

Report of the International Advisory Panel to An tUdaras
On the AIT-LIT Consortium Application for designation as a Technological
University
Panel Assessment and Recommendation

Background

The National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 (January 2011), among other goals, proposed reform of Ireland's institute of technology sector to better meet national strategic objectives. Specifically, it recommended consolidation within the sector and a pathway for consortia of institutes of technology to evolve into technological universities upon demonstration that they have met or exceed threshold criteria to attain technological university status.

To this end, the Technological Universities Act, 2018 (the Act) came into effect in March 2018. The Act sets out the functions, governance, academic oversight and operational requirements of technological universities. It specifies eligibility criteria and application requirements for consortia seeking technological university designation. It describes the order and transitional mechanisms in the establishment of new technological universities and provides for an independent advisory panel to assess preparedness for a merger.

The consortium formed of the Athlone Institute of Technology (AIT) and the Limerick Institute of Technology (LIT) submitted an application in November 2020 to become Ireland's third Technological University (TU). This International Advisory Panel was convened in the third week of January 2021 by An tUdaras, the Higher Education Authority (HEA), to provide independent advice to the Minister for Education and Skills on the merits of the AIT-LIT application for technological university status.

Introduction: Panel Activities

The panel conducted all activities virtually, given the COVID pandemic. Application materials were received and reviewed beginning January 19, 2021. Meetings were held on seven days between January 27 and February 8, 2021 and included discussions with the HEA staff and executive, QQI leadership, representatives from the constituent union branches, the CEO of the Technological Higher Education Association, the Deloitte auditor who conducted an "Eligibility Criteria Sample Process Review," and fifteen discussions with AIT and LIT representatives on general and specific topics related to their desire to merge into one technological university. Representatives included the Institutes' presidents, senior staff, Board Chairs, academic and administrative staff and their union representatives, student representatives, and a number of external stakeholders from the community and industry. An email address was made available by the HEA for any comments that

institutional constituents might want to make via that conduit; 29 emails were received. In all, the meeting schedule provided for 20 different discussions and briefings.

The panel would like to have seen more detailed and specific information in the documentation supporting this application. We requested and received additional information in the course of our work but find ultimately that some questions, particularly with regard to governance and research planning and capacity, are still to be answered.

General Findings

The various meetings held allowed the panel to verify application information originally received, to pose questions of clarification regarding definitions and data provided, to request and receive additional information, and to obtain a range of perspectives on the issues. It allowed the panel to observe the great enthusiasm for this proposed technological university across all constituencies, without exception. Basic questions regarding the 'hows and whys' of these two institutions coming together to form a consortium were answered consistently across all groups, indicating strong communication and collaboration from the earliest days of the consortium's forming in early 2020.

As has been the case with the previous applications for Institutes of Technology to become TUs, it is clear that the AIT-LIT consortium has completed only a limited amount of work to date to become one institution. Given the great speed with which the consortium's work has been done—less than one year elapsed between the consortium's first meeting and the submittal of its application to the HEA—it is understandable that many tasks are still to be completed and many plans unifying activities across the current institutions are still to be formulated. While significant work has been done, significant work (some of which is in the planning stages) remains to be accomplished should designation as a TU be granted. Further details in this regard are discussed below with regard to specific eligibility criteria as found in the Act.

Panel Assessment Process

The panel reviewed the consortium's application and supporting documentation (see Appendix 1) and engaged with consortium representatives and others in a series of meetings (see Appendix 2) to assess the consortium's performance against the eligibility criteria set out in the Act and its overall level of preparedness to transition to TU status. The panel is grateful for the audit work performed by Deloitte Ireland LLP, as reported in its report, "Eligibility Criteria Sample Process Review," which aided the panel in its review.

In what follows, the panel relates its findings regarding compliance with criteria specified in the Act. Simpler statements regarding compliance are made in those areas where compliance is clear; more detailed explanations are provided where the panel did not find compliance to clearly be the case.

Performance Metrics and Compliance with Eligibility Criteria of the Technological Universities Act 2018

Section 28 (1)(a)-(b): Student numbers

This section of the Act requires that applicant institutions' current student bodies comprise at least 4% research students (*critterion met*), that 30 % of students in programmes leading to at least an honours bachelors degree fall within certain classes (*critterion met*), and that the percentage of research students be increased to a minimum of 7% within ten years (*panel withholds judgment*).

According to the consortium, 318 or 4.31% of the 7,380 students enrolled in programmes leading to at least honours bachelors degree level are research students, i.e., are enrolled in programmes leading to at least masters degree level. While the panel accepts that this criterion is met, it notes that this number of research students, attained in the 2019/20 year, is 70% higher than in the 2018/19 year, and that the number of research students had been relatively flat in the three years prior to 2018.

The consortium leadership reported that a significant investment (€1M) had been made in research student support to allow for the rapid and significant increase in this number in 2019/20. It appears convinced that greater investment, to be expected once TU status is achieved, will enable it to maintain and grow this number to the minimum of 7% within ten years of designation.

The panel can neither confirm nor deny that this 7% minimum may be met within ten years. The delegated authority that TU would receive at designation is expected to bolster attractiveness to potential students and is expected to increase the number of PhD students coming to or staying on for further study. The panel notes that in this context the optimism of the consortium is to some extent at odds with the increased national competition for research students as well as the very likely possibility of reduced international mobility during, and potentially also a long time after, the Covid-19 pandemic. It also notes that other factors to be considered with respect to increasing research student numbers include appropriately qualified staff, levels 9 and 10 programmes of interest, and other resources (e.g., availability and quality of study space, laboratory, information resources, technologies). Regarding these factors, detailed plans have not yet been created, although budget figures have been projected for campus development plans that can be expected to at least in part support higher levels of research. The issue of qualified staff will be discussed below.

Section 28 (1) (c)-(f): Staff qualifications

This section of the Act requires that of applicant institutions' current full-time academic staff engaged in providing programmes leading to at least honours bachelors degree level, at least 90% hold a masters or doctoral degree (*critterion met*), that at least 45% hold a doctoral degree or equivalent, and that the percentage of staff in the latter category not exceed 10% (*panel withholds judgment*).

The consortium reports, and the Deloitte audit confirms, that 93.45% of staff in the category referred to here hold a master's degree or doctorate. The percentage of those holding a doctoral degree is reported and confirmed by Deloitte to be 35.36%. The question that arose for the panel, which it is unable to answer, is whether the 9.96% of staff reported to hold the equivalent of a doctoral degree indeed hold credentials that are equivalent to that degree.

The criteria set by the consortium to define doctoral equivalency are:

- a) Achieved Fellowship status in the relevant professional/discipline (where available).
- b) Where Fellowship is not achieved/available in the relevant profession/discipline, equivalence is considered on the following framework: In line with the principles of professional recognition and Doctoral education, staff are considered equivalent provided they:
 - 1. Hold the highest qualification in the relevant discipline/profession.
 - 2. Have a minimum of 10 years practical experience
 - 3. Demonstrate a track record of professional development and have evidence of one of the following:
 - I. Recognition-Active professional participation or membership
 - II. High achievement—publication, performance or contribution

The Deloitte auditor reviewed the CVs of ten of the 39 academic staff deemed by the consortium to satisfy the requirement of doctoral equivalency. She stated, however, that “whilst we have undertaken the above review, the review only provides a level of assurance over the assurance of the CV from an academic qualification and fellowship of a professional body perspective. We are not in a position to evaluate if the sample selected meet the terminal degree criteria as set out in the legislation. This is a decision that will need to be considered by the advisor panel as part of the application review.” (Deloitte report, p.28)

In an appendix to her report, the auditor presented a summary of the qualifications of each of the 10 staff members she reviewed, including what information she was able to verify (e.g., degrees and fellowships held). One CV was forwarded later in its entirety as a sample of the CVs that were reviewed. Given the paucity of information provided—for example, what specifically the staff in question were teaching—it was not possible for the panel to confirm or deny that the staff qualifications summarized in the Deloitte report were indeed equivalent to a doctoral degree. It regrets that there was no external validation of degree equivalency in these cases, which would have given confidence in these qualifications.

Section 28 1(d) of the Act also requires that the percentage of doctorally qualified staff increase from 45% to 65% within ten years (panel is satisfied that this criterion will be met).

When the panel questioned consortium representatives about its confidence that the 65% would be reached, it was told that 1) a high percentage of current academic staff without this qualification would be retiring within the coming ten years and 2) new hires to replace retiring staff would be brought in with doctoral qualifications. There was confidence among the representatives that the high number of doctorally

qualified candidates for academic positions available now and into the future would enable the new TU to reach the 65% without a challenge. Although the panel cannot verify that the consortium members currently meet the 45% marker for doctorally qualified staff, it is satisfied that the 65% marker can be reached within ten years.

Section 28 1(f) requires that *each* [emphasis added] of the full-time academic staff engaged in the supervision of students registered on level 10 programmes hold either a doctoral degree or the equivalent and have a record of continued conduct of research in an area relevant to the programme (*panel is satisfied that criterion is met, with a qualification*).

The panel notes that this criterion is not met to the letter of the law: while each of the 52 full-time staff engaged as *primary supervisors* of doctoral level students holds a doctoral degree, the percentage of all 87 such supervisors is 91.95%. As this percentage is quite high, and the assumption is made that each student supervised has the oversight of a doctorally qualified primary supervisor, the panel is satisfied that this spirit of the law regarding this criterion is met. It notes that all 87 supervisory staff are research active in relevant areas.

Section 28 1(g)(h)(i)(j): Research capacity

Section 281(g) requires that applicant institutes provide programmes leading to doctoral degrees in at least three fields of education (*criterion met*). The consortium offers seven such programmes.

Section 28 1 (h) requires that the institutions (i) carry out innovation activity and conduct research to a high standard and that (ii) these efforts have positive social and economic effects on stakeholders in the region (*criteria partially met*).

The consortium notes that it has been involved in 56 EU-funded research and development projects, 19 as coordinator, with a cumulative value of over €20M coming from sources such as Horizon 2020, INTERREG, Erasmus+ and Creative Europe. It has been active in Enterprise Ireland's technology gateway programme, representing 27% of the total industry project engagements with the 15 such research gateways. Specifically with regard to the Midlands and Midwest regions, the panel heard from a number of business, industry, and community representatives about the positive impact of the consortium's innovation and research efforts.

While the applicant institutes have to date been successful with the research projects in which they have engaged, the panel notes that there has been very limited activity by academic staff due to existing staff contracts that require 16-18 hours of teaching time per week, making it difficult for staff to engage in research without certain workarounds that have been put in place to free time for research activity. The national issue of an academic contract appropriate to support the intended research levels of a TU is one that has existed since the creation of the first TU, TUDublin in 2018, and one that must be resolved to solidly ground the research endeavours of these

institutions. The issue is the more pressing since the research plans of this consortium rely on ramping up research capacity by attracting competitive funding, whereas the lack of academic contracts prevents building up the staff capacity needed to be truly competitive internationally. The panel also notes that the research plans provided with the application are of a very high level, without the kind of detail that is necessary to truly evaluate the planned progression from current levels of research to the higher levels of research that would be expected from a TU. It notes as well that the socio-economic study that was done related to the specific needs of the region, intended to support the consortium's application, was not completed before the application was written (and is still marked "draft") and thus could not have better informed the limited amount of planning for research that is evidenced in the application.

Section 28 1 (i) requires that programmes leading to the award of a doctoral degree comply with all QQI policies (*criterion met*). The applicant institutions refer to compliance with quality assurance procedures as required by the QQI as evidence that innovation activity and research are conducted to a high standard. The QQI website lists the latest institutional review of LIT as having occurred in 2010 and that of AIT in 2011, under the auspices of the then-Higher Education Training and Awards Council (HETAC), QQI's predecessor. QQI representatives with whom the panel met confirmed that each institution had its QA procedures approved in 2017 and that each institution has submitted Annual Institutional Quality Reports regarding any modifications that are reviewed by that agency. QQI representatives also noted that a review of the new TU would be required within 18 months of designation.

Section 28 1 (j) requires that at least five doctoral programmes be available within five years of the date of making an order under Section 36 of the Act, i.e, the dissolution of the existing institutions and creation of a new TU (*criterion met*). The consortium already exceeds this number.

Section 28 (1) (k) Capacity to perform the functions of a TU

This section requires that the applicant institutes *have the capacity at the time of application* [emphasis added] for an order under section 36 to effectively perform the functions of a technological university and in particular to demonstrate

(i) that they have integrated, coherent and effective governance structures in place concerning academic, administrative, and management matters (*criterion partially met*).

The consortium has operated since its inception with an Academic Steering Group and a Professional Services Steering Group. The intention is to keep these structures in place, with the same membership, and to designate the Academic Steering Group as the Academic Council for a period not to exceed one year, pending the election of a new TU Academic Council.

The panel understands that the consortium has acted with the conviction that it shall become a TU but without yet having that designation. A Joint Governing Body Steering Group, comprising a subset of each of the partner institutions' governing boards, has approved statements of mission, vision, and values of the new TU and worked to oversee the consortium's activities as conducted by 30 working groups. Yet this group is not and will not be the governing board of the new TU: that governing body will be appointed by the Minister as specified in Section 55 of the Act. The question the panel faced in determining compliance with this criterion was therefore a difficult one: strictly speaking, the consortium is unable to have the capacity *at the time they apply for an order under section 36* to effectively perform the functions of a technological university with respect to all administrative and management matters, as evidenced by the simple fact that there is not as yet a president of the new TU, nor a governing board. Regarding the management structure of the new TU, although a study was commissioned regarding what might be possible for a management structure, no decisions or suggestions were made regarding what the best such structure might be, given that a new president will have the authority to create this structure, hopefully in conjunction with the new governing body. There was discussion among the panel regarding whether greater progress toward the creation of a new management structure might have been expected at this point, and whether it would have been worth the time of the exercise knowing that the consortium had no authority to effect such a structure. While a definitive answer to this question is not possible, the panel would have liked to have seen at least some effort to prepare suggestions regarding a new structure, perhaps as a white paper, to be considered by the new governing board and president as decisions in this area are made. The applicant institutions know well how current operations are carried out across the two institutes of technology; their proposing suggestions for a new structure could be very useful to the new board and president.

The panel recognizes that the consortium has a general plan to proceed with academic and professional services in place on appointment day and that time will be necessary to ultimately settle on an organizational structure, new titles, etc., until new leadership is in place. The panel also acknowledges that care has been taken to ensure that all student-facing operations, down to student ID cards and the uniforms worn by facilities staff, are integrated prior to appointment day, and that there has been a prioritization of activities to take place up to appointment day and thereafter. The panel was assured that integrated IT, financial, and HR systems will be in place by September 1, 2021, and finds no reason to doubt that the major systems needed as of that date will be in place, with additional work proceeding in accordance with priorities that have already been set.

The panel is convinced of the good will, energy, mutual support and potential on the part of all parties involved in this endeavour to continue the work done to date and to complete ongoing work, such as the further development and integration of systems and the review and revision of policies and handbook, as prioritized. Everyone with

whom the panel spoke displayed confidence that this work would continue past designation day to be in a strong position to take on the role of a TU on the day of appointment, and the panel is satisfied that this is the case. The panel notes an observation offered in the course of discussions that a new TU management structure must encompass all campuses of the university in a manner that reflects and reinforces the unitary nature of the institution.

Section 28 (k)(ii) requires the demonstration of strong links with business, enterprise, the professions, the community, local interests, and other stakeholders in the region (*critterion met*). The panel's meeting with representatives of these groups satisfied the panel that there are strong links between them and the consortium.

Section 28 1(k)(iii) requires applicant institutes to have established procedures in writing for quality assurance, not to have received notice furnished by the QQI, and that QQI approval has not been withdrawn (*critterion met*). See above, Section 28 1(i)

Section 28 1(k)(iv) requires applicant institutes to demonstrate that they develop and have procedures in place to further develop programmes that respond to regional needs (*critterion not met*).

In the consortium's application, it notes regarding this criterion that "AIT-LIT will develop and have procedures in place under the direction of the Governing Body and the Academic Council, for the development of programmes that respond to the needs of business, enterprise, the professions and other stakeholders in the region in which the campuses of the applicant institutions are located." This development is referred to in the future tense, under the direction of bodies that are not and cannot yet be created. The socio-economic impact study may well, and should, assist the new TU in this development, but as noted above this study is very recent and cannot have had an impact on the development of any procedures to create programmes responding to regional needs.

Section 28 1(k)(v) requires applicant institutes to demonstrate that native staff and students have opportunities outside of Ireland for teaching, learning, and research; that such opportunities are available at the applicant institutes for staff and students outside Ireland; and that the institutes collaborate internationally on joint research projects and for the provision of programmes (*critterion met*). There are currently 272 international Agreements of Cooperation offering opportunities for students and staff to study and work internally. International students, of 84 nationalities, comprise 9.7% of full-time students (2019-20). The institutes are newly members of the Regional University Network-EU, which they are confident will provide many additional opportunities for internationalisation of the new TU.

In summary, the panel finds compliance with all criteria delineated in Section 28 1 of the Act, with the exception of those found in the following sub-section of Sections 28 (1)

(b) : minimum of 7% research students within 10 years: judgment withheld

(c)(iii) : maximum of 10% of academic staff engaged in provision of programmes at level 8 and higher hold doctoral equivalency: judgment withheld

(h)(i and ii) : research currently carried out: partially met

k(i) : governance structure in place: partially met

k(iv) : procedures to respond to regional needs: not met.

International Advisory Panel Recommendation to the Minister for Education and Skills

While the AIT-LIT consortium does not perfectly meet the requirements set out in the Technological Universities Act, 2018 related to student and staff metrics, governance structure, research capacity and preparedness to respond to regional needs, it has provided sufficient convincing evidence of its potential compliance with these requirements and of its the ability to function as a technological university in the short to mid-term after appointment to enable the panel to recommend its designation as a TU. We hereby make that recommendation.

The evidence provided exists not only in the paper application and documentation received to support it. The panel was struck by the level of integration, partnership, and collegiality already accomplished among representatives of both AIT and LIT in the work done to date to become a TU. It was struck as well by the unqualified support of TUI, UNITE, FORSA and SIPTU for this endeavour. Student union representatives have clearly been included in the work to date and were very well versed on various efforts, indicating good communications across the consortium. Student and staff surveys showed a very high level of support for becoming a TU, and the majority of comments received via anonymous emails were positive as well, with a small number of reservations matching those of the panel itself regarding research capacity. While much remains to be accomplished, the level of work completed to date in little more than a year indicates that the levels of teamwork, energy, communication and enthusiasm needed to continue and complete this work in the time after designation are sufficient to realize that goal.

Further Comments and Suggestions Related to this Review

The panel's greatest concerns throughout this process have been the lack of specificity for research plans and the question of how an appropriate research capacity will be built. The current number of research students meets the minimum criterion for such students, but this number is recent, with very small numbers enrolled in some of the current level 9 and 10 programmes. Efforts will need to be made—and funding available—to keep and grow the number of research students in current and new programmes at the new TU. And while we are satisfied that the number of doctorally qualified staff will grow to 65% over the next ten years, we are concerned with the

current number of such staff and the immediate need to create more detailed plans for the specific areas of research and specific research projects to support regional needs in the short to mid-term. We recommend that appropriate assistance be obtained by way of expert consultants to work with existing staff and the new administration and governing board to give greater specificity to the TU's research planning. The socio-economic study must be completed and serve to support this planning.

The panel also has concerns over the balance to be maintained between the urgency to recruit sufficient high calibre staff in relevant research areas and the need to maintain teaching capacity at full strength, with teaching staff fully motivated for apprenticeships and skills training. The tension between serving students well from level 6 through level 10 was mentioned more than once during the panel's discussions with consortium representatives and must be recognized and kept uppermost in the minds of the new TU's constituent bodies.

More general comments related to this and other TUs:

The issue of the teaching contract must also be resolved as soon as possible, not only for this new TU but for the two previously created TUs as well, to ensure that the time for research is clearly built into academic staff's workloads. It is not reasonable to expect higher levels of research to be conducted while the current contract is in place.

The language in the Act is somewhat ambiguous regarding governance. Ordinarily the term governance refers to the work of a governing board, the ultimate fiduciary of an organization. But Section 28(1)(k) requires that applicant institutions have "at the time they apply under section 29 for an order under section 36, the capacity to...demonstrate that they have integrated, coherent, and effective governance structures in place concerning academic, administrative and management matters..." The panel has interpreted this to mean integrated, coherent, and effective academic, administrative and management structures as a consortium, not governance structures in the sense of a governing board's oversight of these areas, which would not yet be possible given that the new TU's governing board will not be in place until appointment day. Additional clarification and interpretation of this section of the Act would be helpful for future advisory panels. The panel suggests that applicant institutions be encouraged to agree on plans fit for a functioning TU to be taken up by the new governing board and administration immediately after establishment day.

The new TU will require significant levels of funding. It is clear to the panel that the reliance on competitive funding as now foreseen in the research plans is unrealistic given the need to build sufficient high-calibre research capacity to attract and secure such funding. Comparison with other countries shows that government funding is necessarily dominant in the initial phase, which might be as long as 5-10 years. It is clear that the creation of TUs is a government priority and that there is willingness to invest heavily to create these new universities. However, the current financial picture for Ireland, as for other countries, has become somewhat less clear due to the COVID

pandemic. It is hoped that the new TU will be sufficiently supported financially to reach its goals.

Post Script

This review was necessarily conducted virtually. The panel members felt very keenly the disadvantage of this way of conducting a review. Not experiencing first-hand the physical environment of the two institutions and the logistics involved in traveling across campuses; not having multiple opportunities to engage with various constituencies supporting the application, as was the case with previous reviews; not having the opportunity for individual conversations with students, staff, board members and other stakeholders that were then considered together in group panel discussions; not being able to experience the subtleties of culture at the two institutions and in their locations: all of these were considered to be limitations to our work in reviewing this application.

While the panel is satisfied that an on-site review would not have led to substantially different conclusions than those presented in this report and is confident in our recommendation that the AIT-LIT consortium be granted TU status given the overwhelmingly positive evidence of collaboration and progress to date in becoming a TU, we recommend that, if possible, any further reviews be postponed until a review team can do its work on the ground. This first-hand experience would certainly contribute to more detail and nuance in the panel's discussions and possibly a more useful report.

Given the difficulty the panel experienced in verifying staff qualifications related to Section 28(1)(c) (doctoral equivalency), the panel recommends that any further applications for designation as a TU include expert external review of the credentials of academic staff deemed by the applicant institutions to have the equivalency of doctoral-level preparation.

Last but certainly not least: the panel members would like to express their sincere appreciation to the Minister and the HEA for the privilege of having served on this advisory panel. They would like to thank the leadership of the two institutes and their staff, students and stakeholders for meeting them and providing their valuable input to this process of review. And the panel sends a special note of thanks to the HEA staff who supported their work diligently, professionally, efficiently and with unfailing good spirits, defying time zone differences to respond quickly to all of the panel's questions and requests.

Appendix 1: Supporting documentation provided by AIT-LIT Consortium

Subject	Supporting Documents
Academic Policies and TU QAE Handbook	Discussion Document in Regard to Academic Regulations
	TU Gap Analysis Policies AIT-LIT
	TU QAE Handbook 2021
AIT-LIT Consortium Meetings	Minutes of WG meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Academic Steering Group - Joint Governing Body; - Joint Management Steering Group; - Professional Management and Support Service Industrial Relations Forum; - Professional Services Steering Group; - Teachers Union of Ireland Industrial Relations Forum
Apprenticeships and Engagement	TU Apprenticeship Case Studies
Collaboration and Regional Development	AIT-LIT Collaborative Research Regional Development Plan Case Studies
Complementarity Analysis	AIT-LIT TU Consortium Programme Complementary Review
	Source Data Programme Portfolio Analysis AIT-LIT Consortium Appendices
Gap Analyses	Finance Working Group Report
	HR Project Overview Chart
	AIT-LIT HR Policies
Institutional Statistics	Student numbers by institute
Learning Analytics	AIT-LIT Consortium Learning Analytics
	AIT-LIT Consortium Teaching and Learning Digital Ecosystem
Level 10 Equivalence	TU Metric - Guidelines for audit
	TU Metric - Process to seek equivalence
Level 9 and 10 Provision	PG Breakdown
Market Research Study	MCCP Response to AIT-LIT Tender Response Document
	MCCP AIT-LIT Naming Process Update
	MCCP AIT-LIT Next steps
Research Metrics	Research Metrics - plan in support of application
Socio-Economic Assessment	Socio-Economic Assessment of AIT-LIT Consortium
Staff and Student Survey	Staff Survey
	Student Survey
Stakeholder Register	Industry and Civic Stakeholders
	Stakeholder List - requirement specific
	TU Midwest Stakeholders

Strategic Plans	AIT Strategic Plan 2019
	LIT Strategic Plan 2019
TU Management and Governance Structures	Advance HE Report
TU Research and Innovation Development Plan	TU Research and Innovation Development Plan
Working Group Structures	AIT-LIT Consortium Programme of Work

Appendix 2: Schedule AIT-LIT TU Review

Schedule TU Panel - AIT-LIT Review	
Wednesday 27th January 2021	
13:00 - 13:15	Introductions - HEA/Advisory Panel
13:15 - 14:15	Advisory Panel session with HEA Executive
14:15 - 14:30	Advisory Panel break
14:30 - 15:30	Advisory Panel session with QQI
15:30 - 16:00	Advisory Panel break
16:00 - 16:45	Presentation on Technological Sector by Dr Joseph Ryan, CEO, Technological Higher Education Association
16:45 - 17:15	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)
Thursday 28th January 2021	
13:00 - 13:45	Advisory Panel session with Deloitte / Staff Qualifications expert
13:45 - 14:00	Advisory Panel break
14:00 - 15:00	Advisory Panel session with AIT-LIT Presidents; Joint GB Chair; Project Leads, Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
15:00 - 15:30	Advisory Panel break
15:30 - 16:30	Advisory Panel session with AIT-LIT Staff (Mix of Academic & Admin Staff): Mission, Vision, Values
16:30 - 17:00	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)
Monday 1st February 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Advisory Panel session with AIT-LIT Research personnel
14:00 - 14:15	Advisory Panel break
14:15 - 15:15	Advisory Panel session focused on AIT-LIT Internationalisation
15:15 - 15:45	Advisory Panel break
15:45 - 16:45	Advisory Panel session with AIT-LIT Joint Management Steering Group
16:45 - 17:15	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)
Tuesday 2nd February 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Advisory Panel session with AIT-LIT Student Union representatives
14:00 - 14:15	Advisory Panel break
14:15 - 15:15	Advisory Panel session with Staff Representative Bodies (TUI)
15:15 - 15:45	Advisory Panel break
15:45 - 16:45	Advisory Panel session with Staff Representative Bodies (PMSS)
16:45 - 17:15	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)

Thursday 4th February 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Advisory Panel session with Teaching and Learning, Quality Assurance personnel
14:00 - 14:15	Advisory Panel break
14:15 - 15:15	Advisory Panel session focused on Apprenticeships
15:15 - 15:45	Advisory Panel break
15:45 - 16:45	Advisory Panel session with business/professions representatives
16:45 - 17:15	Optional additional session with Joint Management Steering Group / Close out Panel discussion.
Friday 5th February 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Advisory Panel session with Professional Services WG representatives
14:00 - 14:15	Advisory Panel break
14:15 - 15:15	Advisory Panel session with AIT-LIT community/local representatives
15:15 - 15:45	Advisory Panel break
15:45 - 16:45	Advisory Panel session with AIT-LIT Joint Governing Body Steering Group
16:45 - 17:15	Advisory Panel session: Close out discussion
Monday 8th February 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Close out session with HEA CEO and Senior Management
14:15 - 14:45	Advisory Panel Session with AIT-LIT TU Project Directors