



Maynooth University Quality Committee
Teams Meeting 30th May 2022 at 12.00 pm

Minutes

Present: Dr Alison FitzGerald (Chair), Dr Teresa Lee (Secretary), Professor Joseph Coughlan, Mr Niall Daly, Professor Fiona Lyddy, Dr Conor McCarthy, Ms Joan O’Riordan Bruton, Ms Sarah Searson.

Apologies: Ms Nicole Carr.

In Attendance: Ms Helen Berry.

| Agenda Item | Key Points/Decisions | Actions, if any (Follow-up by) |
|---------------------|--|--|
| 1 Membership Update | <p>The Chair informed the Committee that Dr Conor McCarthy will be replaced on the Committee by Academic Council early in the next Semester. The Chair thanked Dr McCarthy for his willingness to stay on the Quality Committee (QC) in the interim.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Ms Nicole Carr (Postgrad Rep) for her input on the Committee and will write a note of thanks to her.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Mr Niall Daly (VP Education MSU) for his input on the Committee and wished him well in his new role as President of MSU.</p> | The Chair to write a note of thanks to Ms Nicole Carr. |
| 2 Minutes | The draft minutes of the meeting of 25 th April were accepted as accurate. | Minutes adopted. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>3 Matters Arising</p> | <p>3.1 Quality Committee Annual Quality Report 2022, for Academic Council and Governing Authority.</p> <p>The Director of Quality informed the Committee the Annual Quality Report went to Academic Council last week, will be sent to Governing Authority this week, and to the University Executive for note. The Director thanked everyone on the Committee for their feedback. The timing of future QC meetings will allow for more input into the Report from Committee members. The Chair thanked the Director of Quality for her work on the Report.</p> <p>3.2 Joint Sectoral Protocol between Designated Awarding Bodies, and Quality and Qualifications Ireland for inclusion of Qualifications within the National Framework of Qualifications.</p> <p>The Director of Quality confirmed the Protocol was approved by Academic Council at the meeting on 23rd May 2022.</p> | <p>For Note.</p> <p>For Note.</p> |
| <p>4 Third Cycle of Quality Reviews</p> | <p>The Director of Quality gave an update on the Third Cycle of Quality Reviews:</p> <p>All eight Quality Improvement Plans for the FACSP have been received, with two completed. The remaining six are in draft format with QIP executive meetings to be set up in June. The QIP's will be finalised over the Summer and published with the Peer Review Reports on the Strategy and Quality Website in September/October. The eight final QIP's will be brought to the QC for note.</p> <p>Follow up reports for the FSE Departments and Estates and Capital Development will be requested in June. All other units reviewed prior to that will be requested to submit a synoptic report.</p> | <p>The Quality Office to set up QIP executive meetings in June.</p> <p>The Quality Office to request follow up and synoptic reports in June for completion by September.</p> |
| <p>5 Fourth Cycle of Quality Reviews</p> | <p>5.1 Review of Maynooth University Framework for Quality Assurance and Enhancement.</p> <p>The Director of Quality introduced this item and outlined some minor edits/factual changes that needed to be updated in the document. The Committee agreed that the minor edits/factual changes should be made to reflect current practices.</p> | <p>The Committee to provide any further feedback to the Director of Quality by the end of the week. The Director of Quality will then update the document.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>5.2 Draft Schedule of Quality Reviews for Cycle 4.</p> <p>The Director of Quality introduced this item and presented the draft schedule which will be sent to UE for approval by September.</p> <p>A discussion followed with the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where the schedule needs to be amended during the cycle, any changes will be brought to the QC for note. • The development of thematic reviews, should they be introduced, requires input from the VPA/UE. Proposals for thematic reviews will be invited from those attending the Deans' meetings. • There was discussion of the disaggregation of Strategy and Quality in terms of oversight – this to be raised with the VPA. • Instances, where a function or operation falls across more than one unit may be incorporated within the quality review of each unit involved or as deemed necessary, be provided for with a separate review. • Research Institutes (RIs), scheduled to be reviewed early in the fourth cycle, need to be aware that they may have insufficient time to consider the new Strategic Plan as part of their quality reviews if there are delays with completion of the Plan. • It has been agreed with the VP Research, to set up a Working Group of RI representatives to develop the terms of reference (ToR) for these quality reviews. This will ensure that reviews can take account of differences between them. • In terms of research units that fall outside the formal research institute structure these will be incorporated as part of the quality reviews of their associated unit(s). • Other items for consideration are, whether a review will be/is required: of the new structures of the faculties; of the critical skills offerings; and how quality offices are provided for in review cycles. • Add notes to the schedule to highlight anything that may not be captured. <p>5.3 Revision of Draft Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) – Template & Guidelines.</p> <p>The Director of Quality introduced this item and presented the updated draft document. The Working Group have agreed to the changes made. The Director of Quality and the original Working Group will now work on updating the follow up report template.</p> | <p>The Director of Quality to determine, from relevant departments, if the International Engineering College is best suited for a separate review or if it should it be incorporated into the separate reviews of each unit involved.</p> <p>The Director of Quality to check how the quality offices are reviewed at other institutions.</p> <p>The Committee approved the document.</p> <p>The Chair will seek replacements to the Working Group for exiting members of QC.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>5.4 Student participation in the quality review processes.</p> <p>The Director of Quality introduced this item and presented a document for discussion. The document focuses on ideas for increasing student integration throughout the quality review process. The key item is having student reviewers on peer review group (PRG) panels. It was reported that the VPA is supportive of having the student voice clearly articulated through the quality review process, and of having student representation on PRG panels, once it did not prove too onerous for the students involved.</p> <p>Discussion followed and the Committee agreed that partnership with students is fundamental to the process, and that students should be involved from the self-assessment report stage through to the production of the QIP. The variety of engagement opportunities proposed for students was welcomed and it was remarked that this approach would ensure that the student voice is captured from the outset with students seeing that their opinions have value. The VP Education (MSU) highlighted that greater use of MSU resources, such as the student elected representatives, should be made, in addition to drawing representation from the wider student body. It was recognised that units under review, and student participants will require support and guidance in order to ensure success in enhancing and increasing student engagement in the quality review process.</p> <p>5.5 Cycle 4 Draft concept map for quality reviews – integration of processes.</p> <p>The Director of Quality introduced this item and presented a draft Concept Map to Committee members for discussion.</p> <p>The Committee supported the ethos behind the approach. There was general consensus that there is a need to enhance existing practice and move away from the ‘big bang’ approach to quality assurance and enhancement. The proposed change would see an annual light-touch QA/QE report being produced by each unit that would inform a discussion meeting with the unit’s relevant dean or head of administrative</p> | <p>The Committee to provide any further ideas and feedback to the Director of Quality by the end of the week. The document to be updated and shared with the VPA for feedback.</p> <p>The Director of Quality to engage with NStEP and other Institutions to explore: the general concepts; the nature of training and resources that could be made available to students, and in particular for student reviewers on PRG panels.</p> <p>The Director of Quality to prepare a short document outlining options for the inclusion of student reviewers on PRG panels for presentation at the next meeting of the QC.</p> <p>The Committee to provide any further feedback to the Director of Quality by the end of the week. The Map will be updated on foot of all feedback received from Committee members with an updated Map then</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| | <p>area. Deans/heads of administrative areas would subsequently submit a short report to the Quality Committee that would include reference to progress made with unit-level QIPs. The Strategy & Quality Office would prepare a short report for the Quality Committee to highlight emerging themes and enhancements, and to report on overall progress with QIPs. The role of the Quality Committee in the process is a high-level one with oversight of the quality processes, together with a role in identifying where things are not working effectively.</p> <p>It was noted that the approach proposed aligns with the Deans' request that quality reviews place a greater focus on quality processes and procedures, and that they be a process that sees an emphasis on ongoing QA/QE. It was observed that the approach proposed was a positive and developmental one and sees an integration of quality matters into the planning cycle of academic and administrative units with their deans and heads of administrative areas. The changes outlined will see greater ownership relating to matters of quality assurance and enhancement resting with the deans and the heads of administrative areas. The changes will also provide for a closing of the QA/QE loop whilst embedding a culture of ongoing quality from unit level upwards. It was remarked that the process will also facilitate the identification of topics that merit a thematic quality review.</p> <p>It was recommended that bullet points are incorporated beneath the Concept Map flagging key changes or enhancements of the process.</p> <p>It was highlighted that templates for reporting purposes would be required so colleagues are all clear as to what to focus on as part of this new approach.</p> | <p>presented for feedback to the VPA, and to a Deans' meeting (expected to take place before the end of June).</p> <p>The Chair and the Director of Quality to report back to the Committee on the feedback received from the Deans' meeting.</p> |
| AOB | <p>The Chair reported that the President expects to be able to attend the next meeting of the QC, scheduled in October, to discuss quality enhancement.</p> <p>On 28th April the Chair attended the FACSP Internal Reviewers Feedback Workshop, organised by the Quality Office, where excellent and invaluable feedback was received on a variety of matters.</p> | <p>For Note.</p> <p>For Note.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>The Director of Quality notified the Committee the <i>Quality Officer</i> position is currently being advertised internally and externally. The role incorporates the function of the Student Complaints Procedure.</p> <p>Mr Niall Daly informed the Chair he will remain on the Committee as the MSU representative for the next academic year.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the Quality Office staff and everyone on the Committee for all their work this year.</p> <p>The Director of Quality thanked the Chair for her excellent work this year and all the Committee for their input throughout the year.</p> | <p>For Note.</p> <p>For Note.</p> |
| <p>Schedule of meetings for 2022/2023</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday, 3rd October 2022, at 12 noon • Monday, 28th November 2022, at 12 noon • Monday, 6th February 2023, at 12 noon • Monday, 20th March 2023, at 12 noon • Monday, 29th May 2023, at 12 noon | <p>The February date was revised to Tuesday, 7th February at 12 noon.</p> |