

Maynooth University Quality Committee Meeting 3rd October 2022 at 12.00 pm

Minutes

Present: Dr Alison FitzGerald (Chair), Dr Teresa Lee (Secretary), Dr Antonio Cascelli, Professor Joseph Coughlan, Professor Fiona Lyddy, Mr Gerry O'Sullivan,

Ms Sarah Searson

Apologies: Mr Niall Daly, Ms Joan O'Riordan Bruton

In Attendance: Ms Helen Berry

| Agenda Item | Key Points/Decisions | Actions, if any (Follow-up by) |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 1 Declaration of Interest | The Chair introduced this item and stated that all Committees reporting to Governing Authority must include this item on their Agenda going forward. | No conflicts |
| 2 Minutes | The draft minutes of the meeting of 30 th May were accepted as accurate. | Minutes adopted |
| 3 Membership Update | The Chair thanked Dr Conor McCarthy for all his work on the Committee and welcomed Dr Antonio Cascelli as the new FACSP representative. The Chair also welcomed Mr Gerry O'Sullivan, the new additional external Governing Authority member to the Committee. It is expected the Postgraduate representative on the Committee will be in place following their appointment to Governing Authority in October. | |

| 4 Matters | Joint Sectoral Protocol | |
|---|--|--|
| 4 Matters Arising | Joint Sectoral Protocol The Director of Quality introduced this item and gave an update. This protocol was signed into place between MU and Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI) on 17th June 2022. The need for the Protocol arose as a result of an amendment in 2019 to the 2012 Qualifications and Quality Assurance Act (QQA) that requires arrangements to be put in place for the inclusion within the National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ) of awards made by designated awarding bodies (DABs). The Protocol provides the means by which MU, as a DAB, can meet its obligations under the revised Act. The Director of Quality reported on a briefing provided in early September 2022 to key members of the Registry Office in which the importance of including MU awards on the QQI operated Irish Register of Qualifications (IRQ) was highlighted as being the means by which MU ensures that its awards are included on the NFQ. It was also stressed that the inclusion of awards on the NFQ will be a prerequisite in the application for, and the operations of, the soon to be introduced International Education Mark (IEM). Institutional applications for the IEM are expected to be invited in quarter one of the calendar year 2023. | The International Education Mark (IEM) will be brought to another meeting as it has implications for International students. The Director of Quality will keep the Committee informed of any updates. |
| 5 Third Cycle of Quality Reviews | The Director of Quality introduced this item and gave an update. Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) discussion meetings have been completed for Ancient Classics, Celtic Studies, Media Studies, Philosophy and SMLLC, with the meeting for the English Department to be arranged. Completed FACSP peer review group reports and the associated QIPs will be presented for note to the next Quality Committee meeting. A Faculty analysis report identifying common themes across the eight peer review reports in the FACSP is being prepared for the Dean. Follow up reports for the FSE, Estates and Capital Development and synoptic reports for all previous units reviewed in the third cycle will be requested in mid-October. | For Note |
| 6 Fourth Cycle of Quality Reviews | 6.1 Review of MU Framework for Quality Assurance & Enhancement The Director of Quality stated that the minor amendments to the Framework previously approved by the Quality Committee were completed and the Framework will now be updated to reflect the recent changes made to the Terms of Reference of the Quality Committee. Academic Council and Governing Authority will be notified accordingly. | Updated MU Framework to go to Academic Council and Governing Authority for note. |

A discussion followed on the Quality of the student experience and the Erasmus Charter for HE. The Chair will write to the new Vice President International (VPI) in November to follow up.

Chair to write to the new Vice President International in November.

6.2 Schedule of Quality Reviews for Cycle 4

Maynooth International Engineering College

The Director of Quality has spoken with each of the Heads concerned (MIEC, Computer Science, and Electronic Engineering) with the outcome being that a separate review of MIEC should take place. The Quality Committee agreed with this option.

Quality Office/Unit Review

The Director of Quality outlined a sectoral analysis of IUA universities completed in 2019 and 2022 showing a variety of options for Quality Office reviews. A discussion followed and the Quality Committee agreed that the Quality Office should be incorporated into the next cycle with the review looking at processes, performance and resources. The mechanism for the review to be decided and it was agreed that options as to what form this might take be fed back to the VP Academic.

6.3 Revision of draft QIP Follow Up Report

The Director of Quality reported on the need to update the draft QIP follow-up template, with the expectation that when updated it will mirror the format of the QIP report template that was previously approved by the Committee. The Working Group set up by the Committee to prepare the QIP report template, chaired by Professor Lyddy, will remain in place to work on updating the follow-up report. The QC Chair will write to members seeking replacements on the Working Group for exiting members, taking account of representation and gender balance. One meeting to be scheduled before the next meeting of the Quality Committee.

6.4 Student participation in Quality Review processes

The Director of Quality provided a document outlining student representation on Quality Review Teams at all IUA Universities. In the ensuing discussion several points were raised with previously submitted feedback also presented at the meeting.

The Director of Quality to check with the Quality Office in TCD regarding the coordination of their review and report back to the QC

The Chair to write to members seeking replacements on the QIP follow up report working group.

This item to be kept on the agenda.

- There was general support from the Quality Committee to look at the feasibility of rolling this out as part of
 the fourth cycle of reviews, possibly as a pilot, using a structured and measured approach in the first
 instance.
- Training will be particularly important the usefulness of NStEP resources was highlighted.
- The use of a structured 'PhD-type' module approach, that prepares students to serve as potential members of peer review group panels as part of MU quality reviews, with a 5-credit weighting was mentioned, as was the potential to develop a micro-credential offering.
- It was agreed that graduates on review teams would be useful, but it might be challenging in terms of the time commitment involved.
- Working with students from other faculties or other departments within a faculty was also viewed as having potential, as was the use of student representatives within a faculty as part of any pilot.
- The use of MSU student representatives was seen as a positive in terms of their experience and knowledge. On the other hand, the many existing calls on their time would limit the time they could commit to serving as review team members.
- The challenge of the workload involved, and the commitment required of students was highlighted as being an important issue.
- At the departmental/unit level students could be asked to serve on the Internal, unit-level, Quality Committee.
- It was noted that student engagement and outcome reports and surveys, including ones such as the Graduate Outcome Survey or surveys of international students, serve a purpose within the quality review process in terms of capturing student engagement in general and capturing student outcomes following the completion of their studies in MU.
- There are pros and cons to each approach, we do not need to rely on one option and should look at a mixed approach.
- It was noted that the views of the MSU/VP Education are needed as part of this work.

6.5 Concept Map

The Director of Quality introduced this item. The QC Chair and the Director of Quality presented the Concept Map to the Deans at a meeting in September. The Deans were supportive of the concept with overall agreement that we need to agree a definition of what quality is, and the parameters of what a quality review focuses on. The Deans requested that the Chair and the Director of Quality return to the VP Academic with a proposal to discuss.

The Director of Quality to explore the feasibility of a structured PhD module approach.

The Director of Quality to bring a working document on benchmarking as a starting point for

| | discussion at our next |
|---|---|
| The Quality Committee discussed the matter with the following points made: | meeting. |
| We need to closely review and agree a definition, and the parameters for Quality Reviews, including | |
| | |
| | |
| , , | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| , o | |
| always easy to separate matters such as teaching & learning from facilities and resources. | |
| There needs to be effective dialogue on how to move forward on recommendations made at institutional, and at unit level. | |
| There is a need to ensure that the burden for follow through does not fall solely to the HoD. | |
| • The work of the HoD and new HoD's who take up responsibility for quality review outcomes, subsequent to | |
| the review having taken place, needs to be supported. | |
| The Chair stated the President was invited to the meeting today but had a conflict in her diary. The Chair will invite the President to our next meeting. | The QC Chair to invite the President to our next meeting. |
| The Chair stated that the Strategic Planning consultation process ends on 14th October and asked Committee Members for their views on high-level priorities to be included as a submission from the QC. | The QC Chair and Director of Quality to work on a document reflecting the QC discussions and the work of the QC to date – to be circulated to members of the committee for comments. |
| | We need to closely review and agree a definition, and the parameters for Quality Reviews, including consideration of the legal requirements. There is a rationale for a stepped approach to quality. It was remarked that culture is at the centre and is a driver of quality. There is a need to place an increased focus on teaching & learning, and the student experience. The unique growth of our undergraduate numbers is a real pressure point. Quality Reviews should not be about lobbying for resources, although it was highlighted that it is not always easy to separate matters such as teaching & learning from facilities and resources. There needs to be effective dialogue on how to move forward on recommendations made at institutional, and at unit level. There is a need to ensure that the burden for follow through does not fall solely to the HoD. The work of the HoD and new HoD's who take up responsibility for quality review outcomes, subsequent to the review having taken place, needs to be supported. The Chair stated the President was invited to the meeting today but had a conflict in her diary. The Chair will invite the President to our next meeting. The Chair stated that the Strategic Planning consultation process ends on 14th October and asked |

| Date of next meeting | Monday 28 th November at 12.05pm in Eolas Meeting Room 1 | It was agreed all meetings for this Semester will be face-to-face. |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | |