

Report of the International Advisory Panel to An tÚdarás
On the TUSEI 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 Institute of Technology Carlow (ITC) and the Waterford Institute of Technology (WIT) submitted an application in April 2021 to become Ireland's fourth Technological University (TU). This International Advisory Panel was convened in the third week of May 2021 by An tÚdarás, the Higher Education Authority (HEA), to provide independent advice to the Minister for Further and Higher Education,

Research, Innovation and Science on the merits of the ITC-WIT application for technological university status.

Introduction: Panel Activities

The panel conducted all activities virtually, given the ongoing COVID pandemic. Application materials were received and reviewed beginning late May 2021. Meetings were held on seven days between July 5, 2021 and July 15, 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 BDO auditor who conducted an “Eligibility Criteria Sample Process Review,” and 20 discussions with ITC and WIT representatives and external stakeholders on general and specific topics related to desire for a merger of the two institutes into one technological university. Institutional representatives included the Institutes’ presidents, senior staff, Board Chairs, academic and administrative staff and their union representatives, and student representatives. External stakeholders represented a wide variety of organisations and enterprises from the community and industry. An email address was also made available by the HEA for any comments that institutional constituents might want to make via that conduit; 37 emails were received.

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 many questions remain, particularly with regard to the operationalisation of the application’s high-level strategic and aspirational plans and the extent to which stakeholder confidence that the

consortium is and will be ready to operate as a technological university on designation day is well founded.

General Findings

The various meetings held allowed the panel to verify the application information received, to pose questions of clarification regarding definitions and data provided, to request 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. However, basic questions regarding specifics of how these two institutions have come together and will operate as a technological university were often answered looking forward to activities that will occur subsequent to designation day.

It is clear that no consortium applying for TU status can be expected to be structured and operating as a TU prior to its designation as such. Nonetheless, given the length of time devoted to this project since the signing of a 2017 MOU (not counting a previous MOU from 2014), the panel was surprised by the low level of progress that has been made in moving the consortium to the level of compliance with the Act's criteria that the panel reads as requisite to designation as a TU. An overwhelming amount of the work needed to create appropriate unified structures and operations for a TU by designation day is slated to occur after that day, which has already been announced by the Minister as January 1, 2022.

Section 30 of the Technological Universities Act 2018 states that "An application by applicant institutes under section 29 shall include information... (b) demonstrating that plans and arrangements are in place for managing academic, financial and administrative matters arising on the making of an order under section 36 and (c) to

enable the Minister and advisory panel to have regard to the matters referred to in section 34(2).” The panel did not find this application to demonstrate that those plans and arrangements are in place. In many cases it heard that operations within the two current institutions will continue as they are past designation day, simply under one umbrella, and come together later. A review of the work of 33 working groups to date revealed a large number of policies and procedures that are still in development or to be developed.

Given the difficulties experienced by the consortium over the past four to seven years in coming together, it is understandable that the stage of progress reached at this time is what it is. The panel’s question is whether understanding those difficulties relieves the consortium of meeting the criteria in the Act prior to designation day.

Panel Assessment Process

The panel reviewed the consortium’s application and supporting documentation and engaged with consortium representatives and others in a series of meetings (see Appendix 1) 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 also reviewed the audit work performed by BDO advisors, as reported in its report, “Technological Universities Act 2018 Eligibility Criteria Review: Technological University of South-East Ireland.”

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

Section 28 (1)(a) of the Act requires that applicant institutions' current student bodies comprise at least 4% research students (*critterion met*), and that 30 % of students in programmes leading to at least an honours bachelors degree fall within certain classes (*critterion met*). Section 28 (1)(b) of the Act requires that the percentage of research students be increased to a minimum of 7% within ten years (*panel is satisfied that this critterion can be met*).

The panel notes that the current percentage of research students, 5.14%, should easily grow to a minimum of 7% over a ten-year period, recognizing the factors that the consortium points to as reasons for confidence in this projection. It notes further that no specific plans are laid out to ensure this growth, but that more detailed plans are to be developed once the TU and its new president and governing board are in place.

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

Section 28 (1)(c)(i) 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*). Section 28 (1)(c)(ii) requires that at least 45% of these staff hold a doctoral degree or equivalent, and that the percentage of staff in the latter category not exceed 10% (*critterion met*). Section 28 1(d) also requires that the percentage of doctorally qualified

staff increase from 45% to 65% within ten years (panel is satisfied that this criterion can be met).

The consortium reports, and the BDO audit confirms, that 94.61% of staff in the category referred to in Section 28 (1)(d) hold a master's degree or doctorate. The percentage of those holding a doctoral degree is reported and confirmed by BDO to be 51.27%.¹ To reach 65% of doctorally qualified staff in this category over a ten-year period should be feasible, but as in the case with research student growth projection, the consortium has presented only very general strategies as to how this number will be achieved. A more detailed development plan is to be created post-designation.

Section 28 (1)(e) requires that at least 80% of staff engaged in the provision of doctoral programmes and conduct of research hold a doctoral degree or equivalent and have a record of continued research in an area relevant to the programme. (*criterion met*). Section 28 1(f) requires that each 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 the criterion is met).

Of the 137 staff engaged in the provision of a doctoral programme and the conducting of research, 120, or 87.59%, were reported to hold doctoral degrees. The number of staff supervising PhD students is 82; 100% of these staff were reported to hold a doctoral degree. All of these staff are reported to be actively engaged in research. The

¹ The panel notes that QQI figures on doctorally qualified staff differed from this figure but that HEA figures agree with those presented by the consortium.

panel did not receive specific information on “a record of research in an area relevant to the programme” for all of these staff but on the basis of discussions with faculty members it is satisfied that the criterion is met.

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 (*critera met*).

The consortium offers doctoral degrees in the areas of Information and Communications Technologies; Natural Sciences, Math and Statistics; Engineering, Manufacturing and Construction; and Business, Administration and Law.

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 met*).

The consortium notes that it has received jointly 717 research grants in 2017-2019, €37 million in European funding through 26 successful submissions, and four INTERREG projects in 2019 jointly worth €10.65 million. The institutes currently host four Enterprise Ireland Technology Gateways, one at ITC (Design + Applied Design); three at WIT (SEAM, Advanced Manufacturing; PMBRC, Pharmaceutical and Healthcare; Walton Institute, Mobile Services). The partners are also hosts to five Designated Activity Companies funded under the Regional Enterprise Development Fund. Specifically with regard to the South-East region, the panel heard from a number of business, industry, and community representatives about the positive impact of the consortium’s innovation and research efforts.

Section 28 1 (i) requires that programmes leading to the award of a doctoral degree comply with all QQI policies (*criterion met*).

Both applicant institutions have undergone QQI review recently and found to meet QQI standards. QQI representatives with whom the panel met confirmed that each institution has had its QA procedures approved 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 the consortium have a plan that demonstrates that it would have the capacity as a TU to increase within five years of the date of making an order to at least five the number of fields of education in which programmes leading to a doctoral degree and the staff and students conduct research *panel is satisfied that the criterion can be met*.

The consortium's application notes its areas of research strength ranging from "emerging" to "high performing." While there is no plan provided, as required by this criterion, to increase the number of fields of education in which programmes lead to a doctorate and research is conducted, the area of Health, Welfare, Sports and Nutrition, deemed "developing" could, in the opinion of the panel, be raised to the level intended by this criterion. The panel stresses that while this development is in the realm of possibility, it notes that no plan was presented related to the specifics of how this field was to be elevated from "developing" to "matured," nor is any of these descriptors defined.

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 not met).

The history of this project and the level and amount of work accomplished to date have not, in the view of the panel, provided evidence of integrated, coherent and effective governance structures concerning academic, administrative, and management matters. Oversight of the project has been discontinuous, with overlapping and seemingly duplicative leadership bodies, and the concrete work of collaboration on the specifics of unified academic, administrative, and management matters did not begin in earnest until September 2020, three years after a 2017 MOU between the two institutes was signed—as noted, the second MOU that had been agreed to since initial conversations began between ITC and WIT in 2011-2013.

It is not the case that no work was accomplished between the 2014 MOU and the 2017 MOU. During that time, it is reported that vision, mission and values and an implementation framework were worked on to identify issues and thematic areas to be addressed in coming together as one institution. High-level conversations are said to have occurred during this period about forming a unitary institution. The work within and between the institutions from 2017 forward, however, cannot in the view of the panel be characterised as having led at the current time to “integrated, coherent and

effective governance structures in place concerning academic, administrative and management matters” that are the subject of this criterion. To be more specific:

At the time of the signing of the second MOU on October 12, 2017, a Steering Group was created, leadership of and membership in which have changed over time. An external chair was appointed July 19, 2018 and appears to have continued in that position through 24 August 2020. There was a five-month hiatus in meetings between 24 August and December 15, 2020, explained in the minutes as have arisen from a change of government and the fact that both governing bodies’ terms had expired. It was not until the group was revived in December 15, 2020 under the leadership of the two governing body chairs that administrative and professional staff and students were included in the group.

The current Steering Group consists of the governing body chairs, two institutional presidents; academic, administrative and professional staff; students; academic staff members; professional and administrative staff members, and two members of the governing bodies of each institute. According to the materials submitted to the panel upon request, it appears that this group held 24 meetings between December 2017 and February 2020 under the leadership of an external chair, and four meetings between August 24, 2020 and March 18, 2021 under the joint chairmanship of the two institutes’ governing body chairs. For whatever reason, the terms of reference for the group that were approved August 28, 2020 were revised October 19, 2020.

On July 28, 2020, an external Project Executive Director was appointed to lead a Project Office to provide support to the consortium’s work, ultimately to the eight work streams and 33 working groups that were created in September

2020, nearly three years into the life of the MOU. The Project Office liaises with the two institutional presidents and has been accountable to the Steering Group. The Project Office comprises the Executive Director, an academic advisor, two project directors, an engagement manager, a data coordinator, and eight workstream coordinators (not to be confused with the workstream leaders). It is not clear to the panel why this second body was put in place so far into the consortium's work or why the Steering Group was not sufficient to fulfil the role undertaken by the Project Office. Nor is it clear why working groups were formed only eight months before the consortium's application was submitted to the Minister.

In addition to the Project Office, a Project Team consisting of the Project Office members plus institutional relations facilitators from the PMSS and TUI unions was created and is said to meet weekly. It is not clear to the panel why this group has a separate designation and why the IR facilitators, if crucial to this work, are not considered part of the Project Office.

A Project Leadership Group, chaired by the Project Executive Director, appears to have been formed August 24, 2020 and comprises the two leaders of each workstream. This group meets weekly and is, as is the Project Office, accountable to the Steering Group.

On December 4, 2020, a Joint Executive was created as the embryonic executive team for the proposed TU. This group has largely the same membership as the Leadership Group but includes both institutes' presidents. It has the responsibility of reviewing and approving the work products coming

from the eight workstreams' 33 working groups that are ultimately to be approved by the appropriate bodies of the TU once formed.

Rather than integrated, coherent, and effective structures, the consortium's history and the existence of these numerous groups indicate to the panel that coherently and steadily leading this project has been a great challenge.

In interviews with a number of staff in academic and administrative areas the panel heard concerns about how the objectives of the TU are to be realized. As noted, it appears to the panel that the intention is for the two current institutions to largely continue operations as they are currently in place and that these operations will be brought together as unified operations after designation day. Indeed, documents from the Joint Executive and others indicate that the consortium has been working on the project seeing it in three phases: one, up to the time of panel review; two, between the review and designation day, and three, after designation day. Much of what the panel saw in plans indicates that the concrete and specific work of bringing separate operations together occurs not only after the panel's review but after designation day.

To many with whom the panel spoke it was not clear exactly how this unification was to be carried out, although there was for the most part (but not always) confidence that it would be done satisfactorily. The panel heard some agreement on what the highest priorities are for being ready on designation day to carry out operations, but even here how those priorities will be realised is not clear. Questions regarding operational issues crucial to opening on day one, particularly regarding IT, HR, and student services, were answered by stating that, for the most part and with the exception of the highest priority items that needed to be resolved, two parallel systems would continue to run past designation day and continue to be worked on. With regard

specifically to IT, the panel heard that Educampus was engaged in March of 2021 as consultants to identify the tasks and sequencing required to migrate key systems into one IT system for the proposed TU and that institutional staff should be involved as soon as possible in this planning. It appears that central IT systems will be fully integrated and operational only late in 2022, and that planning for a transitional period with separate systems has started only quite recently and is very far from complete.

The panel heard a need for clearer plans and communications about how next steps in the creation of a TU are to be carried out and heard more than once that the work done to date—after an initial period of difficulty that all agreed is now in the past—has been largely high-level and strategic, and that working groups are now furiously attempting to create the operational structures that are needed to operate as one institution. The fact that work on the appropriate structures required to be in place in order to meet this criterion was started as late as September 2020 and is far from complete provides a serious challenge to the panel.

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 (panel is satisfied that the criterion is met).

From conversations with external stakeholders it is clear that the institutes develop programmes that respond to a wide range of regional needs. The panel finds this work commendable and applauds the institutes for their dedicated efforts in this regard. Some of the work done was reported to serve the region in a spectrum of areas ranging from the arts to the military to prison education to women's centres. The application also noted examples of engagement with a number of industry clusters/networks. It was however less clear that there are procedures in place for further development of such programmes not as independent institutes but as a TU. The consortium's Charter for Programme design states a commitment to these stakeholders, and the application further states that "each faculty, department and programme will be required to demonstrate through formal structures...how they engage with business, enterprise, the professions, the community, local interests and related stakeholders in the region." The development and engagement referred to is in the future tense, under the direction of bodies that understandably are not and cannot yet be created, but the application does indicate that a scoping exercise has been done and that areas for potential development with potential for the South-East region have been identified.

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 (criteria met); and that the institutes collaborate internationally on joint research projects and for the provision of programmes (criterion met).

The application materials and discussions during the panel's exchanges with consortium representatives provided sufficient evidence of these opportunities and collaborations.

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

k(i) : that they have integrated, coherent and effective governance structures in place concerning academic, administrative, and management matters: not met

Although the panel's remit was to review the consortium's compliance with criteria listed under Section 28 of the Act, we find it important to note that in our opinion the application that was submitted did not comply with the requirements for an application under Section 30 (b) of the Act. This section states that "An application by applicant institutes...shall include information...(b) demonstrating that plans and arrangements are in place for managing academic, financial, and administrative matters arising on the making of an order under section 36..." (emphasis added). While the panel agrees that the various Section 28 criteria are met either individually by the institutes, which apparently do an excellent job in serving their students and the region, or jointly by the institutes when their individual contributions are looked at collectively, it has serious concerns about the level to which plans and arrangements are in place for managing the academic, financial and administrative matters of a unitary TU. Staff are currently working extremely hard within their working groups, but there remain too many questions of how these two institutions will come together with unified processes and operations by designation day. Indeed, as noted, many of the work products that comprise the nuts and bolts of operations are not planned for until after designation day.

In the first interview held with the ITC and WIT presidents and governing body chairs the statement was made that the application had first been completed in 2018. Meeting minutes of the various leadership groups indicate that a great deal of work was done on the application between that initial version and the 2021 submittal reviewed by the panel. Yet the working groups assigned to provide the specific plans and arrangements for a TU, to the extent these could be created pre-designation, became active only eight months prior to the April 30, 2021 submittal. The application is, then, as was agreed to by many of those with whom the panel spoke, strategic and future-oriented rather than focused on the specifics of unitary operations. As was said in one of the discussions held: “what the objectives are is clear, how to reach them is still in question.”

International Advisory Panel Recommendation to the Minister for Further and Higher Education, Research Innovation and Science.

While the consortium meets, or is assumed to meet, or has the potential to meet many of the requirements set out in the Technological Universities Act, 2018, it has not provided sufficient convincing evidence of its ability to function as a technological university in the short to mid-term after designation as a TU.

The panel found only an incipient level of integration and partnership across the institutions, although the collegiality among institutional representatives appears real, there are individual long-standing relationships of colleagues in various areas, and the enthusiasm for becoming a TU is clear. The majority of comments received via anonymous emails were positive as well regarding the desire for the creation of a TU in the South-East region. The fact remains, however, that the level of work completed to date, after four to nine years of expressing the intention to become one institution,

does not provide sufficient evidence to the panel of the consortium's ability to function as a TU for it to recommend approval at this time.

The panel recommends that the consortium's work planned to occur post-panel review up to designation day related to the domains of IT, HR, and Student Services be completed before determining whether this designation should be granted. More specifically, a detailed plan should be created including timelines and the deliverables required to ensure that sufficient governing structures in the areas of administration and services will be in place to allow the two separate institutes to successfully and safely become one legal entity. The timelines should be realistic and credible. In addition to convincing plans for such governing structures, there should be an account of the services within these domains that, if not ready on designation day, would hamper crucial TU operations. If the timelines included with these plans extend beyond designation day, there should be clear transition plans including fall-back options demonstrating that the TU can continue to act as one legal entity and have all crucial operations continue without interruption.

Further Comments and Suggestions Related to this Review

The panel understands that there have been challenges and difficulties along the way since the consortium first held discussions in 2011-2012 regarding becoming one institution. These include initial rejections of the most recent MOU by first one, then the other institute, and the need to resolve the issue of semesterisation, since resolved, that delayed progress toward desired ends. Understanding these issues and realising that the necessary work to create the structures of a TU could not occur until these issues were resolved do not, however, change the reality of where the consortium stands now in relation to the end goal of becoming a TU.

An ongoing issue in Ireland related to the expansion of research at the Institutes of Technology is the existing staff contract 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. It is the panel's understanding that recommendations from the OECD are expected in the coming months related to this contract's amendment to address this issue, and it is the panel's hope that this issue may be resolved soon and that it will be found satisfactory to allow for the balance of teaching, research, and service appropriate to a TU.

Post Script

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 candid responses to questions posed during 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. We could not have done it without this excellent support and partnership.

Appendix 1: TUSEI TU Review Schedule

Schedule TU Panel - TUSEI Review	
Monday 5th July 2021	
13:00 - 13:45	Advisory Panel session with HEA Executive
13:45 - 14:15	Presentation on Technological Sector by Dr Joseph Ryan, CEO, Technological Higher Education Association (THEA)
14:15 - 14:45	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
14:45 - 15:30	Advisory Panel session with Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI)
15:30 - 15:45	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
15:45 - 16:30	Advisory Panel session with BDO re Metrics Review
16:30 - 17:00	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)
Wednesday 7th July 2021	
13:00 - 13:45	Advisory Panel session with Presidents and Governing Body Chairs
13:45 - 14:00	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
14:00 - 15:00	Advisory Panel session with External Stakeholders 1: Business and Enterprise
15:00 - 15:30	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
15:30 - 16:30	Advisory Panel session with External Stakeholders 2: Civic /Cultural/ Education
16:30 - 17:00	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)
Thursday 8th July 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Advisory Panel session with Joint Executive
14:00 - 14:15	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
14:15 - 15:15	Advisory Panel session - Academic Delivery, including Apprenticeships
15:15 - 15:45	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
15:45 - 16:45	Advisory Panel session - Research, Development, Innovation and Graduate Studies
16:45 - 17:15	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)
Friday 9th July 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Advisory Panel session with Student Union representatives
14:00 - 14:15	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
14:15 - 15:15	Advisory Panel session with Staff Representative Bodies (TUI)
15:15 - 15:45	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
15:45 - 16:45	Advisory Panel session with Staff Representative Bodies (PMSS)
16:45 - 17:15	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)

Tuesday 13th July 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Advisory Panel session - Engagement and Regional Responsiveness
14:00 - 14:15	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
14:15 - 15:15	Advisory Panel session with Academic staff
15:15 - 15:45	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
15:45 - 16:45	Advisory Panel session Corporate, Governance and Professional Services
16:45 - 17:15	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)
Wednesday 14th July 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Advisory Panel session with Professional Services WG representatives - Supporting Students
14:00 - 14:15	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
14:15 - 15:15	Advisory Panel session with Administrative/Technical staff
15:15 - 15:45	<i>Advisory Panel break</i>
15:45 - 16:45	Advisory Panel session on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) and Internationalisation
16:45 - 17:15	Close out discussion (Advisory Panel only)
Thursday 15th July 2021	
13:00 - 14:00	Close out session with Presidents and Governing Body Chairs