

Minutes of Quality Committee Meeting, June 27th 2018

Present: Prof. Ann Ryan, Prof. Colin Graham, Ms. Niamh Halfpenny, Paula Murray (Chair)

Apologies: Dr. Janeen Naji, Ms. Marie Griffin, Prof. Stephen Buckley, MSU Post Grad Rep, Dr. Zsuzsanna Zarka

In Attendance: Prof. Jim Walsh, CINNTE Institutional Co-Ordinator

1. The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming those present and noting the apologies. In the absence of Dr. Zsuzsanna Zarka the Chair agree to take minutes of the meeting in short point format. It was decided that only one item would be considered by those present at this meeting since the timeline for the CINNTE institutional Self-Assessment Report was very tight and Prof. Walsh required feedback from the Quality Committee. All other items will be held over to the next ordinary meeting of the Quality Committee.
2. QCI CINNTE Institutional Review (Draft 1 V14 24/08/18)
The Chair congratulated Prof. Walsh and the Quality Office staff for their considerable work and effort in creating the MU Institutional SAR. Prof. Walsh asked for comment and feedback on the MUQC Self-Assessment Report which had been shared with the Committee prior to meeting. A robust and open discussion took place with the CINNTE ICC answering queries, noting issues of concern and suggestions and offering explanations. The following is a brief note of the comments and suggestions offered by members of the Quality Committee:
 - There was general positive feedback on the extensive SAR and it was felt that the review of quality processes was appropriately self-critical.
 - 3.2 teaching and Academic Practice - The addition of student(s) to the Academic Programmes Committee was raised as a concern.
 - 3.2 teaching and Academic Practice - A member noted that a strategic decision has been taken to maintain the current staff:student ratio as it is not addressed in the new Strategic Plan.
 - 3.2 teaching and Academic Practice - Another member suggested that the calculations on P.21 of the draft SAR be checked to ensure that they match the KPIs.
 - 3.2 teaching and Academic Practice - The inclusion of a Feedback Policy was suggested for the new undergraduate curriculum.
 - Section 3.8, Student Experience, Student Supports and Student Life was discussed
The MSU representative tabled a document and noted that finance remained the same while student numbers have increased and hence finance per student has

decreased to €187 per student. It was agreed to remove “per student” from para 3 in 3.8.1 (p.41) under Student Experience, to read “The University has prioritised investment in academic staff, academic support services and support for student wellbeing, and has maintained constant the funding to MSU in support for...”

- 3.8.1 under the section “What have we learned from the above” it was suggested that this is expanded and explained in more detail.
- Section 3.8.2 (g) it was suggested that the statement be edited to indicate the following: The Placement Office assists students, organises and oversees work placements where these are part of the academic programme, in addition to supporting academic departments and employers.
- 3.13 Governance and Management Structures – under the section on the Quality Committee it was noted that there is no mention of the QC Terms of Reference and it was felt that the paragraph did not reflect the extent of the QC breadth and depth of work and responsibility, not only overseeing the quality obligations of the University but also ensuring a quality orientated community and ethos. Other suggestions are that the piece on the Quality Committee be moved to the front of the SAR document with additional descriptive text and the inclusion of the membership of the Quality Committee.
- Part 4: Synthesis and Conclusions – it was suggested that the word “superior” in regard to staff development programmes should be deleted since staff development is not generally available to all staff and the Athena Swan award is for academic staff only.
- A members suggested that the language of the SAR document be examined in light of statements which use words such as “excellent” and “best” as they are not clearly defined.
- Terminology that is inclusive of all should be used throughout the SAR.
- It was suggested that external stakeholders be included in more detail/sections of the SAR document.
- A member suggested that further education entry via CAO be included in the document.
- A general comment regarding the overall look and feel of the SAR document was that the addition of diagrams, graphs etc. could reduce the text content while still showing the information and making the document more readable and interesting.
- It was noted that no Appendices were included and the CINTE ICC stated that the Appendices would be listed in a separate document and would be made available to the reviewers on request.

The chair closed the meeting thanking those present for their contribution and time in considering the MU SAR. The Chair also noted that this was Prof. Ryan’s final Quality Committee Meeting and on behalf of the Quality Committee thanked Prof. Ryan for her considerable contribution to the committee and wished her well for her retirement. The meeting ended at 12.20.

Paula Murray
Chair, Quality Committee