



## **Special Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General on Accountability and Governance at the National College of Art & Design**

### **Briefing paper for Committee of Public Accounts**

The HEA regards the **Special Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General on Accountability and Governance at the National College of Art & Design** as an important report both as it relates specifically to the NCAD and more generally as part of the on-going work of reviewing and strengthening accountability processes across the higher education system.

The HEA, together with the higher education institutions we fund, is committed to strong and effective governance and accountability. Today governance structures and the reporting requirements in place in the higher education sector are far more effective than, say, 10 years ago. But such structures require constant, on-going review and reform. A particular value of a report such as this Special Report is that it highlights where such structures and processes can be improved. This memo sets out for the Committee some of the background to the issues raised in the Report, in particular the actions of the HEA. We also set out how we propose to strengthen accountability and governance processes, following on from the recommendations in this report and our own review of such processes which was underway independently.

#### **Governance of Irish higher education institutions**

The principles of good governance have been well established in the higher education sector. There have been various codes of practice applicable to the universities – e.g. the 2007 Code HEA/IUA *Code of Governance for Irish Universities* and most recently updated in 2012. Similarly, a *Code of Governance for Irish Institutes of Technology* was produced for the Institute of Technology sector. The original Code of Governance for Universities, published in 2007, and its revised version published in 2012 were both based on the Code of Practice for the Governance of State Bodies. From 2009, the HEA has required other higher education institutions to ensure similar processes were in place and to submit annual governance statements to the HEA. The NCAD operates under the Code of Practice for the Governance of State Bodies.

#### **Roles and responsibilities of HEA, NCAD and C&AG**

The HEA is a part of a system of accountability for public funding and expenditure in the higher education system, which also includes the institutions themselves with primary responsibility and the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General

In the present case, the NCAD was established under the National College of Art and Design Act 1971 and is governed by a board appointed by the Minister for Education and Skills. Section 5 of the Act specifies that the Board “shall carry out the management of the College and the organisation and administration of its affairs, and shall have all such powers as are necessary for or incidental to those purposes.” Section 15 (2) of the Act states that “accounts [...] shall be submitted annually to the Comptroller and Auditor-General for audit ...”

The HEA is responsible for the allocation of core State funding to higher education institutions and has a responsibility to ensure appropriate accountability to the Minister and Government for such expenditure. In general, this responsibility is carried out by requiring higher education institutions to have appropriate financial processes and internal governance systems in place as well as associated regular reporting.

The Comptroller and Auditor General plays a central role in the public accountability process by providing assurance to Dáil Éireann on the manner in which public funds have been administered and providing it with reports on matters arising out of audits and other statutory examinations. These audits and reports, while primarily to the Houses of the Oireachtas, are an intrinsically valuable part of the overall accountability ecosystem

### **Issues raised in the Special Report**

Issues arise in respect of three main areas in NCAD:

- Preparation of financial statements;
- Internal governance, in particular issues relating to review of internal controls;
- Procurement practice.

The report also addresses the issue of oversight by the HEA.

In relation to the **preparation of financial statements**, the HEA has, over the years, consistently stressed to NCAD, in common with other higher education institutions, the importance of prioritising the completion of accounts. In correspondence and at meetings with the College the HEA stressed the importance of getting accounts signed off in a timely manner and that any internal controls procedures raised by the C&AG should be dealt with. Furthermore, in the HEA’s annual grant allocation letter, all institutions are reminded of the requirements regarding the timely laying before the Houses of the Oireachtas of the accounts of bodies audited by the C&AG.

Nevertheless, it is clear that delays have arisen, sometimes for valid reasons, in the preparation of accounts. The HEA has had very limited powers to address these delays (See further discussion on proposed reform in this area later). However, it is important to note that the HEA has not been operating with no meaningful financial

information on the institutions. We consistently have had up-to-date information on the financial position of the NCAD, and other institutions, through the provision to us of detailed accounts (albeit unaudited) for each calendar year, submitted on an annual basis along with budget submissions for the year in question.

It is also noteworthy that throughout the period in question, the HEA received Governance Statements for the College confirming that there were no compliance issues with the Code for the Governance of State Bodies.

The HEA notes that the current position in relation to the production of the College's accounts and preparation of its financial statements is that the C&AG signed the 2010/11 accounts on 28 December 2014. The position in relation to outstanding financial statements is as follows (as at January 2015):

- 2011/12 - field work complete - by the end of week starting 12 January 2015, NCAD will have responded to all C&AG queries
- 2012/13 - C&AG looking at March to commence field work - file and Financial Statements will be ready in advance of this date
- 2013/14 - NCAD committed to continuing with audits until the College is fully up to date. College is targeting a May/June date for commencement of field work

In relation to **internal governance**, a key issue is the failure of the College to carry out a review of internal controls. The C&AG report states that the HEA should have been more proactive in pursuing the College on this matter.

The facts are that in draft statements of internal control submitted by the College for 2008/09 and 2009/10 received in October 2012, the HEA was assured that a review had taken place in 09/10. However, the audited accounts that were copied to the HEA in January 2013 established that such a review had not taken place. The discrepancy was overlooked in the HEA – this should not have occurred. As a result we did not pursue the College for an explanation, until late 2013 when the matter was brought to our attention as part of the C & AG review of processes in the College.

In February 2014 the College advised the HEA at a meeting we had convened to discuss the issues of internal controls that it would complete internal audits and hold the four Internal Audit Committee meetings, with their internal auditors providing reports on the audits one week ahead of each meeting. The HEA notes that the College is now implementing rigorous and effective audit arrangements in order to rectify the issues identified by the C&AG.

In relation to **procurement practice**, the HEA has consistently informed higher education institutions of latest Government directives and circulars on the issue. In January 2013 the HEA received the College's signed and audited accounts for 2008/09 and 2009/10 which showed that procurement good practice had not been followed. It would have been reasonable and appropriate for the HEA to have required the College to explain their position. That we did not do so was, again, an oversight that should not have occurred. However, it arose in the context where by then we had assurances that the College was taking action to address this issue. The College is now proactively addressing issues identified by the C&AG by updating relevant policies, training staff and availing of the Government's E-Tenders service. The HEA also understands that the College is availing of procurement arrangements in UCD thus achieving savings to the College.

### **HEA oversight**

The following is the present sequence of events in relation to the preparation of financial statements of higher education institutions for audit and governance reporting requirements to the HEA:

1. When a financial year ends (30 September or 31 August in the case of Institutes of Technology) institutions commence production and finalisation of financial statements. These financial statements will be audited by the C&AG (and in the case of universities by externally appointed commercial auditors first).
2. During the following year the HEA will write to institutions requesting annual Statements of Governance and Internal Control. These are submitted during the second half of the year. This allows institutions sufficient time to complete the accounts production process and identify any issues arising, to which we should be alerted in the Statement.
3. On an annual basis the HEA Executive prepares for the Authority a summary of all governance statements received with commentary on any issues arising and any proposed follow-up action.
4. Notwithstanding the length of time between the end of the financial year in question (30 September) and the presentation of the governance statements to the Authority at the end of following year, many of the statements received are still only in draft form as external and/or C&AG audits of an institution's financial statements may not have been completed or indeed have commenced at all. Therefore the information contained in the Statements of Governance and Internal Control submitted by each institution, and presented to the Authority, may subsequently be revised in light of issues identified as part of the audit process.

(This last point is of relevance when considering the issues outlined in the C&AG's Special Report as the HEA did not become aware of the mis-statement of full compliance in the Governance Statements from the College until the audit of its accounts occurred a year later).

The conclusions and recommendations contained in the C&AG's report also raise issues of governance and oversight of general application to the sector.

Autonomy in the management of their internal affairs is an important aspect of our higher education institutions and one that is enshrined in law and supported by public policy. Each HEI has a Board/Governing Authority that is responsible for the institution's mission, values, strategic direction, internal governance, financial sustainability and overall performance.

While HEIs should operate with a high level of autonomy, they must do so within an appropriate level of accountability given the public investment made in them and the public interest in the outcomes from that investment. The HEA has a central role to play in ensuring that appropriate level of accountability. In doing so, the HEA cannot, and should not, micro-manage the operations of a HEI. Instead the HEA exercises its accountability role by requiring governing bodies to have in place internal governance structures and processes that accord with good practice. We do this through requiring HEIs to implement codes of governance which have been agreed by the HEA that set out good practice in relation to the governance structures and processes, and that also specify the particular reporting requirements of the HEA.

These codes of governance require the Governing Authority and the Chief Officer of each HEI to make a formal Annual Statement of Governance to the HEA, affirming that the governing authority is responsible for and is satisfied that the institution is in compliance with all statutory obligations applicable to the institution and providing confirmations in relation to a range of areas. Where a HEI cannot, or does not, comply with one or more provisions of the Governance Code, they are required to provide an explanation as to why they are not in compliance. Equally, where breaches are identified HEIs are expected to identify what action has been taken to address the matter and what processes have been put in place to ensure non-recurrence.

The HEA has consistently relied on the bona fides of institutions and statements made on their behalf by their most senior governance and management structures. We have not been in a position, from either a statutory or practical position, to look behind such statements and do not therefore routinely do so. The present case requires the HEA to review our reliance on the accuracy of statements made to us.

The accountability framework is strengthened by the fact that the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General audits the financial statements of the HEIs and as part of this work it reviews the Statement of Governance and Internal Control included with the annual accounts; considers if the statement is consistent with the information of which they are aware from their audit work and confirm that it reflects the institution's compliance as set out in its governance statement.

Prior to this Special Report, the HEA was reviewing our governance and regulatory role in the context of our expanded mandate under the National Strategy for Higher Education. Following from that review, a number of initiatives are underway to strengthen our role with a focus on enhanced processes in relation to the oversight of annual governance statements and statements of internal control. This will include the expansion of the format for required returns, more detailed analysis of institutional responses and appropriate follow-up, and the development of best practice approaches. Specifically, the HEA will:

- Set out formally for the sector a statement on HEI responsibilities in relation to governance and the HEA role in relation to oversight of processes.
- Include in the performance related element of the funding model, a requirement for institutional compliance with governance requirements and procedures and other statutory requirements.
- In order to improve the timeliness of reporting, HEIs will be required to submit an annual Statement of Governance and Internal Control no later than 6 months after the end of each financial year end. (It is appreciated that in some instances this report will not have been formally audited by the C &AG).
- HEIs to separately report on risk management in relation to institutional mergers, alliances etc.
- HEIs will be required to specifically inform the HEA where any discrepancies arise between assurances given to the HEA and the outcomes of audits.
- Review and strengthen HEA executive processes in relation to oversight and follow-up on governance and internal control statements
- Review reporting formats submitted by HEIs with a view to achieving more consistency and depth in returns
- Introduce a programme of rolling reviews, which would cover specific elements of governance processes – to provide assurance that they are operating effectively and to assist in the development of best practice approaches

In this context too it should be noted that the Office of the C&AG is currently carrying out on a review of the HEAs general governance and regulatory role. This is a most welcome development and opportune as we undertake our expanded mandate.

Given the findings in relation to NCAD, the HEA must now consider with the Department of Education and Skills and the Office of the C&AG whether we should exercise a formal audit function, either generally or on a “spot-check” basis. This would be a significant extension to our current role. If it were to proceed it would be desirable to underpin it in legislation and it would have resource implications.

In dealing with clear breaches of accountability requirements the issue of the capacity of the HEA to impose financial penalties arises and indeed is referenced in the Special Report. Currently the powers of the HEA in this regard are at best doubtful legally as there is no explicit statutory power to do so. However, as of 2014, circumstances have changed arising from the implementation of the National Strategy for Higher Education. An important part of our new and expanded approach to accountability of the higher education sector is the agreement of an annual compact with each higher education institution, setting out targets to be achieved in respect of specified national objectives for higher education. The HEA’s funding model is being revised to support this new approach and will include a performance related element, which will be linked to the achievement of targets agreed for each HEI. As part of this development, performance funding will take into account institutional compliance with governance requirements and procedures and other statutory requirements. Failure to adhere to good practice and to effectively carry out accountability responsibilities will, in future be met with a potential reduction in funding.

### **Monitoring of progress**

Given the significance of the findings in this Special Report and the fact that the HEA has previously relied on assurances from the College which were subsequently found to be inaccurate, the HEA will conduct a full review of the implementation by NCAD of the full range of measures now underway to address the findings and recommendations in this Report and to assure ourselves that the governance and accountability procedures in the College are in line with best practice.

15 January 2015





As submitted by NCAD as part of the annual budgetary process										
NCAD	Submitted March 2010		Submitted March 2011		Submitted March 2012		Submitted March 2013		Original Budget Submitted March 2014	
	Budget 31/12/2010	Result 31/12/2009	Budget 31/12/2011	Result 31/12/2010	Budget 31/12/2012	Result 31/12/2011	Budget 2013	Not Audited 2012	Revised Budget 2014 (based on a revised budget submitted in May 2014)	Result 31/12/2013
<b>Income</b>										
Grant	€7,869,000	€9,653,472	€6,736,000	€8,317,000	€5,945,174	€7,818,596	€6,159,000	€6,756,000	€5,222,000	€6,459,000
Academic Fees	€5,106,000	€4,705,648	€5,450,000	€5,239,000	€5,567,731	€5,527,348	€5,803,000	€5,477,000	€6,741,000	€5,837,000
Other Grants	€545,000	€1,742,704	€555,000	€876,000	€723,420	€969,609	€325,000	€1,191,000	€134,000	€619,000
Other Income	€40,000	€47,381	€40,000	€115,000	€80,000	€181,440	€203,000	€187,000	€131,000	€189,000
Grant towards Pension Costs							€263,000	€263,000	€298,000	€298,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>€13,560,000</b>	<b>€16,149,205</b>	<b>€12,781,000</b>	<b>€14,547,000</b>	<b>€12,316,325</b>	<b>€14,496,993</b>	<b>€12,753,000</b>	<b>€13,874,000</b>	<b>€12,526,000</b>	<b>€13,402,000</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>										
Academic Departments	€6,839,000	€7,778,831	€6,615,000	€6,990,000	€6,578,515	€6,823,663	€6,620,000	€6,726,000	€6,230,000	€6,797,000
Academic & Other Central Services	€835,000	€898,443	€733,000	€801,000	€645,191	€721,437	€599,000	€654,000	€553,000	€541,000
Premises	€1,914,000	€2,823,918	€1,699,000	€1,911,000	€1,703,744	€1,898,837	€1,803,000	€1,818,000	€1,864,000	€1,859,000
Central Administration	€1,849,000	€2,116,134	€1,681,000	€1,814,000	€1,499,316	€1,632,156	€1,593,000	€1,618,000	€1,642,000	€1,606,000
General Education Expenses	€70,000	€88,855	€47,000	€47,000	€32,000	€36,037	€7,000	€15,000	€23,000	€29,000
Student services	€380,000	€502,485	€380,000	€492,000	€344,947	€483,525	€334,000	€485,000	€256,000	€455,000
Miscellaneous Expenditure	€1,571,000	€1,888,208	€1,633,000	€2,227,000	€1,838,880	€2,955,149	€1,909,000	€2,958,000	€1,947,000	€2,467,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>€13,458,000</b>	<b>€16,096,874</b>	<b>€12,788,000</b>	<b>€14,282,000</b>	<b>€12,642,593</b>	<b>€14,550,804</b>	<b>€12,865,000</b>	<b>€14,274,000</b>	<b>€12,515,000</b>	<b>€13,754,000</b>
(Deficit)/ Surplus for Year	€102,000	€52,331	-€7,000	€265,000	-€326,268	-€53,811	-€112,000	-€400,000	€11,000	-€352,000
Accumulated (Deficit)/ Surplus at beginning of year	-€62,000	-€43,405	€14,000	-€192,000	-€69,890	€14,165	-€485,000	-€70,000	-€837,000	-€485,000
Transfer to Capital Account	-€40,000	-€70,908	-€7,000	-€59,000	€0	-€30,244	€0	-€15,000	€0	€0
<b>Total</b>	<b>€0</b>	<b>-€61,982</b>	<b>€0</b>	<b>€14,000</b>	<b>-€396,158</b>	<b>-€69,890</b>	<b>-€597,000</b>	<b>-€485,000</b>	<b>-€826,000</b>	<b>-€837,000</b>



## **Cork Institute of Technology and IT Tralee – costs of merger**

The PAC has sought information in respect of the costs incurred by CIT and IT Tralee in working towards a merger in Munster, leading to an application for a technological university for the region. The HEA has provided specific funding to support this project and this note sets out some of the relevant issues.

### **Purpose of funding**

The National Strategy for Higher Education (2011) provided for very significant change in the landscape of higher education, to better enable the system to meet the demands of its many stakeholders into the future. The strategy took into account the rising demand for higher education from both school leavers and mature learners, increased international competition from other higher education institutions, raising expectations of employers, declining state funding amongst other issues.

A particular focus of the report was on the need to encourage and facilitate mergers of institutions, to improve the quality of those institutions, and also to provide an opportunity for institutes of technology that took on such a merger process, to aspire towards re-designation as Technological University, subject to meeting demanding criteria.

The process of merger of higher education institutions is recognised internationally as complex and difficult. Successful mergers require significant planning and commitment, as well as some upfront funding to address inescapable costs arising.

In this context, the HEA provided some limited funding from within the overall allocation of funding provided for higher education to support institutions planning to merge. In making such allocations, the HEA was conscious that front-line services and supports to students had to be prioritised, notwithstanding the fact that funding for higher education is severely limited at present, while student numbers are increasing rapidly. Given such constraints, the HEA was not in a position to fully fund the costs involved, but did seek to provide some support to assist the institutions concerned.

## **Funding allocated and conditions imposed**

In total, 24 institutions sought assistance under the mergers strand of the HEA's Strategic Innovation and Development Fund (SIDF) 2013, seeking circa € 13,000,000 in funding.

In the case of CIT and IT Tralee, the institutions sought an allocation of € 350,000 over a 24 month period. The funding was to support:

- Investigation of appropriate models/ structures for a multi-campus university – research the structures utilised by other multi-campus and multi-site organisations to determine current good practice and the range of options available. Potential implementation of the model/ structures identified to determine suitability.
- Investigate appropriate systems (particularly ICT) for the provision of education, research and engagement in a multi-campus university - research the potential for ICT to facilitate the efficient and effective provision of services and supports. Potential implementation of the model/ structures identified to determine suitability.

The HEA was not in a position to provide such a quantum of funding, and to allocate it over a multi-annual basis. Instead, from total funding of € 3,871,465, made available for the mergers process, an allocation of € 100,000 was provided, for a single year.

It was noted that this is a challenging institutional consolidation project, with two geographically dispersed campuses. CIT and IT Tralee were advised that academic vision needs to be the primary driver, with emphasis on outcomes and implementation. The reformed workplace should comprise one element of this project, with a greater shared services approach, involving a larger number of relevant institutions in the planning stages of this project. Partners were advised to liaise with other relevant institutions on the aspects related to shared virtual learning environments, shared student registry and administration. The project outcomes of multi-campus HEIs should then be disseminated through a workshop to relevant HEIs merging.

Where proposals explicitly linked the pursuit of TU status to the funding sought, the HEA stated that funding is provided in respect of proposed institutional consolidation, in line with the implementation of recommendation 5.3 of the HEA System Reconfiguration Report to Minister for Education and Skills. Clear progress towards institutional consolidation is required irrespective of TU application.

## **Report on activity**

The HEA sought progress reports from all institutions in Autumn 2014. In the case of CIT and IT Tralee, both institutions reported jointly on expenditure of the funding allocated. The detail is attached at Appendix A. In general the funding was applied to costs associated with the due diligence process, analysis of structures for management and governance, travel costs and overheads. In both cases the institutions indicated that they had provided additional institutional funds to complement the funding allocated by HEA.

## **Current position**

In August 2014, the HEA announced a further dedicated call for submissions in respect of the costs of mergers being undertaken as part of the National Strategy. A total of €2,000,000 was made available for this call. CIT and IT Tralee submitted a joint application and were awarded € €766,667 in respect of their proposal, having regard to the scale of the project, the level of co-funding provided by institutions, and the track record of success in the development of the project to date. A report on funding expenditure and activity will be submitted to the HEA in mid-2015.

## **Appendix A**

Expenditure on the award amounted to €95,639.38 and is broken down as follows:

Due Diligence Process	€58,999.38
Analysis of Structures for Management and Governance	€21,800.19
Visit to University of South Wales	€2,365.11
Overheads	€12,474.70

This represents direct project expenditure and does not include matched funding from both Institutes which is comprised of staff and other resources allocated to the project. This is estimated at €114,770.00.

## **Waterford IT and IT Carlow – costs of merger**

The PAC has sought information in respect of the costs incurred by WIT and ITC in the work towards the establishment of a TU for the South East. The HEA has provided specific funding to support this project and this note sets out some of the relevant issues.

### **Purpose of funding**

The National Strategy for Higher Education (2011) provided for very significant change in the landscape of higher education, to better enable the system to meet the demands of its many stakeholders into the future. The strategy took into account the rising demand for higher education from both school leavers and mature learners, increased international competition from other higher education institutions, raising expectations of employers, declining state funding amongst other issues.

A particular focus of the report was on the need to encourage and facilitate mergers of institutions, to improve the quality of those institutions, and also to provide an opportunity for institutes of technology that took on such a merger process, to aspire towards re-designation as Technological University, subject to meeting demanding criteria.

The process of merger of higher education institutions is recognised internationally as complex and difficult. Successful mergers require significant planning and commitment, as well as some upfront funding to address inescapable costs arising.

In this context, the HEA provided some limited funding from within the overall allocation of funding provided for higher education to support institutions planning to merge. In making such allocations, the HEA was conscious that front-line services and supports to students had to be prioritised, notwithstanding the fact that funding for higher education is severely limited at present, while student numbers are increasing rapidly. Given such constraints, the HEA was not in a position to fully fund the costs involved, but did seek to provide some support to assist the institutions concerned.

## **Funding allocated and conditions imposed**

In total, 24 institutions sought assistance under the mergers strand of the HEA's Strategic Innovation and Development Fund (SIDF) 2013, seeking circa € 13,000,000 in funding.

In the case of WIT and IT Carlow, the institutions sought an allocation of € 1,397,500 over an 18 month period. The funding was to support:

- Joint Business Plan development detailing how the criteria set for designation as a Technological University will be met and the timescales, strategies and resources involved;
- Due diligence/sustainability review which will also inform the Business Plan;
- Targeted joint initiatives which will assist the Institutes of Technology in improving outcomes in teaching, research and engagement, and in developing and demonstrating trajectories in various areas required to meet the criteria for re-designation as a Technological University. These will specifically deliver on a Joint Academic Development Centre, Joint Graduate School and a Regional Engagement Forum

The HEA was not in a position to provide such a quantum of funding, and to allocate it over a multi-annual basis. Instead, from total funding of € 3,871,465, made available for the mergers process, an allocation of € 250,000 was provided, for a single year. Furthermore, the funding allocated was to be provided in two tranches, with evidence of progress required before the second tranche of funding could be released.

It was noted that this is a challenging institutional consolidation project, with two geographically dispersed campuses. Notwithstanding this, it was clarified that funding was being provided towards the costs of one integrated project office for the merger. Where proposals explicitly linked the pursuit of TU status to the funding sought, the HEA stated that funding is provided in respect of proposed institutional consolidation, in line with the implementation of recommendation 5.3 of the HEA System Reconfiguration Report to Minister for Education and Skills. Clear progress towards institutional consolidation is required irrespective of TU application.

## **Report on activity**

The HEA sought progress reports from all institutions in Autumn 2014. In the case of WIT and ITC, both institutions reported on their respective spends of the funding allocated. The detail is attached at Appendix A. In general the funding was applied to payroll costs, some external consultancy, and travel costs. In both cases the institutions indicated that they had provided additional institutional funds to complement the funding allocated by HEA.



## Current position

In October 2014, the institutions indicated that the process for merger had been suspended by WIT. The Minister for Education and Skill subsequently appointed Mr. Michael Kelly, former Chair of the HEA, to lead a process of consultation with all parties to consider the establishment of technological university in the region. That work is presently ongoing. Neither the second tranche of funding under the Strategic Innovation and Development Fund 2013 award, nor any further funding, has been allocated to the institutions; the HEA will consider the position further at the completion of Mr. Kelly's work.

## **Appendix A**

### **Waterford Institute of Technology**

In relation to expenditure on the TU project, over the past three years WIT has incurred direct costs of €166,858. The breakdown of the expenditure is as follows:

Staff Costs	€98,484
Consultancy/External Experts	€47,476
Travel and subsistence	€ 6,956
Other Costs	€13,942

Of the total expenditure incurred, €85,000 was awarded to the Institute by the HEA through a Strategic Innovation Development Fund (SIDF) grant in 2013.

### **Carlow Institute of Technology**

In relation to expenditure on the TU project, over the past three years ITC has incurred direct costs of €162,199. The breakdown of the expenditure is as follows:

Staff Costs	€79,445
Professional Fees	€25,087
Due Diligence Costs	€49,200
Meeting and associated costs	€8,467

Of the total expenditure incurred, €85,000 was awarded to the Institute by the HEA through a Strategic Innovation Development Fund (SIDF) grant in 2013.