chief Operating Officer; Ms. Breda Walls, Director of Student Services; Ms. Julia Carmichael, Chief Risk Officer; Mr. Patrick Magee, Director IT Services; Ms. Jessie Kurtz, Deputy Librarian; Mr. David Fennelly, AHSS Representative; Ms. Catherine Arnold, SU Education Officer; Professor Jan De Vries, HS Representative.
<b>Apologies</b>	Professor Emma Stokes, Vice President for Global Engagement; Professor Breiffni Fitzgerald, STEM Representative; Professor Dirk Van Damme (External); Ms. Vickey Butler, Deputy Secretary -position vacant.
<b>In attendance</b>	Dr. Richard Porter, Dean of Students, for <i>QC/23-23/020 National Student Survey Report UG</i> .

Agenda items		Actions/Decisions
	Key points arising from discussion	
<b>QC/23-24/017</b> Quality Committee minutes		<b>Decision QC/23-24/017:</b> The Quality Committee minutes of the 19 October 2023 meeting were approved.
<b>QC/23-24/018</b> Matters arising	The following items have gone to Academic Council for the meeting of 1 November 2023: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality Committee Minutes of 21 September 2023</li> <li>• Implementation Plan for Academic Affairs and the Careers Service</li> <li>• Consolidated Annual Faculty Quality Report 2021/22 (with presentation)</li> <li>• Quality Office Review Report</li> </ul>	



Trinity College Dublin

Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath

The University of Dublin

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Thematic Review Report of Mental Health</li></ul> <p>The following items have gone to Board for the meeting of 15 November 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Quality Committee Minutes of 21 September 2023</li><li>• Thematic Review Report of Mental Health</li><li>• RIAM Policies for Noting</li></ul> <p>The following item will go to Academic Council for the meeting of 29 November 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation Plan Thematic Review of Mental Health <b>(QC/23-24/010)</b></li></ul> <p>The following item will go to Graduate Studies Committee for the meeting of 7 December 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The PGT and PGR National Student Survey Reports <b>(QC/23-24/011)</b></li></ul> <p>The Vice-Provost gave an update regarding the International Education Mark and the following key points were highlighted:</p> <p>Trinity submitted a response to QQI on feedback from the Quality Committee of 19 October 2023 <b>(QC/23-24/012)</b> on the QQI Guidance Note for HE Providers and contributed to a sectoral response as a member of the IUA IEM Working Group.</p> <p>At a meeting of the IUA Working Group on 20 November 2023 some progress was reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• QQI has agreed that it is not necessary to publish the Institution's Self-Assessment Report, however, the Review Team Report and the decision on the outcome of the application will be published. There are three possible outcomes: Outcome 1-Authorised to Use IEM; Outcome 2-</li></ul>	



Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<p>Authorised to use the IEM with conditions; Outcome 3- Not authorised to use the IEM. There is no agreed format as yet for the Review Team Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFHERIS will launch the International Strategy on 16 January 2024 and the IEM is expected to be launched on 30 January 2024.</li> <li>• There will be a request to institutions to confirm intention to apply at an early stage; timeframe to be confirmed.</li> <li>• Training will be provided on the use of the IEM application portal to institutional representatives in mid-January 2024.</li> <li>• Following feedback from the sector, QQI will work to differentiate the single brand logo with appropriate text.</li> <li>• QQI will seek to address concerns regarding the process itself i.e., it is an application process, not a quality review process, and therefore the content and language used in the final HE Guidance Note should reflect this fact.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>QC/23-24/019</b> Progress Report Joint TCD/SIT Physio Programme</p>	<p>The Dean of Health Sciences, Professor Brian O’Connell, gave apologies on behalf of Professor John Gormley, who could not attend the Quality Committee meeting.</p> <p>The following key points from the Progress Report were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Joint TCD/SIT B.Sc. in Physiotherapy Programme, which began in 2016/17, is currently being phased out. The SIT now delivers and awards its own B.Sc. in Physiotherapy.</li> <li>• 18 recommendations were made, of which 13 have been or are being implemented on the SIT programme, and four were implemented on the Joint TCD/SIT programme.</li> <li>• Recommendation 3 regarding clinical placements was not implemented as it relied on SIT’s clinical partners, who do not have the capacity to provide 1<sup>st</sup> year students with clinical placements.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Decision QC/23-24/019:</b>          The Quality Committee recommends the Progress Report on the Joint TCD/SIT Physio Programme to Council.</p>



**Trinity College Dublin**

Coláiste na Tríonóide, Baile Átha Cliath

The University of Dublin

Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Dean stated that he was satisfied that substantial progress had been made.</li> </ul> <p>The Deputy Librarian commented that it was positive to see changes have fed into the TCD/SIT programme, as this highlights the benefits of the Quality Review process. Regarding recommendation 3, she commented that 1<sup>st</sup> year clinical placements would be an advantage, as it would allow students the opportunity to decide if they wish to pursue a Physiotherapy career or not. The lack of exposure to clinical placements until 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year could present a problem for students.</p> <p>The Academic Secretary added that there are currently approximately 10 or 11 students who are not qualified to practice Physiotherapy, and as a result SIT is looking at the possibility of offering an Ordinary degree. The introduction of a clinical placement in 1<sup>st</sup> year would help to prevent this situation.</p> <p>The Vice-Provost concluded that the committee is happy to convey the message that it supports the introduction of clinical exposure for 1<sup>st</sup> year students. The Dean of HS agreed to advise SIT of the Quality Committee recommendation, and added that, overall, SIT has responded to positively to the majority of the review recommendations.</p>	<p><b>Action QC/23-23/019:</b> Dean of HS to revert to SIT on the Quality Committee discussion on clinical placements for 1<sup>st</sup> Year students.</p>
<p><b>QC/23-24/020</b> National Student Survey Report UG 2022/23</p>	<p>The Quality Officer, Ms. Roisin Smith, gave the following updates on the National Student Survey UG Report, 2022/23:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Undergraduate report was considered by the Undergraduate Studies Committee meeting of 14 November 2023, and received similar feedback to the discussion that took place at the Quality Committee meeting of 19 October 2023 (<b>QC/23-24/011</b>) regarding the National Student Survey Reports - PGT and PGR.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Decision QC/23-24/020:</b> The Quality Committee recommends the UG National Student Survey Report 2022/23 to Council.</p>



Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Quality Officer explained that in USC a query was raised by a STEM School regarding specific School response rates. Upon investigation it was revealed , that for Schools involved in the delivery of the Undergraduate Science it is no longer possible to identify which students align with which School, as students are registered to the stream and the Science Streams are configured as STEM Multi-School programmes in SITS.</li> <li>Between multi-faculty and multi-school and Trinity Joint Honours programmes, 48% of the 1,910 UG respondents fall outside of a single School/Faculty structure. This means that some Schools cannot respond to the questions on feedback from the National Student Survey for input to the Annual Faculty Quality Report.</li> </ul> <p>The Senior Lecturer noted that efforts were made last year and this year to consider the role that the USC can play in addressing the findings of the National Student Survey Report.</p> <p>The Quality Officer added that a communication from the National Steering Committee was received via the Irish University Association to advise that a Taught Survey would not be administered in 2024 as a result of feedback from student representatives and sectoral bodies. The HEA and co-sponsors will look to design and test a new student survey in 2024/25. Trinity will seek to provide institutional input to the design, test and pilot of the new instrument.</p> <p>The Vice-Provost confirmed that the required paperwork has been returned from all HEIs regarding systems performance. She explained that the quality metrics regarding teaching and learning (Effective Teaching Practice; Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment) are predicated on the results of the National Student Survey. It is unclear what the impact of this might be on the institution's</p>	<p><b>Action QC/23-24/020:</b> The Quality Officer to action the request by the Deputy Librarian.</p>



Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<p>performance compact. The Vice-Provost expressed that these events were worrisome, as they lacked a reliable baseline, and it was crucial to highlight this concern to quality committee.</p> <p>The Academic Secretary commented that the dialogue with the HEA allows us the opportunity to raise this concern, but even without any development on this issue, she noted that Trinity's response rate to the survey is comparable to other Irish universities.</p> <p>The SU Education Officer wished to note the launch of the campaign to boycott the National Student Survey. She also confirmed that the Students' Union Communications Team will not be involved in the promotion of the future survey, as it has been historically.</p> <p>The Dean of Students commented that regardless of concerns about the survey instrument itself, the report contains information that can be used to enhance the student experience. The Dean was supportive of the inclusion of questions on academic integrity in the new survey.</p> <p>The Quality Officer in request from the Deputy Librarian agreed to provide the Deputy Librarian with the survey open comments on the Library.</p>	
<b>QC/23-24/021</b> Any other business	Nil	
<b>**QC/23-24/022</b> QQI Revised Guidelines for Blended and Online Learning	<p>The QQI Topic - Specific Guidelines for Blended and Online Learning Documents were circulated to the Quality Committee for noting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trinity staff provided feedback on a previous draft of the Guidelines and also attended a QQI webinar during the consultation process.</li> </ul>	<b>Decision QC/23-24/022:</b> The Quality Committee recommends the QQI Revised Guidelines for



Agenda items		
	Key points arising from discussion	Actions/Decisions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Dean of STEM noted that the section of the guidelines referring to student learners outside Ireland advises of a need for institutions to consider what countries students would be applying from for online and blended learning programmes and questioned whether this was possible pre-registration. She further noted that these guidelines will need to be aligned with programmes that are offered fully online.</li> <li>The Quality Officer requested the Dean of STEM to send an email outlining her concerns after the quality committee meeting and promised to communicate them to QQI.</li> <li>The Academic Secretary reiterated they are guidelines only and not directives.</li> <li>The Dean of Graduate Studies expressed that there has been a need for the development of these guidelines, as the definition of blended can be unclear and the definitions in the guidelines will help to navigate the uncertainties on this topic.</li> </ul>	<p>Blended and Online Learning to Council for Noting.</p> <p><b>Action QC/23-24/022:</b>          The Quality Officer on receipt of feedback from the Dean of STEM to seek clarification from QQI.</p>
<p><b>QC/23-24/023</b>          RIAM Quality Review IT Services Report</p>	<p>The following key areas were highlighted in the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Quality Officer introduced this item and noted that RIAM are working to address the recommendations, they are engaging with the HEANet, and they have service management contracts in place for IT.</li> </ul> <p>The Academic Secretary stated there is a need for Trinity to agree a format for quality reviews of non-student related services with both of our Linked Providers. The creation of a statement declaring that they will satisfy our Quality Assurance requirements will be addressed in 2024.</p>	<p><b>Decision QC/23-24/023:</b>          The Quality Committee recommends the RIAM Quality Review of IT Services Report to College Board for Noting.</p>