

UNIVERSITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Thursday 1 April 2010

9.00 a.m.-11.20 a.m. in A204

Present: Professor Anne Scott (Chair), Dr Françoise Blin,
Ms Olivia Bree, Dr Pat Brereton, Ms Jennifer Bruton,
Professor Saleem Hashmi, Mr Billy Kelly,
Ms Louise McDermott (Secretary), Ms Phylomena McMorrow,
Ms Morag Munro, Professor Gary Murphy, Mr John Murphy,
Ms Annabella Stover, Mr Ronan Tobin, Dr Ann Wickham,
Dr Sheelagh Wickham

Apologies: Ms Bernadette Dowling, Professor Martin Henry,
Ms Barbara McConalogue

SECTION A: MINUTES AND RELATED ISSUES

1. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

2. Minutes of meetings

2.1 Minutes of the meeting of 4 February 2010

The minutes were confirmed subject to the addition of the words ‘at this stage in its development’ at the end of the second sentence in Item 3.18.

They were then signed by the Chair.

2.2 Minutes of the USC Documentation Subgroup meeting of 18 February 2010

The minutes were confirmed.

3. Matters arising from the minutes

- 3.1** The Chair referred to the Teaching Qualifications Working Group, formed at the request of the university Registrars, and its Technical Subgroup which had been established to make recommendations on the placing on the National Framework of Qualifications of the award previously known as the Higher Diploma in Education and currently designated the Postgraduate Diploma in Education. She noted that the Technical Sub-group had recommended that this award be placed at Level 8 on the Framework. Mr Lewis Purser, Director of Academic Affairs in the IUA, is investigating the implications of this for the universities and will report his findings to the meeting of the IUA to be held in June 2010 in DCU. It was noted that there might be implications for other Graduate Diploma programmes as well as for comparability with overseas qualifications. The Chair summarised the rationale for the decision which the Subgroup had made available and undertook to send the Subgroup's report to the Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning/Education and the associated covering letter to all USC members. Following from a general discussion of the difficulties attaching to Level 9 on the Framework, Dr Sheelagh Wickham undertook to draft a brief reminder about how these might be addressed and to send it to the Chair with a view to having it then forwarded to Mr Purser. (Item 3.2)
- 3.2** Noted that the issue of restructuring the MSc in Psychotherapy to make it compatible with Marks and Standards was likely to be addressed at the meeting of the Teaching Committee in the Faculty of Science and Health on 14 April 2010. (Item 3.3)
- 3.3** Noted that the draft revised *Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Degrees by Research and Thesis* were under consideration in Faculties with a view to discussion by the Graduate Studies Board at its meeting of 6 May 2010 and the USC at its meeting of 3 June 2010. (Item 3.6)
- 3.4** Noted that no need had arisen for a report to be submitted to the USC about the February 2010 Progression and Awards Boards, as no issues relating to Marks and Standards had arisen at them. (Item 3.7)
- 3.5** Agreed that Ms McDermott would request the members of the USC for comments and recommendations about issues relating to the appointment of external examiners such as number of appointments and regulations pertaining to renewal, reciprocity and independence. Recommendations on these matters will then be made to the USC at its meeting of 3 June 2010. (Item 3.9)
(See also Item 4.1 below.)

- 3.6** Noted that Queen's University Belfast had expressed satisfaction with the former Marks and Standards, and derogations would be required to facilitate the signed Memorandum of Understanding for the jointly-awarded Graduate Diploma/MSc in Plasma and Vacuum Studies. The derogation for 2009/10 granted by the USC at its meeting of 3 December 2009 would require to be considered for continuation. Noted that, where joint programmes were concerned, it might be necessary to adopt a somewhat different approach to the granting of derogations than is the case with other programmes. (Item 3.16)
- 3.7** Noted that discussions were ongoing about the operational implications of Marks and Standards for 'mother' and 'child' modules. It was agreed that no definition for 'mother and child' modules would be included in M&S. (Item 3.21)
- 3.8** Noted that a meeting of relevant staff members had been organised to discuss the operational implications of Marks and Standards for programmes which hold Progression and Awards Boards in November. (Item 3.22)
- 3.9** With regard to the completion of external examiners' reports, it was noted that a small group had been convened, as agreed by the USC, and an online form for the external examiners to use following the Summer examinations had been devised, with externs having also been advised that the use of hardcopy reports would be discontinued. Additional work to develop the system that would support the online form and hold the reports in a database would then need to be undertaken and would very probably require a submission to Budget Committee to request the necessary staffing resources. (Item 3.23)
- 3.10** The revised draft procedures in respect of external examiners' reports were approved subject to the following:
- the expansion of the reference to 'stakeholders' at Stage 4 so as to list all those to be copied on the responses to external examiners, including the Deputy President/Registrar, the President and the Registry
 - the deletion of the redundant words '(including the External Examiner)' in the second line of Stage 4.
- It was noted that the inclusion of the Registry among the stakeholders at Stage 4 would ensure that the Registry had an archive of all reports. Once the system referred to in Item 3.9 above is in use, all reports will be in electronic form. (Item 3.23)
- 3.11** Noted that the final revision to the policy on plagiarism had been carried out. (Item 3.24)

- 3.12** Noted that the working group on approval procedures was continuing its work to streamline approval procedures across a range of areas and to redraft the regulations and guidelines in respect of validation and accreditation. (Item 3.25)
- 3.13** Noted that a Programme Board had confirmed its intentions in respect of calculating the precision mark for a student who had returned to complete the programme following an exceptional absence. The calculation will be performed on the basis of module marks obtained when the student originally undertook the programme (70 credits) plus the mark for the dissertation which is currently being undertaken (20 credits). (Item 3.27)
- 3.14** Noted that it had been mentioned to the Graduate Studies Board, at its meeting of 4 March 2010, that Marks and Standards apply to research students to the extent that they take taught modules. (Item 4)
- 3.15** Noted that further information had been obtained about a proposed external examiner and that the nomination had been approved electronically on 2 March 2010. (Item 5.1.3)
- 3.16** Noted that no feedback on the operation of Marks and Standards at the February 2010 Progression and Awards Boards had been received by the Students' Union. (Item 7)
- 3.17** Noted that the group which had been charged with meeting before the February 2010 Programme Board Review and Examination Committee meetings, to clarify Marks and Standards issues, had done so. (Item 7)
- 3.18** Noted that it had not been necessary to avail of Chair's action to resolve any outstanding issues at the February 2010 Programme Board Examination and Review Committees. (Item 7)
- 3.19** Noted that Oscail BA students and applicants had been notified that all programmes, including theirs, are subject to possible future restructuring. (Item 7.1)
- 3.20** Noted that the revised policy and procedures in respect of AP(E)L would be on the agenda of the 3 June 2010 meeting of the EC. (Item 8)
- 3.21** Noted that, where necessary, the wording about compensation had been revised in the programme-specific regulations for 2009/10. (Item 9.1)

3.22 Noted that the subgroup on documentation had met on 18 February 2010. Its recommendations are contained in the minutes of the meeting (see Item 2.2 above) The programme-specific regulations documentation for 2010/2011 will be submitted to the USC at its meeting of 3 June 2010 with a request for formal approval. (Items 9.2 and 9.3)

3.23 Noted that approval had been granted, by means of Chair's action on 11 February 2010, for a request to allow a student to register for the MSc in Intellectual Disability following an exceptional absence (the student having relinquished the parchment for the Graduate Certificate in Intellectual Disability previously awarded).

4. Minutes of the Graduate Studies Board meeting of 14 January 2010

4.1 Approved. Noted that the issue of independence of external examiners was a very important one and that it would form a significant part of the recommendations on external examiner appointments to be made to the USC at its meeting of 3 June 2010, as mentioned at Item 3.5 above.

4.2 Noted that the most appropriate approval route for taught modules offered to research students prior to GSB approval (whether via Faculty Teaching and Learning/Education Committees or Faculty Research Committees or both) remained to be determined. The Chair noted that the issue of how teaching and supervision of research students was to be allocated in the context of Full Economic Costing had not yet been finally agreed, though the current classification was with the teaching stream, and advised that the final outcome of the FEC discussions might influence the decision taken in respect of module approval routes. It was noted also that it would be important for the GSB to conceptualise taught modules as requiring to be approved as part of a structured offering to research students rather than on a stand-alone basis. It was agreed that the question of approval routes should be discussed by the relevant parties, including the Director of Graduate Research, the Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning and the Associate Deans for Research, and that a proposal should be made to the USC at its meeting of 3 June 2010.

SECTION B: FACULTY ISSUES

5.1 Appointment of external examiners

5.1.1 Mrs Amanda Jane Zacharopoulou, University of Ulster
Modules in the School of Law and Government
Approved.

5.1.2 Dr Karen Guldberg, University of Ulster
Graduate Certificate in the Education of Pupils with Autistic Spectrum Disorders,
Approved.

5.1.3 Dr Hazel Lawson, University of Exeter
Graduate Certificate in Special Educational Needs
Approved.

5.2 Renewal of appointment of external examiners, and/or changes to duties

5.2.1 Professor Philip Thomas, University of Central Lancashire
Stand-alone module NS487: Co-operative Learning in Mental Health
Approved.

5.2.2 Ms Margaret McCann, Trinity College Dublin
Stand-alone modules:
NS436: Nursing Practice and Respiratory Conditions
NS439: Nursing Individuals with Respiratory Conditions
NS466: Enhancing the Well-being of People with Dementia and their Carers
Approved.

5.2.3 Professor Kathleen Lynch, University College Dublin
Human Development on the MA in Humanities, St Patrick's College
Approved.

6. Other issues

None.

SECTION C: OTHER ISSUES (NOT FACULTY SPECIFIC¹)

7. Marks and Standards: clarification of outstanding issues

7.1 It was noted that some of the issues numbered 1-20 on the list required some additional discussion to that which had taken place up to now and agreed that this discussion would take place at a meeting of the USC Subgroup to be convened as soon as possible. (The minutes of this meeting of the Subgroup are attached as an appendix to the present minutes.) The Chair requested members of the USC who might wish to raise any additional Marks and Standards-related issues to submit these to Ms McDermott within the day.

¹ In these minutes, Faculty-specific requests for derogations from Marks and Standards are located in Section C because of their close relationship with Marks and Standards, which is a standard Section C item.

7.2 The outcomes of the discussion on the remaining items are noted below.

Issue no. 21: M&S Section 2.2 (Table 2 - Award Credit Accumulation Structure)
Agreed to discuss at a future meeting the question of whether or not 60-credit Master's programmes should be considered.

Issue no. 22: M&S Section 2.4
Noted that module exemptions would not be granted in the case of awards carrying 60 ECTS credits or lower.

Issue no. 23: M&S Section 2.4
Agreed that no change was required and that the advice given to the enquirer in respect of shared teaching accurately reflected Marks and Standards. Noted that the recommendation of the Learning Innovation Advisory Panel in respect of shared teaching (see Item 8 below) would be likely to be of assistance in the scenario which had been outlined by the enquirer.

Issue no. 24: M&S Section 2.4
Agreed that no change was required and that the advice given to the enquirer in respect of shared teaching accurately reflected Marks and Standards. Noted that the recommendation of the Learning Innovation Advisory Panel in respect of shared teaching (see Item 8 below) would be likely to be of assistance in the scenario which had been outlined by the enquirer.

Issue no. 25: M&S Section 3.1.1
Agreed that, since 2.5-credit modules would no longer be available for students to repeat, students who had failed such modules would be required to register for a 5-credit module with similar learning outcomes.

Issue no. 26: M&S Section 5.1
Agreed that no further action needed to be taken at this point. Noted that a record of all requests for re-admission following exceptional absence was being kept with a view to informing future policy decisions in this area if this proved necessary.

Issue no. 27: M&S Section 5.1
Agreed that the issue raised here was covered in M&S Item 5.1.4. Noted that the references, in the description of the issue, to 'the 8-year period' and '7 times' should read 'the 4-year period' and '3 times' respectively.

Issue no. 28: M&S Section 5.1.1
Agreed that the issue raised here was covered under Issue no. 26 above.

Issue no. 29: M&S Section 5.1.3

Covered under Item 7.4 of these minutes.

Issue no. 30: M&S Section 6.2.1

Noted that discussions were in progress with a view to establishing how a Programme Board could ensure compliance with Marks and Standards in respect of assessment components.

Issue no. 31: M&S Section 6.2.2

Agreed that the necessary recalculations should be undertaken by Oscail.

Issue no. 32: M&S Section 7.1.4

Agreed that the necessary recalculations should be undertaken by Oscail.

Issue no. 32a: M&S Section 8.1.2

Agreed that, for the necessary transitional period, the capping of overall awards for Oscail students who take more than three years to complete their degree-level modules would be discontinued.

Issue no. 33: M&S Section 7.1

Noted that a meeting of relevant parties would take place on 7 April 2010 to agree on the queries raised in relation to fees.

Issue no. 34: M&S Section 7.1

Noted that information would be obtained from Ms Aisling McKenna, Institutional Research and Analysis Officer, which would give an indication of the likely fee implications with respect to the regulations on repeating modules and that discussions would then take place with the Finance Office. The Chair stressed the importance of resolving this issue soon.

Issue no. 35: M&S Section 7.1

Agreed that the position was clear in relation to the query and that no change to wording would be required.

Issue no. 36: M&S Section 7.1

The importance of having appropriate transitional arrangements in place for students who require them (not having completed all modules in a programme or study period under the previous Marks and Standards) was noted.

Issue no. 37: M&S Section 7.1

Agreed that the suggested additional wording in this section was not necessary and would be removed.

Issue no. 38: M&S Section 7.1

Agreed that the suggested additional wording in this section was not necessary and would be removed.

Issue no. 39: M&S Section 7.1.1

Agreed that the suggested additional wording in this section was not necessary and would be removed. Agreed that, in the paragraph beginning 'RESIT', the word 'repeat' in the third line should be replaced by the word 'resit' and that the same change should be made at the appropriate point in the Glossary.

Issue no. 40: M&S Section 7.1.4

Agreed to delete the word 'marked' from the first line of subsection iii of this section so that it reads 'a maximum of 1/6 of the available ECTS credits ... '.

Issue no. 41: M&S Section 7.1.6

Agreed that students registered in 2009/10 or previously as repeat students would not be allowed an additional repeat registration opportunity in 2010/11.

Issue no. 42: M&S Section 7.1.6

Agreed that students who failed some components of modules in former years would now be required to repeat the modules in their entirety rather than simply the failed components.

Issue no. 43: M&S Section 7.1.6

Noted that a student who fails a 'child' module but passes the 'mother' module overall must resit the 'child' module but must also re-register for the 'mother' module (to ensure that the Calculate programme deals appropriately with the resit mark). Agreed that there was no need to mention 'mother' and 'child' modules in Marks and Standards as they relate to procedures rather than regulations. Noted that it might be preferable to discontinue the use of such modules and instead use the compensation regulations to support students who failed to obtain a small number of credits despite an acceptable overall performance. Agreed that a proposal on this issue would be submitted to the USC at its meeting of 3 June 2010.

Issue no. 44: M&S Section 7.1.6

Noted that situations may arise in which a student is required to take an alternative module to a failed module and that the student will not normally exercise an option in this matter. Agreed that students taking alternative modules must pass them within one academic session. Agreed to change the wording in the last sentence of this section from 'A student may be required to register for an alternative module to a failed module if the failed module is not available in the next academic session' to 'A student may be required to register for an alternative module to a failed module

in the next academic session if the failed module is not available.’ The same change is to be made to Section 7.1.10.

Issue no. 45: M&S Section 7.1.6

Agreed that, in cases where students are permitted to carry a small number of failed credits into the next academic session (e.g. to facilitate the taking up of work placements abroad), they should be required to pay the appropriate repeat module fee and should have online subject material and support made available to them as they are unable to attend the academic exercises relating to the failed module.

Issue no. 46: M&S Section 7.1.6

Agreed that alternative modules could be undertaken only in the next academic session, not in the current one.

Issue no. 46a: M&S Section 7.1.6

Agreed that, where a student needed to repeat a module that was available only in every second academic session, an alternative module would need to be identified.

Issue no. 47: M&S Section 7.1.13 and associated footnote

Agreed that students who are registered in 2009/10 on Graduate Diplomas which extend beyond 2009/10 would, in 2010/11, be registered as Master’s students. This does not preclude a student from exiting with a Graduate Diploma on completion of the appropriate Level 9 credits. Issues relating to funding (e.g. where a student is funded by an external agency to complete a particular award) can be resolved by making the credit structure available to the external agency.

- 7.3** It was noted that the amendments to the wording of Marks and Standards which had been agreed, and any which would be agreed at the meeting of the Subgroup referred to in Item 7.1 above, would be highlighted in the Marks and Standards document and that this document would be submitted for formal approval to Academic Council at its meeting of 14 April 2010 together with a statement that a list of frequently-asked questions, together with responses, to provide additional information on matters which had arisen in the course of discussion, would be made available to Programme Chairs and other stakeholders prior to the Summer examinations. It was noted none the less that it would be very important, in dealing with queries about Marks and Standards, to refer the enquirer to the relevant section in the first instance, as the answer would very often be available here without additional explanatory material being required.
- 7.4** The draft policy on leave of absence was approved subject to the inclusion of ‘e.g.’ before the description (‘mental health, family situation’) of what might constitute ‘serious ongoing/medium-term documented personal issues’ and before the description (‘relocation of self or partner’) of what might constitute ‘serious

medium-term work commitments'. The following were noted: leave of absence carries no fee implication for the student, and the Finance Office does not envisage problems in operating the policy; the reason for requesting leave may or may not be the same as that previously used for requesting deferral though it is likely that the underlying cause (an example would be a progressive medical condition) will normally be the same. In the case of Oscail, it was agreed to monitor how the policy would impact on the operation of programmes. It was agreed to submit the policy to Academic Council for formal approval at its meeting of 9 June 2010 with a view to having it in place from the beginning of 2010/11 (in this connection, it was noted that students who request such leave in 2009/10 cannot be considered for it). It was noted that it would be very important to ensure that Heads of School, Programme Chairs and staff in Student Support and Development were aware of the policy.

- 7.5 It was noted that, although a Level 8 programme cannot have Level 9 outcomes, there is a *de facto* requirement by the Teaching Council that the teaching practice components of Level 8 teacher education programmes have outcomes which would be considered more appropriate to Level 9. The difficulties caused by this in relation to both the application of the NFQ and future study at Level 9 for graduates of Level 8 teacher education programmes were noted.

8. Report from the Learning Innovation Advisory Panel on the pedagogical implications of shared teaching

It was noted that two approaches to shared teaching are normally used: one in which one module (at Level 8) is jointly taught to students registered on both Level 8 and Level 9 programmes, and another in which two distinct modules (at different levels, 8 or 9) are jointly taught to a combined group registered on both Level 8 and Level 9 programmes. The recommendation from the LIAP is that the former approach is acceptable and the latter approach should be discontinued. It was noted that it might take some time to do this, and suggested that it might be desirable to set a time limit. It was agreed that a recommendation on the issue should be made to Academic Council at its meeting of 9 June 2010 and that a report on the final decision would be made to the Heads' meeting of 24 June 2010 to foster awareness of it. The Chair thanked Ms Morag Munro and the other members of the LIAP for their work in preparing the report.

9. Recommendation from the Appeals Board about undergraduate and taught postgraduate projects

The recommendations were noted as being consonant with university initiatives in terms of teaching quality and quality assurance of programmes. It was noted that

the Associate Deans for Teaching and Learning/Education are already engaged in an exercise to gather data about practice across Faculties in administering projects. The recommendations from the Appeals Board will also be on the agenda of the meeting of Academic Council of 14 April 2010.

10. Any other business

The Chair noted that, in a recent report from the EU Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs², Ireland is mentioned favourably, particularly with regard to graduation rates. She indicated that the online location of this report would be made available to the USC.

Date of next meeting:

**3 June 2010
9.00 a.m. in A204**

Signed: _____
Chair

Date: _____

² *Study on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Public Spending on Tertiary Education* (Economic Papers 390, November 2009)

APPENDIX

**UNIVERSITY STANDARDS COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES OF SUBGROUP MEETING**

Thursday 1 April 2010

2.00-3.30 p.m. in the Executive Dining-room

Present: Professor Anne Scott (Chair), Dr Françoise Blin,
Ms Jennifer Bruton, Mr Billy Kelly,
Ms Louise McDermott (Secretary), Ms Phylomena McMorrow,
Dr Sheelagh Wickham

1. Marks and Standards: clarification of outstanding issues

The following changes to wording/proposed wording were agreed.

1.1 The version number for the revised version of Marks and Standards is to be 2010.1.0.

1.2 The last sentence of the last paragraph under 'Principles' is to read as follows:

These Marks and Standards must be applied consistently at all times and to all taught programmes and modules, including taught modules designed for graduate research students; only derogations required by professional bodies will be considered for approval.

The proposed first new sentence underneath this paragraph is therefore no longer required.

1.3 The proposed second new sentence underneath the paragraph referred to in 1.2 above is to be moved to just above *Section 1 – Dublin City University (DCU) Awards*.

1.4 Under 'Version', the following is to be inserted:

Amendments submitted for approval and approved by Academic Council on April 14th 2010.

- 1.5** The 'Certificate of Continuing Professional Development' referred to in Table 1 will need further discussion at a future date. Such a Certificate has, to date, not been awarded by the university.
- 1.6** A suggestion that Table 2 include an indication of the NFQ level per award was not acted upon, on the basis that it might cause confusion since most awards will contain both modules at the level of the award and modules at other levels.
- 1.7** In Table 2, the words 'minimum of' are to be inserted before '30 ECTS credits' and '60 ECTS credits' beside 'Graduate Certificate' and 'Graduate Diploma' respectively.
- 1.8** In Section 2.4, the suggested additional sentence at the end: 'Exemptions will not be granted in respect of an award worth 60 or fewer credits' is deemed redundant and will be removed.
- 1.9** In Section 5.1, the second sentence is to read as follows: 'All academic sessions from the date of first registration contribute to the overall registration period irrespective of whether or not the student is registered for such sessions (excluding approved leave of absence).'
- 1.10** In Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2, the words 'an extension to the maximum' are to be inserted, and the word 'period' indicated in the singular not the plural, so that the end of the sentence reads '... when considering the possibility of an extension to the maximum registration period and/or alternative exit awards'.
- 1.11** With regard to Section 6.1.6, it was noted that the reference to a '0 mark' is appropriate because it is consistent with the Calculate programme.
- 1.12** In Section 7, in the first line of the definition of the precision mark, the reference to 'average weighted mark' is to be replaced by a reference to 'weighted average', and the same change is to be made at the appropriate point in the Glossary.
- 1.13** In Section 7.1.2, the suggested additional wording is to be replaced by the following: 'Details of non-compensatable modules are outlined in the programme-specific regulations' (plus web link – see Item 1.16 below).

- 1.14 In Section 7.1.13, the suggested new second sentence is deemed not necessary and will be removed.
- 1.15 Footnotes 1, 2, 3 and 4 are no longer required. Footnotes 5, 6 and 7 are renamed 1, 2 and 3 respectively.
- 1.16 At all appropriate points, the reference to programme-specific regulations will be accompanied by the appropriate web link.
- 1.17 All amendments to Marks and Standards indicated in Issues 1-20 in Item 7 of the papers for the USC meeting of 1 April 2010, other than those subject to agreement in Items 1.1-1.16 inclusive of these minutes of the Subgroup meeting of 1 April 2010, were approved.

2. **Module exemptions in relation to compensation**

It was noted that Marks and Standards do not refer to the eligibility, or otherwise, of modules from which a student has obtained exemption for use in calculating entitlement to compensation and that this issue, while arising infrequently at present, may arise more often in the future as the potential of the Academic Framework for Innovation is developed. It was noted also exemption is sometimes granted on the basis of a prior mark obtained and sometimes not (e.g. where APEL is applied). Ms McMorrow undertook to investigate the implications of this issue for the working of the Calculate programme and to report the findings to the Deputy President/Registrar.

3. **Provision of additional information for Programme Chairs and others**

- 3.1 It was agreed that Ms McMorrow and Ms McDermott would liaise on the issue of preparing a list of frequently-asked questions for the information of Programme Chairs and other stakeholders (as mentioned in Item 7.3 of the minutes of the meeting of the USC of 1 April 2010). It was noted, however, that many of the issues might well have been addressed by now.
- 3.2 The importance of keeping correct records of versions of Marks and Standards was noted. Dr Wickham undertook to supply information on procedures relating to this from University College Dublin as well as information on their procedures relating to the listing of FAQs and the provision of responses.

4. **Any other business**

None.