

**IUA Review [06/1] for IUA Meetings  
in NUIG on 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2006.**

	<b>Section</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>4.</b>
1.1.	National Research Plan 2007-2014	4.
1.2.	Science Foundation Ireland	4.
1.2.1.	<i>Fixed Term Work Act [see also Section 3.6]</i>	4.
1.3.	Research Strategy – Joint IUA/IBEC Conference	5.
1.4.	Work Permits and Visas for non-EU Researchers	5.
1.5.	European Research Policy	5.
1.5.1.	<i>Researchers Charter and Code of Conduct for Recruitment</i>	5.
1.6.	EU Sixth Framework Programme	6.
1.6.1.	<i>Human Resources &amp; Mobility Programme – Marie Curie</i>	6.
6.1.7.	EU Seventh Framework Programme	6.
1.7.1.	<i>National Support Structure for FP7</i>	6.
1.7.2.	<i>Rules for Participation in FP7</i>	7.
1.8.	Irish Researcher Mobility Centre and Web Portal	7.
1.9.	All Island Technology Transfer Feasibility Study	7.
1.10.	Expertiseireland.com	8.
1.11.	PRTLTI	8.
1.12.	Survey of R&D in the HE Sector 2004	9.
<b>2.</b>	<b>University Reform</b>	<b>9.</b>
2.1.	IUA Submission to Government	9.
2.2.	Strategic Innovation Fund	9.
2.3.	National Development Plan	11.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Funding</b>	<b>11.</b>
3.1.	Current Funding 2005/2006	11.
3.2.	Capital Funding	12.
3.3.	Funding Model	12.
3.4.	Pensions Issues	14.
3.4.1.	<i>Sectoral Approach</i>	14.
3.4.2.	<i>Funding Issues</i>	14.
3.4.3.	<i>Transfer of Nurse Tutors to University Pension Schemes</i>	15.
3.5.	Fixed Term Work Act	15.
3.6.	Tax Relief Schemes	15.

3.7.	Nursing – Transfer of Midwifery & Nursing Education to Third Level	16.
<b>4.</b>	<b>HEA</b>	<b>16.</b>
4.1.	Code of Practice for the Governance of Third Level Institutions	16.
4.2.	Review Body on Higher Remuneration in the Public Sector	17.
4.3.	Members of the Higher Education Authority	17.
<b>5.</b>	<b>New Procedures/Regulations</b>	<b>17.</b>
5.1.	Taxation Issues	17.
5.2.	Procurement	18.
<b>6.</b>	<b>Ombudsman</b>	<b>18.</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Access</b>	<b>19.</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Internationalisation</b>	<b>20.</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>International Developments</b>	<b>20.</b>
9.1.	EU Budget Agreement	20.
9.2.	EUA Projects	21.
9.2.1.	<i>Trends V Report</i>	21.
9.2.2.	<i>EUA Follow-up Report on Doctoral Programmes for the London Ministerial Conference</i>	21.
9.2.3.	<i>Publication of a Bologna Handbook</i>	22.
9.2.4.	<i>Co-ordination of the National Teams of Bologna Promoters</i>	22.
9.3.	“Responsible Partnering” Guidelines on Better Practices for Collaborative Research between Universities and Industry	22.
9.4.	Council of Europe: Recommendation on University Heritage	23.
<b>10.</b>	<b>Quality Assurance</b>	<b>23.</b>
10.1.	EUA Review of QA Procedures	23.
10.2.	IUQB	24.
10.2.1.	<i>Appointment of New Board Members</i>	24.
10.2.2.	<i>Establishment of IUQB on a Legal Basis</i>	24.
10.2.3.	<i>Research and Communications Co-ordinator</i>	24.
10.2.4.	<i>Sectoral Projects</i>	24.
10.3.	Irish Higher Education Quality Network	27.

<b>11.</b>	<b>National Framework of Qualifications</b>	<b>27.</b>
11.1.	Placement of Awards within the Framework	27.
11.2.	Access, Transfer and Progression	27.
11.3.	European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning and Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area	28.
<b>12.</b>	<b>Reports n Higher Education Regulation</b>	<b>28.</b>
12.1.	Australia’s National HE Protocols	28.
12.2.	Institutional Academic Mobility	29.
<b>13.</b>	<b>IUA Issues</b>	<b>29.</b>
13.1.	IUA Launch	29.
13.2.	Communications Project	29.
<b>14.</b>	<b>Copyright</b>	<b>29.</b>
<b>15.</b>	<b>Lifelong Learning</b>	<b>30.</b>

## **IUA Review [06/1] for IUA Meetings in NUIG on 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2006.**

### **1. Research**

#### **1.1 National Research Plan 2007-2014**

It is expected that the national research plan will go to cabinet in early February with a public announcement soon after. The plan's costings are based on a model that calculates the R&D investment required based on the number of researchers at all levels (from PhD students to Principal Investigators). The IUA Executive has been working closely with DETE and HEA on the details. We are now satisfied that the overall team structure being used for SET Research (1 Principal Investigator, 3 Postdocs, 5 PhD students, 1 Technician and 1 Lab Manager/Administrator). We still have serious concerns on the costings. For example, allocating 20% of total salaries costs to cover research costs (small equipment, consumables, travel etc.). This would imply about €9000 per researcher per annum which is far too low to support laboratory based research.

While this investment is to be warmly welcomed it will present a number of major challenges to the universities. These include;

- The expectation that each institution will match 20% of capital costs and 30% of recurrent costs.
- The use of a 30% overhead rather than the goal of moving to a full cost research model.
- Far greater opportunities to collaborate with industry as the funds for EI and IDA will be significantly increased.

IUA President sent a letter to Secretary General DES outlining provisions of the NRP which could impact on the funding of universities by the DES and other concerns.

#### **1.2. Science Foundation Ireland**

##### **1.2.1. Fixed Term Workers Act [See also section 3.6]**

SFI have refused to accept applications from universities with the 20% pension cost built in to the salaries. They have requested applicants to either delete the request or their proposal will be rejected. This is clearly in contrast to the policy of many of the other funding agencies. In fact the 2005 annual report of the Standing Committee of the Research Funding Bodies specifically mentions the agreement and SFI is a member of this group.

**1.3. Research Strategy – Joint I.U.A./I.B.E.C. Conference – “Careering Towards the Knowledge Society”, 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2005, the Helix, DCU**

This third in a series of IUA conferences on research careers explored the challenges facing industry and academia in creating sustainable research career pathways, in light of the main recommendation of the Building Irelands Knowledge Economy report - that Ireland doubles its number of researchers in academia and industry by 2014. The conference was addressed by key national and international speakers, and was opened by Mr. Michéal Martin, Minister for Enterprise, Trade and Employment - [http://www.iua.ie/news\\_events/iuaibeconference.htm](http://www.iua.ie/news_events/iuaibeconference.htm)

**1.4 Work Permits and Visas for non EU Researchers**

Based on an IUA position paper forwarded to the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment, the Fast Track Work Permit System currently in existence for the Universities will be extended to all publicly funded research projects in all research organisations. In addition, DETE is progressing the issue of green cards for highly skilled workers which will include researchers.

The IUA is involved in discussions on the implementation of the Third Country Researcher Directive with the relevant government departments (DETE and the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform) and the European Commission.

**1.5. European Research Policy**

**1.5.1. Researchers Charter and Code of Conduct for Recruitment**

The European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for Recruitment of Researchers is being adopted and implemented in many European Countries. [http://europa.eu.int/eracareers/pdf/am509774CEE\\_EN\\_E4.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eracareers/pdf/am509774CEE_EN_E4.pdf). The Irish universities were fully involved in the development of the Charter and much of it simply reflects what is already practised in our institutions. The Charter is being adopted across Europe by different organisations, for example the following have signed up to the Code and Charter:

<b>Country</b>	<b>Organisation name</b>
FRANCE	<u>The Rectors' Conference of the French Universities (CPU)</u>
FRANCE	<u>The National Centre of Scientific Research (CNRS)</u>
GERMANY	<u>The German Rectors' Conference (HRK)</u>
GREECE	Euroscience/Greece
ITALY	<u>AREA Science Park of Trieste</u>
ITALY	<u>The National Research Council (CNR)</u>
ITALY	<u>The Rectors' Conference of the Italian Universities (CRUI)</u>
LITHUANIA	<u>The Lithuanian Government</u>
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	<u>The Rectors of the Slovak Higher Education Institutions</u>
SWITZERLAND	<u>The Rectors' Conference of the Swiss Universities (CRUS)</u>

The Irish Universities should now consider adopting the Code and Charter as it will add to their European standing and represents no more than what is already good practice in the system.

## **1.6. EU Sixth Framework Programme**

### **1.6.1. Human Resources & Mobility Programme – Marie Curie**

The Marie Curie Programme continues to be the most successful part of the Framework Programme for Ireland and represents 30% of the total research income from FP6. The majority of the final Calls for these schemes occur in January 2006. For the remainder of this programme there is €450m available, and the IUA, as National Contact Point for the Marie Curie Programme estimates that the €50m target for Ireland in Marie Curie for FP6 will be exceeded. In order to provide key support to applicants the IUA held a workshop on 13<sup>th</sup> December with the participation of the European Commission, successful applicants and members of the peer review panel. The session attracted over 75 attendees with 31 companies. As a result the Marie Curie office within the IUA is now working with over 40 applicants. We expect a high success rate in these final calls. A recent article in the Irish Times (21<sup>st</sup> November, 2005) “Republic wins €42m in research funding” by Jamie Smyth, European Correspondent highlighted the success of the programme for Ireland.

## **1.7 EU Seventh Framework Programme**

### **1.7.1 National Support Structure for FP7**

IUA is deeply concerned with the current national support structures for FP6. National performance in terms of research income is abysmal bar that for the Marie Curie Programme. The IUA’s effective national support means that this is now over 30% of the total Irish income from FP6 for a programme that is only 9% of the total available FP6 budget. The DETE and

Forfás have established a consultative group to recommend the support structure for researchers in FP7. IUA is in the process of making a submission to this group that will propose an effective national support structure closely networked with the relevant offices within the universities (including Research, Finance and Technology Transfer Offices).

#### **1.7.2 Rules for Participation in FP7**

IUA has been involved in ongoing consultation on the Rules for Participation in FP7, The Universities, through their Research Officers and Research Accountants have conveyed their major concerns to Government in a submission made by the IUA. The removal of the Additional Cost Model, and the requirement to use a full cost grant in FP7 will leave the universities at a significant disadvantage. Ongoing lobbying of Government by the IUA, as well as interaction with the EUA will continue during the implementation phase of the Rules under the Austrian presidency.

#### **1.8. Irish Researcher Mobility Centre and Web Portal**

The project is now in its second year and the network is continuing to expand its membership. As a response to the IUA submission for increased Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment funding to develop the recruitment function of the Irish Portal, the IUA has been successful in increasing the DETE allocation from €25,000 to €40,000 for 2006.

This money will be used for the next phase of the [researchcareersireland.com](http://researchcareersireland.com) portal which involves the integration of the Research Job Opportunities Editor function. This will allow the universities to upload and advertise their research job opportunities both nationally and in Europe. The Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment will cover a large portion of this development but will also need a commitment from each of the universities.

#### **1.9. All Island Technology Transfer Feasibility Study**

This study was initiated by Universities Ireland in September 2004 and funded by InterTrade Ireland. It was conducted by the Technology Research Services at Heriot-Watt University, international experts in this area.

### 1.10 *Expertiseireland.com*

The number of experts contributing information to the portal has broken the 4,100 barrier. The breakdown is as follows:

University College Dublin	658
Dublin Institute of Technology	626
University of Dublin, Trinity College	550
University of Ulster	535
Dublin City University	466
Queen's University Belfast	409
University College Cork	400
University of Limerick	235
National University of Ireland, Galway	222
National University of Ireland, Maynooth	74
Institute of Technology Tallaght	4

The number of Technology Transfer Licensing Opportunities has increased to 24 from 5 institutions.

A comparison of the average monthly statistics is provided in the table below.

<b>Comparison of the average statistics per month for 2004 vs 2005</b>			
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Average duration per visit	26	33	26.9
# Page Impressions	17571	24651	40.3
# Searches	1640	2201	34.2
# Visits	1461	2423	65.8
New registrations	60	71	18.3
News articles viewed	213	137	-35.7
# Profiles accessed	1604	3019	88.2

The number of contributing profiles has increased by 25% from January 2004 to 2005.

Work is in progress to get expert contributions from DARD (Department of Agriculture and Rural Development), Teagasc and the ESRI. Efforts are continuing to get the contribution from all the Institutes of Technology.

### 1.11. *PRTL*

The HEA wrote to university Heads on 2<sup>nd</sup> December, 2005 to inform them that the 17% increase in dedicated R&D funding in DES 2006 Estimates included funding for the start-up of Cycle 4 of PRTL. The HEA said that it was preparing for a formal call for proposals early in

2006. The call would be a two-phased process involving Expressions of Interest as the first phase.

### **1.12. Survey of R&D in the HE Sector 2004**

Some of the main findings of this Forfás report on HERD in Ireland in 2004 are –

- HERD expenditure increased by 52.6% in 2004 over 2002,
- In real terms HERD increased by 44% between 2002 and 2004,
- Direct government funding increased by 48% from 2002 to 2004 while indirect (via HEA block grant) increased by 58% in real terms in the same period,
- The HERD intensity ratio (HE R&D expenditure divided by economic activity) rose from 0.27% of GNP in 2000 to 0.40% in 2004 which is still below the EU 25 average of 0.43% of GDP and only 16<sup>th</sup> out of 26 OECD countries.

## **2. University Reform**

### **2.1. IUA Submission to Government**

The draft IUA paper, revised in line with discussions at the Council meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2005 was circulated to Council Members for agreement. The paper was further amended to take account of comments received and was forwarded to Secretary General, DES for discussion at a meeting with DES and HEA on 15<sup>th</sup> October, 2005.

In finalising the paper before submission to Government the Council took on board suggestions made at the DES/HEA meeting. The final paper “*Reform of Third Level and Creation of Fourth Level Ireland – Securing Competitive Advantage in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*” was submitted to the Taoiseach and to each Government Minister on 27<sup>th</sup> October, 2006. The submission received positive newspaper coverage.

The IUA followed up the submission with a pre-budget meeting with Mr. Brian Cowen, TD, Minister for Finance and Ms. Mary Hanafin, Minister for Education and Science, and their officials on 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2005.

### **2.2. Strategic Innovation Fund**

The Minister for Finance, in his budget speech, made a significant statement on investment in higher education and its role in economic and social development. He stated that “*a major initiative within this Budget is a commitment to the establishment of a new PhD level of education, a fourth level*” and described it “*as a major plank of government policy*”. He confirmed the Government’s intention to create a multi-annual Strategic Innovation Fund [SIF] for higher education and announced €300m for the fund over 5 years.

In a joint press conference with Minister Hanafin on 11<sup>th</sup> December, 2005 the Taoiseach in commenting on the provision for higher education in the Budget said –

*“what is demanded is the transformation of third level education and the creation of a new fourth level tier that places Irish research capacity at the global cutting edge. The €300m Strategic Innovation Fund for universities and institutes of technology is intended to drive that transformation over the next five years”.*

In her statement on the same date, the Minister for Education and Science, in summarising the SIF said that it would –

- *“incentivise and reward internal restructuring and reform efforts,*
- *promote teaching and learning reforms, including enhanced teaching methods, programme restructuring at third and fourth level, modularisation and e-learning,*
- *support quality improvement initiatives aimed at excellence,*
- *promote access, transfer and progression and incentivise stronger inter-institutional collaboration in the development and delivery of programmes,*
- *provide for improved performance management systems and meet staff training and support requirements associated with the reform of structures and the implementation of new processes, and*
- *implement improved management information systems.”*

Minister Hanafin further stated that *“commitment to a guaranteed five year Fund allows for meaningful and far-reaching proposals for change to be brought forward. An initial €15 million will be available next year in what is essentially a start-up year. This will grow to €60 million in 2007 and to €75 million per annum in 2008, 2009 and 2010”.*

*“... there will be a requirement on institutions to contribute funds from their own resources to copper-fasten the reform efforts. This is important in ensuring that the Fund can leverage fundamental change throughout the system through promoting new thinking and new priorities in the use of existing resources”.*

The HEA, in its proposals for a Revised Funding Mechanism sent to University Heads on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2005 sought views on the broad outline of a framework for the allocation of the SIF which was set out in Section 7 of the document.

In October 2005, at the request of the DES, the HEA had prepared a detailed draft proposal for a Strategic Innovation Fund. The HEA accepts that new proposals have to be prepared which take account of recent statements made by the Taoiseach and his Ministers about Budget provision for the SIF which were in effect a response to the IUA submission. The HEA has agreed to meet with the IUA on this matter.

The immediate challenge facing the universities is to agree a sectoral position on suitable principles, criteria, guidelines and processes for the SIF and to negotiate them with HEA/DES.

Ideally the principles etc, for SIF should be informed by a national higher education strategy. Minister Hanafin did make a wide-ranging statement in response to the OECD Report in April 2005 but key recommendations for maintaining the binary system were not addressed. National policy on this would be fundamental to the criteria for the SIF.

### **2.3. *National Development Plan***

The Minister for Finance, at his meeting with IUA on 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2005 stated that higher education and research would be a major part of the government's next National Development Plan [NDP]. Whereas in the last plan, only some elements of funding for higher education were included, the new plan would include the recurrent and capital funding of higher education. This has since been confirmed in subsequent budget statements by the Taoiseach and Ministers Cowen and Hanafin.

This development will, in effect, move higher education centre stage in economic and social planning. The NDP should include a clear and comprehensive government policy statement on higher education. Such a statement will also be necessary as a framework for decision-making by the assessment panels proposed under the Revised Funding Mechanism and the Strategic Innovation Fund. The Government has committed itself to an extensive consultation process on the preparation of the NDP. The universities need to actively engage with the DES and HEA to ensure that their views on the development of higher education are reflected in the NDP policy statement on HE.

The government, in a recent press release, set out in a general way the strategic context and background to the NDP 2007-2013, and an indicative overview of the proposed general content of the next NDP and of the initial thinking on the proposed monitoring and implementation arrangements.

## **3. Funding**

### **3.1. *Current Funding 2005/2006***

The Estimates 2006 provision for state recurrent expenditures was published by the government on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2005. They revealed an increase of approximately €47m to €119m in the universities subhead (7% increase) and an increase of approximately €3m to €12m (7% increase) for the IOTs. In her speech on the estimates the Minister indicated that a separate process has commenced to examine the funding requirements of a number of university pension cost issues, including the Fixed Term Work Act. It is expected that separate funding would be made available in respect of these issues.

A 7% increase in recurrent funding together with the agreed increase in the undergraduate tuition fee of up to 7% for the academic year 2005/06 represents a ‘stand still’ position for the sector in the context of known unavoidable cost increases which were calculated to be in the region of 7.6% for the year.

Proposals for grant allocations to individual universities in respect of 2006 were considered by the HEA at its meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> January, 2006.

### **3.2. Capital Funding**

The Minister for Finance, Brian Cowen TD, in his budget speech on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2005 announced that €900m would be made available for the third level sector in the Minister for Education & Science’s capital envelope for 2006 – 2010. Further details were provided by the Minister for Education & Science, Mary Hanafin TD on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2005 when she announced that €575m would be made available for 35 approved projects within the third level sector. A further €5m has been made available to covers commitments due in respect of PRTL. The balance of approximately €200m will be used to meet emerging priorities in the context of the overall national strategy.

Of the 35 projects approved only seven relate to universities. The significant imbalance in state funding of Institute of Technology and university infrastructure is of significant concern and be raised at an early meeting with Secretary General of the Department of Education & Science.

The urgent challenge for universities is to make a convincing case for increased capital funding of universities in the short term. The immediate focus is the unallocated €200m within the 5 year rolling capital budget for Third Level. This will need to be made by the sector on the basis of concrete capital projects already in the planning pipeline, urgent minor works and equipment needs. Universities also need to make a case now for the additional funds that should be provided for in the 6th and 7th year of the rolling budget.

The sector must also give consideration to how to devise a process which would best present and represent the infrastructural development needs of the sector with a view to maximising overall state funding for university capital projects.

### **3.3. Funding Model**

The Higher Education Authority, at its December meeting, agreed to implement a revised recurrent funding mechanism on a phased basis commencing with the 2006 recurrent grant allocation and notified the Presidents/Provost of this on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2005. The key elements of the model are as follows:-

- The core recurrent grant will be allocated on a standard per capita amount in respect of weighted EU student numbers in four broad subject price groups

- Student numbers will be required to be audited
- There will be a further weighting for research students and access students
- 5% of funding will be top sliced and allocated based on research activity
- 10% of allocated core funding will be performance related and subject to meeting certain criteria

The HEA had made presentations to both the UCFOG and Registrar's Group on the proposed model. Both groups welcomed the move towards a model which rewards and encourages key strategic objectives of institutions and the state, however a number of fundamental issues were raised with the proposed model. The Chief Finance Officers in particular had significant concerns in respect of certain aspects of the model and wrote to the HEA in relation to these on 30<sup>th</sup> November.

The key issues arising for universities from the model include the following:-

- The reliability and consistency of student numbers across all institutions is imperative. There must be clearly agreed definitions and categorisations of students. Particular attention must be given to the calculation of fee's for part-time and modularised students, categorisation of students in cross disciplinary courses etc.
- Clear and agreed definitions are also required in respect of access students
- Given inconsistencies and concerns in relation to the reliability of current student numbers, the implementation of the model in 2006 without a full independent audit of student numbers to agreed definitions is extremely unsatisfactory
- The new model is being implemented without universities knowing the impact of the model on existing core funding levels
- Are weightings for subject price groups appropriate? No detailed workings have been provided to universities in respect of weightings or a comparison of allocations under the old and new models.
- The length of degree programmes or retention levels are not taken into consideration in the model
- Is a 5% top-slicing for research adequate in the context of developing research intensive universities?
- Clarification is required in relation to the proposed harmonisation of fees under the model and the impact that this may have on the quantum of funding available to institutions.
- The proposed mainstreaming of current strategic initiative funding may have significant IR and other issues for universities, particularly where the employment contracts indicate that positions are subject to continued funding being available. The mainstreaming of such funding may give rise to such individuals seeking permanency.
- How does the 10% of core funding reserved for performance/strategic outcomes relate to the requirement on universities for 50% contribution to SIF projects?

### **3.4. Pension Issues**

#### **3.4.1. Sectoral Approach**

The IUA Working Group on Pensions reported to the IUA Plenary meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> October, 2005 outlining its recommendations in respect of

1. Issues arising from the Protection of Employees (Fixed Term Work) Act
2. Funding Issues/State guarantee
3. Revised Superannuation Arrangements (Model Scheme).

The group also recommended some further areas for consideration. The Group's recommendations were approved at the Plenary meeting.

#### **3.4.2. Funding Issues**

As reported previously the HEA had sought a nomination from the IUA to participate in a HEA Working Group on Pensions set up to consider the wide range of pension funding issues facing the sector. M. Gleeson, Secretary TCD and Chair of IUA Working Group on Pensions and E. Ceannt, Bursar UCD were nominated to represent IUA on the group. The group is chaired by M. Kelly, Chairman HEA and also includes M. Kerr, HEA and R. Carmody, DES.

The group met on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2005. At the meeting it was agreed that the issue of 'knock-for-knock' arrangements would also be added to the terms of reference of the group. The chairman noted that it was the view of the Department of Finance that all pension related issues had to be considered together and that it was essential that the sector acted together in relation to these issues.

Subsequent to the meeting the HEA wrote to the five universities with pension funds requesting information including the following:-

- Existing actuarial valuations to be updated to September 2005 and details of funding requirements to be provided
- A quantification of how much of the existing deficit relates to added years
- The % increase in funding arising from the FTWA
- The annual funding rate required to be detailed as follows:-
  - on-going funding rate if schemes were fully funded
  - the funding element relating to past deficits

The Working Group stressed the importance of the sector working together in relation to these matters and noted that it was essential that no university would undertake any action in respect of their schemes until all issues have been addressed by the group.

### **3.4.3 *Transfer of Nurse Tutors to University Pension Schemes***

Significant progress has been made in relation to the finalisation of the transfer of nurse tutors to university pension schemes. The IUA, Mercer and the Department of Health & Children met in December 2005 to review progress and it was agreed that sufficient progress had been made to allow interim payments to be made to university pension schemes in respect of transfer values. The following amounts were transferred to university schemes on 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 2005; TCD €3.0m, UCD €2.5m, NUIG €0.8m and UCC €0.65m. No liabilities will be transferred to university schemes until final transfer values have been agreed early in 2006.

### **3.5. *Fixed Term Work Act***

Arising from the recommendations of the IUA Working Group on Pensions the IUA President wrote to all funding agencies detailing the additional funding requirements arising from the implementation of the Protection of Employees (Fixed Term Work) Act 2003.

The IUA also wrote to the HEA requesting them to also contact all relevant funding agencies to instruct/advise them to make the necessary provisions in their grants for compliance by the universities with the requirements of the Act.

As noted in Section 3.1 above the DES and DoF are currently considering the funding requirements of the pension issues facing the sector, including the implications of the Fixed Term Work Act. It is anticipated that additional funding will be forthcoming in respect of these costs.

### **3.6. *Tax Relief Schemes***

The Minister for Finance, Mr. Brian Cowen TD, in his budget speech on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2005, announced the discontinuation of a number of tax relief schemes including the *Relief for Rented Residential Accommodation for Third Level Students* (Section 50) and the *Relief for Investment in Third Level Educational Buildings* (Section 843). There have however been limited extensions to the 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2006 deadline by which expenditure must be incurred for allowances to be available. Full relief will be available for qualifying expenditure up to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2006. Thereafter relief is scaled back in the period to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2008. Allowances are available on 75% of qualifying expenditure incurred in 2007 and on 50% of qualifying expenditure incurred in the period from 1<sup>st</sup> January to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2008. No relief will apply in respect of expenditure incurred after that date.

In addition to the above there was also an announcement in the budget of significant restrictions to be introduced in relation to the use of tax reliefs by high income taxpayers.

A paper detailing recommendations in respect of the development of tax relief mechanisms for the funding of capital projects in universities had been submitted to the Minister for Finance in advance of the budget but does not appear to have influenced the Minister. A HEA working

group has been established to consider this area and E. Ceannt, Bursar UCD is representing the IUA on the group.

### **3.7. *Nursing – Transfer of Midwifery and Nursing Education to Third Level***

An Tánaiste and Minister for Health, Mary Harney TD has approved the transfer of undergraduate midwifery and children's nursing degree programmes to third level commencing in autumn 2006. Post-graduate courses will not be transferring at this point. The new programmes will mean a realignment of health service providers and education institutions in some cases.

An implementation group will be established within the Department of Health & Children to work with the HSE in facilitating the smooth implementation of the new programmes, including any issues that may arise in relation to the existing post registration programmes.

## **4. *HEA***

### **4.1. *Code of Practice for the Governance of Third Level Institutions***

The Secretaries Group met with representatives of the HEA on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2005 to consider the Draft Code of Practice for the Governance of Third Level Institutions. At the meeting it was agreed that although all universities agree to the principles and broad thrust of the draft code the proposed DES document is not acceptable to universities for the following reasons:-

- It is too prescriptive
- Some of the detail and conditions included are not relevant, appropriate or acceptable to universities
- A single standard code for the whole third level sector is not appropriate

It was proposed that the IUA, in conjunction with the HEA, would appoint an independent expert to review the current DES document and the existing Financial Governance Framework and, taking into account current international best practice, agree a Joint HEA/IUA Framework for the Governance of Universities.

Subsequent to the meeting the Chair of the University Secretaries Group wrote to the HEA outlining the proposed approach to progressing and finalising this matter, highlighting some of the key issues for universities with the DES draft document and detailing the current governance practices within universities.

#### **4.2. *Review Body on Higher Remuneration in the Public Sector***

The HEA wrote to university Heads on 6<sup>th</sup> January, 2006 conveying sanction for the implementation of the first phase of pay increases arising from Report No.40 [O'Brien Report]. Salaries for specified grades were stipulated to represent the total remuneration for the posts. Attention was drawn to recommendations of previous Review Body Reports regarding superannuation arrangements and additional payments to apply to all posts covered by the sanction and to conditions relating to residences for heads of institutions.

#### **4.3. *Members of the Higher Education Authority***

The Government, on the recommendation of the Minister for Education and Science, appointed seven persons to be ordinary members of the Authority for the period commencing 6<sup>th</sup> December, 2005 and ending 5<sup>th</sup> December, 2010.

### **5. *New Procedures/Regulations***

#### **5.1 *Taxation Issues***

An IUA taxation working group met with officials from the Revenue Commissioners on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2005 to discuss a number of issues relating to payroll taxes. The meeting proved beneficial and Revenue agreed to assist in putting procedures in place to simplify and speed up the process for facilitating foreign visiting individuals.

A number of issues arose during discussions which require consideration by universities including the following:-

- All visiting lecturers/academics should fall within the PAYE system except in the case of genuine 'once-off' lectures.
- It was Revenue's view at the meeting that other 'visiting' individuals including external examiners, external assessors, external members of quality review panels etc. should fall within the PAYE system.
- This has particular issues for the reimbursement of expenses and effectively such individuals would be subject to tax on the reimbursement of expenses relating to their travel to a university. This will have significant cost implications for universities and may impact on the ability of universities to attract external individuals.
- Revenue are currently reconsidering the displacement policy in relation to BIK on fee remission

Following the meeting the IUA wrote to Revenue outlining its concerns in relation to some of these areas and seeking a ruling in respect of certain types of individuals with a view to addressing these issues. We await a response in relation to these matters.

## 5.2 **Procurement**

The new EU Directive on procurement is due to be signed into Irish law by 1<sup>st</sup> February 2006. It is intended that a one-day seminar will be organised for senior university officers and budget holders in relation to the legal and compliance issues arising from the directive and the maximisation of value for money within universities. The target date for the seminar is late March 2006.

## 6. **Ombudsman**

DES has written to the IUA to say that the Department is of the view that there is no impediment to the inclusion of the universities under the Ombudsman Act and that the Parliamentary Draftsman is being asked to draft an amendment to the Act to extend the Ombudsman's remit to include higher education institutions in respect of the following areas:-

- Procurement
- Admission of Students
- Categorisation of students for Fee Purposes

The DES selected these areas on the basis that independent appeals procedures were not in place in all universities in the areas.

IUA had written to DES last March in relation to an original proposal for blanket inclusion of universities under the Ombudsman Act. The letter suggested *inter alia* that the section 5(1)(a)(iii) of the Ombudsman Act 1980 which excludes action in relation to a person who has a right of appeal, reference or review to, or before a person other than a Department of State, or other specified persons in the First Schedule of the Act appeared to exclude investigations by the Ombudsman into actions taken by a university having regard to the provisions of Sections 26(1) and 2(c) of the Universities Act 1997.

IUA also pointed out that students, staff and graduates under the Universities Act were members of the university and were therefore not the "public" in the ordinary sense of public bodies providing services to the public. No response was received from DES until the HEA informally contacted IUA on 23<sup>rd</sup> November, 2005 to say that DES were suggesting the above three specific areas of university operations for inclusion in the Act. HEA said that it seemed the onus was on the university sector to prove that the appeals procedures under Section 26 of the Universities Act were robust and comprehensive and independent enough to justify the earlier position taken by the IUA.

The DES position is informed by the advice of its internal legal services section that *“the fact that there is an internal grievance or appeal procedure does not in any way preclude the Ombudsman having jurisdiction to deal with such matters. The Ombudsman would only be excluded from dealing with a complaint if the appeals system were independent of the university. Therefore, my view from a legal perspective, is that there is no impediment to having the Ombudsman legislation apply to universities”*

However, it appears that DES legal services acknowledged that *“if independent appeals procedures provided for under S.26 were subsequently put in place, the Ombudsman would then have no jurisdiction over particular issues covered”*.

In the case of the areas chosen by DES for inclusion under the Ombudsman Act, complainants could fall into the category of the “public” seeking services from universities. For instance, persons with a complaint about admission or categorisation of students for fee purposes would not become a member of the university until after admission. It is not clear what aspects of admissions or categorisation of students DES has in mind. Even the area of procurement is not clear. Do students procure services etc from a university? It is proposed that these developments be reviewed by IUA groups concerned with the proposed areas for inclusion under the Act to be followed by a meeting of the Working Group on the Ombudsman Act to consider an appropriate response to DES.

## 7. **Access**

An evaluation of access programmes in all universities and IoTs has been launched by the HEA’s National Office for Equity of Access to Higher Education (NAO). This evaluation has been planned following discussion within the NAO’s advisory group, in which IUA is represented, and the draft terms of reference and methodology were presented to IUA Registrars at their meeting in UCC on 17 October prior to finalisation. It was agreed at this meeting that the scope of the evaluation would be enlarged to include consideration of wider systems-level access policy issues as well as the workings of individual access programmes.

The evaluation is based on a self-evaluation by each HEI, and reporting through a template-style instrument to the HEA consultant, Cynthia Deane of Options Consulting. The deadline for reports from each HEI is 22 February 2006. The external analysis of these reports and discussions of preliminary findings with a number of focus groups will then take place. IUA has requested that such a discussion take place between the HEA and the Registrars’ Group at the latter’s meeting at UL on 10 April 2006.

In parallel, the IUA access officers group had requested a review of the Higher Education Access Route (HEAR) programme for socio-economically disadvantaged students, and prepared draft TOR. It was agreed between the access officers’ and registrars’ groups that this

review would be incorporated as far as possible into the HEA evaluation process, and explicitly into each university's HEA self-evaluation process, including the gathering of an agreed core set of HEAR data from each university. It was suggested however that a special focus group should be convened to consider preliminary sectorally-relevant findings arising from each university's own review, and to draw relevant conclusions and recommendations in conjunction with the HEA consultant. A preliminary date for this meeting has been set for 2 March 2006.

## **8. *Internationalisation***

Following on previous work undertaken by the IUA international officers and registrars, a number of steps were taken during the last 3 months of 2005 to promote further the internationalisation efforts of IUA universities at a collective level.

A meeting of IUA international officers was held on 16 November at which it was decided to press ahead with the collective branding and marketing of IUA member universities under the IUA banner. This resulted in letters being sent to Enterprise Ireland and the International Education Board of Ireland (IEBI) informing them of this and requesting that the universities be placed together when participating in fairs, missions, in documentation etc. Planning regarding the IUA collective presence at the 2006 NAFSA fair has also begun.

A detailed letter was sent in December to visa officers in the Department of Justice outlining IUA concerns and suggestions regarding the current visa service and regime. A meeting with senior officials will be arranged for early in 2006.

IUA is currently preparing a brochure on the Irish university system aimed at international partners, with the objective of ensuring greater awareness of the distinctive role played by the universities in the Irish tertiary education landscape.

## **9 *International Developments / EUA***

### **9.1 *EU Budget Agreement***

The EUA reported that the European Heads of State and government reached an agreement in December 2005 on the future EU financial perspectives for the period 2007-2013. Divided in five sections, future expenditure falls far short of the European Commission's proposals, especially for Research, Education and Training policies. A total of €72 billion is attributed to all activities funded under the Competitiveness for growth and Employment heading which comprises the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Research programme (FP7), the future Education and Training programme (Socrates/Leonardo), internal market activities and social policy, as well as nuclear decommissioning.

Despite stating that the resources available for research in 2013 should be 75% higher than in 2006, the European Council made no firm commitment to ensure this target is met. Regardless, the new figures are far below the initial European Commission's proposal to allocate €73 billion to the research and development activities, as the budget for FP7 may be drastically reduced to €45 billion. Likewise, proposals currently under discussion at the European Parliament to increase funding for Erasmus students and other Education initiatives may not be realised in the context of such a tight budget.

Nevertheless, the agreement shows an increase in funding in higher education and research, and potential new funding sources, such as structural funds and loans from the European Investment Bank, have also been mentioned. It will not, however, be sufficient to support universities and other stakeholders in their efforts to make the European knowledge society a reality.

## **9.2. *EUA Projects***

### **9.2.1. *Trends V Report***

In November 2005, the EUA launched a survey of some 1000 universities and other higher education institutions across Europe regarding the development of the European higher education area, and in particular regarding the implementation of the Bologna Process. The results of the survey will be followed up by case studies and focus groups to provide input for the EUA's Trends V report which will be presented to universities and Ministers in early 2007, to assess changes across European higher education since 2002-03 when a similar exercise was conducted, and to make a direct contribution to developing policy for the next stages of the Bologna Process.

This is one of the universities' most important collective tools in providing bottom-up information and evidence to influence this inter-governmental process. IUA wrote to the universities on 16<sup>th</sup> December, 2006 to say that none of the Irish universities have yet responded to the survey, despite a deadline of 2<sup>nd</sup> December, 2005 and to urge them to respond.

### **9.2.2. *EUA Follow-up Report on Doctoral Programmes for the London Ministerial Conference***

The Bergen Communiqué asks EUA to prepare a report on doctoral programmes for the London Ministerial meeting in 2007. Working together with the Austrian and French governments, EURODOC and ESIB, EUA will follow up the Salzburg recommendations by focusing on (1) programmes – transparency, supervision and assessment, research progress/duration, transmission of skills and competences, etc; (2) institutions – creating critical mass, structures doctoral programmes and research capacity, promoting interdisciplinarity, etc; and (3) the role of the state, in relation to funding issues, the changing profile of PhD students, and improving the attractiveness of research careers. Finally, the groups will investigate horizontal issues such as mobility and the European dimension, and the importance of “joined up” governmental thinking in improving doctoral programmes and enhancing career perspectives.

### **9.2.3. *Publication of a Bologna Handbook***

The objective of this handbook is to create a practically-oriented and flexible tool which will support higher education professionals – academics and administrators at institutional, faculty and department levels – in understanding, introducing and implementing all aspects of the Bologna Process. The publication will consist of a series of specially commissioned articles concerning the full range of Bologna action lines to be written by leading practitioners and experts in each relevant field, and will concentrate on the actual implementation of specific elements of the Bologna Process within higher education institutions. Examples of good practice will be identified and used. The first edition of the handbook that will appear in mid-2006 will contain between 20-35 articles, and will be supplemented 3-4 times per year by an additional 6-7 articles and a new CD-Rom.

### **9.2.4. *Co-ordinating the National Teams of Bologna Promoters***

EUA has been awarded a contract by the European Commission to co-ordinate the national teams of Bologna Promoters that have been established at national level across the EU25. The specific objective is to prepare materials and case studies and to organise a series of training seminars which will provide a European dimension and a comparative perspective on key Bologna issues.

### **9.3. *"Responsible Partnering" Guidelines on Better Practices for Collaborative Research between Universities and Industry***

EUA has launched a new initiative to widen consultation with stakeholders on the further development of the "Responsible Partnering" guidelines and to seek to promote their broad implementation. This follows upon the publication in 2005 of the "Responsible Partnering" Guidelines as a voluntary code of conduct reflecting established good practices on collaborative research between universities and industry. The "Responsible Partnering" initiative is being developed as a joint activity of four organisations: EUA, EIRMA (European Industrial Research Management Association), EARTO (European Association of Research and Technology Organisations), and ProTon Europe (European Network of Knowledge Transfer Offices linked to Universities and Public Research Organisations).

In this next stage of development of the "Responsible Partnership" initiative, which has support from the European Commission, DG Research, two validation workshops are being held to widen awareness of the Guidelines and to gain critical feedback on their strengths and weaknesses, and their potential for implementation. Workshops participants will be drawn from universities, industry (both large and small business enterprises), public research organisations, knowledge transfer offices and other interested parties. In light of this feedback and consultation, the main recommendations of the "Responsible Partnering" will be further refined,

an information package and communication tools developed, and a framework designed for a wider network of partners who would be willing to adhere to the guidelines. As a result, a revised version of the "Responsible Partnering" guidelines is planned to be published in autumn 2006.

#### **9.4. Council of Europe: Recommendation on University Heritage**

On 7<sup>th</sup> December 2005, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe unanimously adopted the Recommendation on the Governance and Management of University Heritage. The Recommendation results from the collaboration of two sections of the Council - Higher Education & Research and Cultural Heritage - and is primarily aimed at governments. The document includes specific recommendations on policies, legislation, governance and management, finance, access, professional training, research, raising awareness, relations with local communities and international cooperation.

The Recommendation constitutes a powerful tool for recognition and provides arguments and political legitimacy for university museums and collections worldwide. The Recommendation asks university administrations "to consider all parts of the heritage of a higher education institution as falling under their ultimate legal, administrative and moral responsibility" and calls for dedicated funding of university heritage in the budget of higher education institutions.

## **10. Quality Assurance**

### **10.1. EUA review of QA procedures.**

Following the request (in March 2005) of the HEA for a 6-month update on progress with the implementation of the recommendations contained within the EUA review reports, IUQB submitted a report to the HEA on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2005. The report is available at:

<http://www.iuqb.ie/6%20Month%20Report%20to%20HEA%20re%20Follow-up%20to%20EUA%20Sectoral%20Reports.pdf>

IUQB requested that individual universities publish an update on progress with (a) implementation of recommendations contained within their individual university report and (b) the response within individual universities to the recommendation contained within the sectoral report. These reports are available on the quality office websites of the individual universities and may also be accessed at:

[http://www.iuqb.ie/IUQB\\_EUA\\_Review\\_Reports.html](http://www.iuqb.ie/IUQB_EUA_Review_Reports.html)

## **10.2. IUQB**

### **10.2.1. Appointment of New Board Members**

Following the appointment of 14 of the 17 Board members at the last IUQB Board meeting (on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2005), a further 2 members were approved by the nominations committee of the Board in December 2005.

### **10.2.2. Establishment of IUQB on a Legal Basis**

Following the endorsement of IUA Council (on 14<sup>th</sup> September) the draft memorandum and articles of association of IUQB were sent to the governing authorities of the individual universities to approve the membership of the company IUQB being the seven universities, represented by the chief officers individual.

Approval of the draft memorandum and articles of association of IUQB was received at meetings of the individual governing authorities, as set out hereunder:

- Dublin City University (13<sup>th</sup> October 2005)
- University College Dublin (18<sup>th</sup> October 2005)
- National University of Ireland, Galway (21<sup>st</sup> October 2005)
- University of Limerick (25<sup>th</sup> October 2005)
- Trinity College Dublin (26<sup>th</sup> October 2005)
- National University of Ireland, Maynooth (7<sup>th</sup> November 2005)
- University College Cork (8<sup>th</sup> November 2005)

Following this approval, the memorandum and articles of association were signed by the Heads of the universities in December 2005 and January 2006.

### **10.2.3. Research and Communications Coordinator**

Funding to appoint a Research-Support and Communications Coordinator was received from the HEA under the Strategic Initiative Scheme 2005. Joan Fogarty was appointed to this post in November 2005 and her experience in the areas of marketing, advertising and branding to the post having worked in these areas both in Ireland and in the US.

### **10.2.4 Sectoral Projects**

**Student Support Services:** The editorial group comprising of Mary Clayton (UCD), Barry Kehoe (DCU), Claire Laudet (TCD), Mary O’Riordan (NUIG) and Teresa Lee (IUQB) met on the 14<sup>th</sup> November and the 15<sup>th</sup> December 2005 during which the booklet was redrafted and updated. The final modifications are now being completed electronically. The pre-publication document will be distributed for consultation to experts and stakeholders by end January/1<sup>st</sup> week in February. Student input will be obtained by means of focus group meetings. The final meeting of the editorial group is scheduled for the 21<sup>st</sup> February at which all feedback obtained

will be considered and used to inform the publication. The final documents will be submitted to the publisher shortly thereafter with publication in mid March.

***Teaching and Learning in Mathematics:*** This project will recommence with a meeting in mid/late February with a small sub-group of the original organising group. Key participants are unable to contribute until that point due to other work commitments. This meeting will consist of Professor Don McQuillan, who has agreed to remain part of the working group, together with three core members of the initial organising group.

***Strategic Planning in Academic Departments:*** Work on the booklet of best practice is now to be completed in-house by the IUQB using information gathered during the course of the project and during site visits and from the feedback obtained by means of questionnaires distributed to project participants. The Facilitator John Davies will be asked to review and edit the booklet. A pre-publication draft of the booklet will be distributed to all the participants in the project and to the senior management for feedback before going to print.

***Improving Teaching and Learning:*** The organising group reconvened in UL on the 10<sup>th</sup> November 2005 to consider the findings of seven preliminary university reports. These reports reviewed the current status of teaching and learning under the broad heading of: *context at the institutional and the national level; links with the university strategic plan; structures in place; supports in place; activities, initiatives and actions undertaken by the unit; collaborative work; evaluation; quality assurance and other review findings.* The project team leader Professor Áine Hyland agreed, with the help of her team in UCC, to compile a synopsis report of all seven reports for distribution in January 2006. This report is now under consideration by the group with feedback requested by mid-February 2005.

***Institutional Research:*** The international workshop for the university and DIT teams took place on the 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2005. Prior to the workshop each university/institute provided a report on their current status including information on the categories of data they use at the moment, the current gaps they perceive and outputs that they would consider desirable. This information was compiled into a composite report distributed to all participants at the international workshop meeting. Each university and the DIT put together a 3-5 member team consisting of senior university staff. The invited international experts, Dr Dawn Terkla, Executive Director, Institutional Research Tufts University and Professor Sir David Watson, School of Lifelong Education and International Development, Institute of Education, University of London made excellent presentations to the meeting and made invaluable contributions to the guided workshop sessions.

A second meeting took place on the 23<sup>rd</sup> November with Dawn Terkla and the project team leaders. A template was drawn up to drive workshop discussions at the local institutional level with key stakeholders that will take place up to the end of March 2006. Each institution will be

asked to return a report outlining the findings of their workshops. An interim report will then be drawn up using the findings from the national meeting and from the individual workshops together with observations and recommendations taken from the quality assurance Review Group Reports and other quality assurance reviews undertaken in the sector.

**Academic Workloads:** Professor Paul Giller has joined the team as a project leader together with Dr Norma Ryan (Quality Officer, UCC), Professor Keith Sullivan (Professor of Education, NUI Galway) and Dr Padraig Walsh (CEO, IUQB).

The organizing group met in Cork on the 6<sup>th</sup> December 2005. It was agreed that an initial one day forum of university teams would take place in Cork. The university team to comprise the Registrar, two Deans (one each from the Humanities and the Sciences), two Heads of School/Departments (one each from the Humanities and the Sciences) and the Quality Officer. The meeting will commence with presentations from key international experts followed by guided workshop sessions in the afternoon. The findings from this meeting will be used to formulate a template for the workshop sessions that will take place at the local level with key local stakeholders.

Key international experts from the US and from the UK have been identified for the national forum. This will complement the expertise of Keith Sullivan (NUIIG) from the New Zealand model. A preliminary date of the 27<sup>th</sup> March 2006 is proposed.

The expert from the US is Michael Middaugh, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning from the University of Delaware who has wide expertise in the area of workloads and in university management and planning matters in general. An example of his work is with the Delaware Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity which he directs. This is a national data sharing consortium that embraces nearly 500 four-year institutions across the United States. It collects detailed information of faculty teaching loads, instructional costs, and externally funded research and service activity, all at the academic discipline level of analysis. The study has recently expanded the data collection to include selected measures of out-of-classroom faculty activity, understanding that what faculty do outside of the classroom (advising, scholarship, service, etc.) can profoundly impact the magnitude of teaching loads and associated instructional costs.

The expert from the UK is Anthony Cryer, Director of Registry and Academic Secretary at Cardiff University. This university has adopted an approach, whereby Schools (the fundamental academic units of the University) have developed their own workload models, complementary to the nature of the disciplines of each school. They have also introduced the notion of different tracks for academic staff which is tied to workload models.

*‘Student Evaluation and Feedback Mechanisms in Quality Assurance’ and ‘Promoting Student Engagement in Learning’.* The IUQB submission for funding to the HEA in 2005 for these projects was limited to €20,000. It had been expected that the balance of funding for the projects would be ratified by the end of 2005. However, these discussions are still ongoing. Work on these projects will not commence until a commitment to the balance of funding is obtained.

### **10.3. *Quality Assurance***

Within the Irish HE Quality Network, the IUA has been working closely with other stakeholders, in particular with IUQB, DIT and the NQAI, to explore the possibilities for increased dialogue on quality assurance issues with professional bodies. A series of small meetings with representatives of such bodies has taken place with a view to organising a conference in autumn 2006 on this issue. The NQAI will undertake some initial research to determine ‘categories’ of professional body, in order to inform the focus of the conference and to create a ‘context paper’ for the conference as a whole. The paper will include an overview of the academic environment in terms of validation, quality assurance and review processes and draw comparisons between professional and academic practices. The international context in which professional and academic bodies are increasingly operating shall also be incorporated. The purpose of the paper is to provide an informative rather than evaluative overview of professional and academic environments. Themes for the conference will be drawn from the research undertaken (e.g. ‘moving together to respond to international developments’) and from various case studies of cooperation in the field of QA/ accreditation between HEIs and professional bodies.

## **11. *National Framework of Qualifications***

### **11.1. *Placement of Awards within the Framework***

In December 2005 IUA registrars agreed a procedure with the NQAI for the placement of minor, special purpose and supplemental university awards on the National Framework of Qualifications. This procedure was published by the NQAI on its website on 6 January 2006.

During the period December 2005 – April 2006, each of the universities will examine in detail its portfolio of non-major certificates and diplomas and identify which of these awards would be more appropriately classified as existing major or as minor, special purpose or supplemental awards.

### **11.2. *Access, Transfer and Progression***

A draft version of the report by McIver Consulting on “transfer and progression into undergraduate programmes leading to university awards” was considered in December 2005 by the NQAI, IUA and HEA project group. A revised draft is currently being prepared and should be finalised at a project meeting to take place on 27 January 2006. The focus of the report is on

entry into honours bachelor degree programmes in the university sector through transfer from HETAC awards, through progression from FETAC or equivalent awards, and entry from UK further education and higher education awards. The report is expected to provide considerable assistance to IUA universities in establishing guidelines and frameworks for such transfer and progression.

The universities have also been asked, together with DIT and other IoTs, to examine transfer and progression practices into Masters programmes, with particular reference to entry requirements, distinctions between taught and research programmes, EU and other international students, and the performance of these various groups of students. This initial gathering of information will be used to help develop more consistent guidelines and procedures for such transfer and progression across the sectors.

### ***11.3. European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning and Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area.***

In July 2005, the European Commission launched a proposal for a European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning, including a Europe-wide consultation process. The EC proposal attracted significant comment from higher education stakeholders across Europe in that in both its timing and its content it became the cause of considerable confusion regarding the Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area, which had already been agreed between Ministers of (Higher) Education in Bergen May 2005 as part of the Bologna Process. The IUA position was that the EC proposal did not take account of the differences between levels 7 and 8 in the Irish framework of qualifications, and that national frameworks would lose their significance with the arrival of an all-embracing EU framework. This position was also communicated to the EUA and to other University Associations in countries which already have such a national framework (UK and Denmark) with a view to developing consensus and support.

## ***12. Reports on Regulation of Higher Education***

### ***12.1 Australia's National HE Protocols***

The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education published a report in January 2006 entitled "*Globalisation, Institutional Aspirations and Regulation: The Australian National Protocols*" by Professor Roger King, Visiting Research Professor at the Centre for Higher Education Research and Information at the Open University, UK. The report examines Australia's 'National Protocols', a regulatory framework for higher education created in 2000 to protect the sector from sub-standard provision. Currently under review, the Protocols' assumptions about what constitutes a 'university' and the importance of research to such a designation have been controversial, and appear increasingly at odds with central governmental policy aiming at further diversifying higher education. The outcomes of the review of the National Protocols contain important implications for higher education regulation more globally as many other

countries confront a growing demand for higher education, the inability of public funding to keep pace with expansion, and issues concerning the role of private, for-profit and overseas institutions in helping to provide a more diverse and responsive higher education system.

### **12.2. Institutional Academic Mobility**

In October 2005 the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education published a report entitled “*Borderless, Offshore, Transnational and Cross-border Education: Definition and Data Dilemmas*” by Dr Jane Knight, Ontario Institute for the Study of Education, University of Toronto, Canada. This report outlines how the increase in international academic mobility has resulted in new and different terms being used to describe this complex phenomenon, and delivers a strong message about the need for institutions, associations and governments to take the collection and analysis of data on programme and provider/institutional mobility more seriously. Without some reliable and valid information on the volume, type and scope of education moving across borders, it is a challenge to develop sound policy and regulations to guide this growing sub-sector of higher education and to monitor new opportunities, risks and benefits.

## **13. IUA Issues**

### **13.1. IUA Launch**

The change of name to Irish Universities Association [IUA] and the new website was launched by IUA President, Prof. Ferdinand von Prondzynski on 19<sup>th</sup> October, 2005 at a reception in the IUA Offices.

### **13.2. Communications Report**

It has been decided to extend the communications project for 2006.

## **14. Copyright**

As reported previously, following a request from Newspaper Licensing Ireland Limited for the payment of an annual fee for a licence for copyright the IUA wrote to the Chair of National Newspapers of Ireland (NNI) noting the mutually beneficial relationship which exists between the newspaper industry and the universities and requesting an exemption from the requirement to obtain a licence. The response received from NNI indicated that while NNI values its relationship with the sector, universities are nonetheless expected to obtain a licence for copyright. IUA representatives subsequently met with Mr. Frank Cullen, Co-ordinating Director, National Newspapers of Ireland on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2006 to discuss this issue further. It was agreed that the IUA would obtain a licence which would cover all universities. The licence fee is to be negotiated between the IUA and Newspaper Licensing Ireland.

## **15. *Lifelong Learning***

The IUA Registrars group has relaunched a working group on Lifelong learning, with the brief to develop proposals for sectoral policies and actions in this field, building on a discussion paper commissioned by IUA from John Coolahan in 2004. Membership of this group includes Maria Slowey, Vice-President for learning innovation, DCU (chair); Sarah Moore, Dean of Teaching and Learning, UL; Seamus O'Grady, Director, Adult & Continuing Education, NUI Galway; Anne Ryan, Head of Department of Adult and Community Education, NUI Maynooth; Sylvia Huntley-Moore, Director of Staff Education and Development, School of Nursing and Midwifery Studies, TCD. A first meeting of the group was held on 9 December 2005.