

Meeting 4 of the Steering Committee to Review the Action Plan on Bullying Minutes

Tuesday 26th April, 2022, 10.30am

WebEx

Attendees:

Áine Lynch, CEO, National Parents Council Primary
Bridget Wilson, Department of Children, Equality, Disability, Integration and Youth
Clíodhna Purdue, Online Safety Programme Training Executive, Barnardos
Dr Clíona Saidléar, Executive Director, Rape Crisis Network Ireland
Deirdre Shanley, Assistant Secretary, Schools Division, Department of Education
Emer Neville, President, Irish Second-Level Students' Union
Prof. James O'Higgins Norman, Director, UNESCO Chair on Tackling Bullying and Cyberbullying, Director, DCU Anti-Bullying Centre
Jane McGarrigle, Project Officer, Webwise
Judith Lyons, Parents and Learners Unit, Department of Education
Kerri Smith, Associate Director of Children's Services, Barnardos
Mai Fanning, President, National Parents Council Post-Primary
Majella O'Dea, Teacher Education Section, Department of Education
Maria Bracken, Digital, Teacher Supply, Teaching Council Section, Department of Education
Maria Joyce, Co-ordinator National Traveller Women's Forum
Martha Evans, Director, Anti-Bullying Alliance, UK
Michelle Kelly, Parents and Learners Unit, Department of Education
Moninne Griffith, CEO, Belong To
Niamh Molloy, Parents and Learners Unit, Department of Education
Dr Noel Purdy, Director Centre for Research in Educational Underachievement (CREU) Stranmillis University College, Chair of Committee
Padraig Fahey, Primary Inspector, Inspectorate, Department of Education
Pádraig Mac Fhlannchadha, Assistant Chief Inspector, Inspectorate, Department of Education
Rebecca Galligan, Post-Primary Senior Inspector, Inspectorate, Department of Education
Ronan Kielt, Teacher Education Section, Department of Education
Sarah Benson, CEO, Women's Aid
Sharon Eustace, Regional Director, National Educational Psychological Service, Department of Education
Siobhan Broderick, Post-Primary Senior Inspector, Inspectorate, Department of Education
Victoria Howson, Community Engagement Manager, ISPC
Yvonne Keating, Deputy Chief Inspector, Inspectorate, Department of Education

Apologies:

Aileen Hickie, CEO, Parentline
Seònaid Ó'Murchadha, Board member, Independent Living Movement Ireland
Susan Mulhall, Digital, Teacher Supply, Teaching Council Unit, Department of Education
Zak Moradi, Anti-racism Activist

Purpose of the Meeting:

The fourth meeting of the Steering Committee to review the Action Plan on Bullying 2013

1. Welcome, overview of agenda, minutes of meeting of 6th April

Dr Noel Purdy welcomed the committee and noted apologies.

Minutes of last meeting were discussed. The following amendments were raised:

Maria Joyce requested a capital 'T' to be used in the minutes for Traveller, and that Traveller parents accessing *reports* needs to be changed to *supports*. Pending these changes, the minutes were approved.

Matters arising from the minutes:

Sarah Benson reiterated her request for a visual regarding the review plan. Dr Purdy outlined the process associated with the review. The committee is currently in the process of listening and getting inputs from a range of speakers. Dr Purdy explained that this is not an entirely passive phase. Parents and Learners Unit are taking note of the key themes that are arising at the meetings and these will be circulated. The working group is due to meet for their second meeting on Friday. Dr Purdy advised that the consultation strands are being progressed and that this process will take a few weeks. At that point the Steering Committee will start to think about the structure of the new action plan. Writing and structuring the action plan is likely to take place in June. It is most important to focus on listening now.

Sarah Benson reiterated that she would still like a visual outlining the project plan as the process still feels abstract to her.

Deirdre Shanley advised that she would speak to the Department's project management office about preparing a visual outline of the project plan.

Judith Lyons thanked the committee for their high levels of attendance and engagement to date. She briefly outlined the planned consultation process. It will be an extensive process involving a public consultation and engagement with school staff and the education partners. Written submissions have been invited from steering committee members. Parents and Learners Unit are working with DCEDIY to arrange the focus groups with children and young people which are scheduled for 11th and 12th May. A report from these engagements will be prepared for the Steering Committee.

Judith outlined the plan for the next two meetings: The 10th May meeting will begin at 10:30, and take a similar format to the meeting today. We will hear from Ofsted, the Department of Tourism, Culture, Arts, Gaeltacht, Sport and Media, Tiktok and CAMHS.

The meeting on 24th May will be an in person meeting. We will hear from Dualta Ó'Broin from META, and the Heaslip family who will speak about the dangers of bullying, following their bereavement due to bullying. There will be round table events with students, parents and teachers, where the Steering Committee will work in small groups to engage with the aforementioned stakeholders. This meeting, originally planned for Marlborough St., will now take place in the Gresham Hotel. Judith advised that the Minister hopes to be able to attend.

Maria Joyce asked what efforts are being made to have diversity in the focus groups with children and young people, including Traveller/Roma participation, and offered to help.

Judith Lyons explained that DCEDIY have been piloting this part of the work. They have selected a Primary DEIS school for the pilot and Comhairle na nÓg are representing Post-Primary. Judith thanked Maria for her offer to help and advised that she will follow up with her on this after the meeting.

Moninne Griffith reported that BelongTo recently received an invitation to nominate some students for the focus groups and advised that this is a short timeframe for selecting students. She suggested an online consultation as it could be hard for LGBT students to leave school to attend a bullying event. She reported that they have had great responses to the school climate report, and stated that we get a more diverse response online, as hard to reach students may not put themselves forward.

Judith Lyons explained that the public consultation will be an online questionnaire that will include filtering for categories of students.

Maria Joyce added that additional effort will be needed to reach out to hard to reach students. She suggested that we could explore the option of direct engagement with diverse students who may find it hard to come into these events.

2. Presentation by Dr Clíona Saidléar, Executive Director, Rape Crisis Network Ireland (RCNI)

Clíona shared her personal professional journey. RCNI was set up in 1985. They operate across a range of areas and government departments. RCNI is an adult service, not a children's service, which focuses on Sexual Violence. Their policy operates largely within the Department of Justice and doesn't deal with sexual violence in children. Clíona suggested that the Action Plan on Bullying is an opportunity to bridge the gap. She shared research through the 2021 report: RCNI 'Storm and Stress' An Exploration of Sexual Harassment Amongst Adolescents: <https://www.rcni.ie/wp-content/uploads/RCNI-Storm-and-Stress-FINAL.pdf> This report provides up-to-date data on sexual harassment in schools. She noted that the study didn't cover disability in this study, but is aware of intersectional bullying as a major issue.

Clíona's input outlined key risk factors for adolescents being targeted including being LGBT+, and being female.

To update the Action Plan 2013, Clíona's suggestions included bringing greater attention to girls' experiences, and a greater focus on sexism, recognising that sexism and sexist bullying acts as grooming for exploitation. There should be an increased focus on cyber bullying and online safety, and it is important to capture the data related to bullying. She also noted that the words sexism or misogyny do not appear in the 2013 Action Plan on Bullying.

3. Presentation by Pádraig Mac Fhlannchadha, Assistant Chief Inspector, Department of Education

Inspectors Pádraig Mac Fhlannchadha, Siobhan Broderick and Padraig Fahey provided a presentation on their preliminary findings about student voice on bullying in primary and post-primary schools. This report complements the inspectorate's previous input to the steering committee on the findings of the anti-bullying inspections in primary and post-primary schools. The report is currently being finalised before publication.

The approach to engaging with pupils and students was based on the Lundy model of child participation and engaged with five primary and five post-primary schools. Prior to their engagement with schools, the inspectorate working group engaged with Prof. James O'Higgins

Norman and Sharon Eustace. The engagement with pupils and students focused on four key areas: School Culture & Atmosphere, Education, Prevention and Whole-school approach to Bullying, Cyberbullying, Inclusion and Diversity

Some of the key messages highlighted included:

- The importance of listening to and giving due weight and influence to student voice. Schools that had this also had a positive school culture and atmosphere
- Education, prevention and whole-school approach to bullying - Having a Code of Behaviour that sets out positive, respectful expectations for whole-school behaviour is vital. It was noted at post-primary that sometimes codes were a list of what not to do and this lacked the preventative layer that included respectful relationships.
- There were differences in Primary pupils' and Post-Primary students' attitudes to reporting bullying. At primary level students reported confidence in reporting bullying. In post-primary the majority of students were reticent to report bullying. Their reasons included lack of pro-active reporting and monitoring in their school, loss of privacy once bullying investigations commenced, no key teacher at post-primary or access to support, and that bullying is often invisible to teachers or happens subtly despite effective supervision.
- There were differences in Primary pupils' and Post-Primary students' feedback on curricular learning about bullying. Primary pupils reported that they were happy with they learned. Post-Primary students reported mixed views on the quality of their learning about bullying, and noted a lack of teacher expertise to teach about bullying in SPHE.
- Regarding cyber bullying pupils and students stated they would need more education in this area and recommended specific changes to stay-safe content e.g. where they may encounter online bullying is more broad now, such as gaming, but this isn't covered in Stay-Safe. Asked for views on their experiences but not given adequate guidance about what to do if they do encounter online bullying. Post primary students felt that there was a lot of repetition from junior years. Both primary pupils and post-primary students felt that teacher training was needed in the area of cyber-bullying
- Regarding inclusion and diversity, at primary level there was a good understanding of inclusion. Specific reference to diversity was limited. At post-primary, most students agreed that their school was welcoming of all. Students mentioned whole-school supports for LGBT+ students. Some (not widespread) discrimination against LGBT+ was highlighted in relation to gender identity and sexual orientation. More education for students and teachers on diversity, inter-culturalism and identity-based bullying is needed. Almost all teachers treated students equally, but it was noted in one school that a very small number of teachers treated children of colour and Traveller students unequally and disrespectfully. Students were positive about inclusion of students with different abilities.
- Key supports needed to prevent and tackle bullying: Teacher training, enhanced support for principals and teachers, review of stay safe/walk tall programme to include diversity, strategies to increase student confidence in reporting bullying, review of schools' Code of Behaviour to set out positive, respectful expectations of the whole school community, a need to build students' confidence to report bullying, and SPHE teacher training.

4. Question and Answer Session

Sarah Benson (Women's Aid) thanked the presenters. Sarah asked the inspectorate if questions had been asked specifically about sexist and misogynist harassment or bullying. She commented that if not asked, students won't necessarily refer to sexual harassment.

Siobhan Broderick (Inspectorate) explained the approach taken by the inspectorate, whereby they looked at best practice in how inspectors engage with pupils/students. Students filled in surveys to obtain quantitative data. Qualitative data was obtained in focus groups through open-ended feedback e.g.: the inspectors used a scale with the student groups to identify to what extent they felt: is it ok to be myself in my school? The inspectorate used tools such as collages with a range of images representing diversity as prompts. Questions were not specifically focused on any area, so students weren't led. Comments did come up about student to student discrimination and about equal access to activities for boys and girls, but the specific term sexual harassment didn't come up.

Maria Joyce (National Traveller Women's Forum) asked a question about ethnic data collection with regard to the intersection of ethnicity and sexual violence. Ethnic data collection is important. She also asked if the Inspectorate had got ethnic visibility in a safe way, and ethnic identifier role. Maria noted that it was good to see some reflection of teacher bullying in the inspectorate report.

Siobhan Broderick (Inspectorate) explained that the students that took part were those that brought back consent forms from a random selection, but that they did achieve a good cross sectional student engagement. Siobhan thanked Maria for her affirmation that they were going in the right direction to build a safe space for engaging with students and pupils, and thanked Prof. James O'Higgins Norman for his help in allowing the team to use some of the FUSE programme materials as stimulus.

Pádraig MacFhlannchadha explained that the inspectorate tried to engage with as wide a profile as possible, and is committed to engaging with as wide a profile as possible. He added that the inspectorate were committed to promoting full engagement with students during inspection through the student voice project work.

5. Tea Break

Dr Purdy convened the meeting for a tea break.

6. Presentation by Martha Evans, Director, Anti Bullying Alliance, UK

The Anti-Bullying Alliance (ABA) is based in England and Wales. ABA was set up in 2002 by ASPCC and the National Children's Bureau, to bring the anti-bullying sectors together to learn from each other. 160 organisations have membership of ABA and come together to share practice by listening to the voice of young people and look at evidence and research.

Three key areas of work: Campaigns, Practice Improvement and Policy.

Free CPD training. Steering Committee members were invited to take part in the online training.

Shared definition of bullying: Repetitive, intentional hurting of one person or group by another person or group, where the relationship involves an imbalance of power. Bullying can be physical, verbal or psychological. It can happen face-to-face or online.

Whole school programme – united against bullying. Established in 2013 to deal with disablist bullying, including students with SEN. Funded by government. 1000 schools currently taking part. Participating schools have access to audit and action planning tools (Gives schools a good picture of where practice is good and where they need to improve), resources to implement action plan, CPD for staff, and an online pupil questionnaire to find out about levels of bullying and wellbeing. Provides a baseline for schools to improve practice. Schools are awarded gold, silver and bronze status based on their improvements in tackling bullying. Schools encouraged to share practice and challenges they encounter.

Following the programme 71% of schools said that bullying had reduced. Wellbeing of students who receive school meals and those with SEN had significantly improved. Children's feelings of positivity and how they felt about going to school had improved. This aspect improved before reductions in bullying reduced. Staff confidence in dealing with bullying behaviour improved. Pupil attendance, behaviour and attainment also improved.

Factors that contributed to improvement included:

- Having a real whole-school understanding of the issue
- Consultation - speaking to every part of the school community including afterschool clubs, and speaking to everyone in the school setting
- Strong senior leadership
- Providing CPD to all school staff, including ITE
- Constant monitoring, evaluation and review of what is working well and what needs to improve

Barriers to improvement included:

- Not including everyone in consultation
- Not listening and understanding what is going on in the school – students have different responses to staff
- Not have strong leadership or real buy-in
- Not collecting the right data - Very important to have a shared understanding of what bullying is and who is likely to experience

Anti-bullying week takes place in 80% of schools in England and Wales. ABA provides school resources, media campaign. Introduced odd socks day to mark the beginning of anti-bullying week – celebrates what makes us unique and different. Impact of conversations about bullying and helps raise awareness about bullying.

Suggestions for our Action Plan:

- Good focus on homophobic, transphobic and racist bullying. Queried why there was less focus on tackling disablist bullying
- Avoid looking at perpetrator and victim, but look at how group dynamics influence bullying
- Martha hopes that she may have an opportunity to speak to the steering committee more about Irish practice and how we can learn from each other

The chair thanked Martha for her presentation.

7. Presentation by Clíodhna Purdue and Kerri Smith, Barnardos

Kerri Smith, Assistant Director of Services in Barnardos started the presentation. She outlined the work Barnardos do in schools regarding bullying. Their approach is in the context of prevention and early intervention. They have a number of support projects, working intensively with families in communities and also in schools. Aware of impact of bullying. Work with victims of bullying and work to build resilience, helping children to understand and name feelings.

Kerri shared views on the current action plan and what they hope would be seen in the revised plan:

- Impact of bullying needs to be looked at from a trauma informed perspective (those displaying bullying behaviour, and those impacted by bullying)
- Responses need to be proactive and preventative rather than reactive
- Voice of child needs to be given more priority
- Plan needs to reflect on the ways in which young people are currently being bullied and how that evolves – impact of technology – the plan needs to have the ability to evolve in line with tools that a bully can use
- More time in school curriculum to discussions around bullying – whole class discussions supported by teacher

Kerri gave an overview of the roots of empathy programme which is used as a preventative measure for bullying. Increased emotional wellbeing and improved learning and development. Evidence based programme proven to reduce aggression and improved social behaviour. The programme involves interpreting a baby's reactions. The baby is the teacher. Instructors are selected from within the school and receive ongoing training.

35,000 primary school children have received the programme to date. It was impacted by pandemic, but has gone online. It is hoped that the programme will be back fully in classrooms from September.

Clíodhna Purdue presented on Barnardos Online Safety Programme. They provide 45 minute workshops for children in 3rd to 6th class, lesson plans and resources for teachers, and free webinars for parents. The programme has thirty experienced trainers nationwide.

The programme involves workshops in schools with four simple rules –STAR: Stay safe, Think smart, Ask for Help, Reach out and be kind. The programme focuses on children being upstanders rather than bystanders online. Empowers children to make good choices and to be kind online. Child-led and always listen to the choice of the child. In a survey regarding online safety in year one, 37% were worried about mean messages from friends, while 32% were worried about messages from strangers. Young people highlighted risks that they were most concerned about included exclusion from group chats, TikTok accounts, Fake accounts, passive aggressive comments, conflict between those /don't have phones, inappropriate video games, hacking, false reporting in games.

Clíodhna gave a brief overview of things that are needed in the new Action Plan:

- Children need support with navigating online interactions. How to express themselves in areas such as 'How do you leave a WhatsApp group?' How do you explain that something used to be a joke but now it's not?

- Schools need more time to explore this type of online behaviour
- Parents need confidence to address online issues with their children
- Clíodhna invited committee members to join their online webinar on May 31st
- They will also be doing focus groups with children in June to explore how cyber bullying has changed
- Voice of the child is paramount
- Prevention and early intervention is key
- More nuanced definition of bullying
- Intention of bullying needs to be looked at rather than the content of message online
- Multi layered approach is needed – whole-school and targeted intervention where needed

8. Presentation by Victoria Howson. Community Engagement Manager, Shield Anti Bullying Programme (ISPCC)

Victoria gave an overview of the ISPCC Shield Anti-Bullying Programme which aims to support children, families, and communities for the intervention and prevention of bullying. Their current work focuses on enhancing resilience and coping capacity of children, families and communities. Shield was originally launched in 2012. Awareness raising was the main facet originally, but one of the most popular elements was the school self-evaluation tool. A lot had changed in the ten years since the tool was originally launched, for example the original tool didn't include cyber-bullying. The tool has since been updated based on up-to-date literature and research. Similar to the 'united against bullying' introduced by Martha Evans (ABA).

ISPCC have updated their Shield programme content in line with up-to-date research on how to prevent and respond to bullying effectively, incorporating advice from Webwise and DCU. Huge demand for the programme. Got feedback from schools about what they would like to see in the programme.

10 Shield statements in toolkit that schools work through and measure to evaluate what is working well and where improvements are needed. The ten statements are evidence-based on what works worldwide as an effective response to bullying and is in line with current department guidelines. Live digital document – continuously updated. Educational materials also provided.

Shield is connected to other ISPCC supports such as the Smart Moves programme that supports move from primary to secondary school, listening and text online service, therapeutic support services, guided digital self-care programme for anxiety and low mood.

Impact of the programme: reaches 7000 students across the country, ongoing support for schools.

Advice for the steering committee:

- Schools need additional guidance and support to meet their responsibilities regarding bullying
- The Shield programme provides many of these supports including staff CPD, user-friendly toolkit

9. Question and Answer Session

The chair thanked the presenters and invited questions from committee members.

Prof. James O'Higgins Norman (DCU) thanked all the presenters. Question for Kerri in relation to the Roots of Empathy programme. What research underpins the programme and what instruments have been used to measure the claims improved empathy?

Kerri Smith (Barnardo's): The programme was developed 25 years ago. Randomised control trials have been carried out in Canada and Scotland and other countries that deliver the programme, and non-randomised controls. Delivered in NI – they did research. Scotland recently did research and the results have been published. On Roots of Empathy website there are references to research.

<https://rootsofempathy.org/research/>

Clíodhna Purdue (Barnardo's) asked Victoria Howson (ISPCC) if the Shield programme is mainly Primary or Post-Primary.

Victoria responded that it is mostly Post-Primary at present, but is available to primary.

Clíodhna Purdue asked if Barnardo's can refer primary schools to engage with the programme.

Victoria responded that they can, and that they are hoping to translate to Irish and to extend to other settings including afterschool to use the evaluation tool.

Dr Noel Purdy (Stranmillis University College) asked Martha Evans (ABA) about the pros and cons of the Bronze, Silver and Gold awards as part of the United Against Bullying programme: has there been much uptake of it and is it a valuable thing that should be considered?

Martha responded that it is a hard question because you don't want to be saying that there's no bullying in a school, but it's something that schools want – a certificate to display. This is not us saying you don't have bullying and as the programme goes on, schools tend to realise the value of not focusing on how amazing they are, but think more about their practice and sharing it. A lot of processes have to be put in place to achieve the award and it's not simply us saying that you don't have bullying or that you're done with your anti-bullying practices, but it is a constant battle.

Victoria Howson (ISPCC) commented that they do something similar with the Shield programme where schools achieve a Shield plaque. Schools respond well to having an award.

Martha commented that they wouldn't have the award if the programme didn't have the voice of the child, and the anonymous wellbeing questionnaire. This gives direct feedback from students. Schools give us case studies. It is a rigorous process. The website lists the criteria. https://anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk/sites/default/files/uploads/attachments/UAB_Award_Criteria%20-%20FINAL.pdf

Prof. James O'Higgins Norman: commented on the various programmes presented, that we need to be conscious that not all programmes are coming from the same paradigm in terms of understanding bullying. Not suggesting that one paradigm is better than another, but Steering Committee needs to think about the definition of bullying what programmes are best suited to addressing bullying as we understand it in the new Action Plan. Need to be careful about making recommendations without understanding what paradigm of bullying is behind it. Some amazing examples of programmes today but they are not all coming from the same understanding of what bullying is.

Victoria Howson agreed with James' point. Shield tool is really about evaluating what everyone else is doing. What Shield is trying to do with the tool is asking schools to see where they are at and what is the research out there that has been collated for them? It is important that information is accessible for schools.

Prof. James O'Higgins Norman explained that there is a step before what Victoria has described (a task that can be done in terms of looking at available programmes and resources and pulling them together for schools). The first step is to have an understanding of what bullying is, for example a resilience programme is not same as looking at group dynamic and how that reduces bullying. The Steering Committee need to have an understanding of bullying and then decide on approach to tackle that. It's a philosophical question that needs to be placed within the overall vision of education in Ireland.

Martha: One of the things we struggle with schools in England is getting them to understand their influence on bullying behaviour. It is important for them to reflect on their practice and to have a shared understanding of what bullying is and why children bully.

Dr Noel Purdy drew the Q & A section to a close and thanked all presenters.

10. Breakout rooms discussion

Dr Noel Purdy explained purpose of breakout rooms.

First part is feedback on today – what needs strengthening in the action plan based on today's input.

Second part – Seeking ideas and insight on how to manage the face-to-face meeting on 24th May, to explore ideas to how best make that session work.

11. Plenary Session

Group 1: Prof. James O'Higgins Norman: There is a need for new action plan to be rooted in a philosophical approach. It is a scoping exercise at the moment. Need deeper consideration of definition of bullying. Conscious that the Action Plan, when launched, will set standard for actions over next 10 yrs. The Action plan may need to include a checklist for schools to assess initiatives. CPD and ITE are important in terms of building schools and whole education approach.

Suggestions for the meeting on 24th May – focus groups with SC members as listeners, but not facilitators. Consider beacon programme – external facilitators to facilitate a creative way of running the focus group.

Group 2: Majella O'Dea: Gaps identified include training for teachers, collection of data, student voice, official reporting of bullying, visibility of diversity in schools. Shared understanding of bullying, racism, ethnic identity. Important to reflect on the different experience of bullying - Impact of bullying on the person is subjective but can be harmful. Inspectorate inclusive approach was noted. Critical to have a school self-evaluation toolkit so schools are aware of extent of bullying. Important to link this Action plan with work of other departments, including Department of Children action plan on racism. Religious-based bullying also noted.

24th May – need good facilitation – scenarios and roleplay. Diversity in groups. Tips from other groups that have engaged with students.

Group 3: Ronan Kielt: Understanding of difference in society. Need to look at organisation and physical structure in schools that perpetuates bullying – e.g. having/not having gender neutral toilets. Difference in empowerment to report bullying in P vs PP. Culture change needed in schools – culture of not reporting bullying ‘ratting’. Bronze, silver and gold aspect of one of the programmes is a good idea.

24th May: Cabaret style approach of having a mix of people at each table. Training for facilitators to increase voice of young people. Prepare young people in advance so they know what will be asked. Inclusive representation. Include online component to the in-person representation.

Group 4: Bridget Wilson: Training important. Need to embed a culture of anti-bullying in school. Holistic strategy – not subdivided in to particular cohorts. It’s about the principles that cover dignity of everyone. Aspects of the anti-bullying strategy shouldn’t be siloed. A definition of bullying is important – need to look at normalised behaviour. Data and how we use data.

24th May: Avoid duplication and repetition. Set of questions in advance would be useful. Focus on each group to identify barriers and opportunities. Boundaries – not necessarily personal experience, but overall strategy.

12. Summary and close

Noel thanked everyone for their engagement. Next meeting 10th May. The note takers from the 4 groups were asked to send their notes to Niamh Molloy.