THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL   **SENATE (1003)**

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SENATE

10 September 2015

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Birch and Professor Brown, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Badcock, Professor Beveridge and Professor Burgoyne, Professors Barr, Begon and Chalker, Mrs E Eades, Professor Edwards, Dr S Edwardson, Professors Elsheikh, Gabbay and Hall, Dr L Hancock, Professors Herzberg, Hodgson and Hollander, Dr R Huzzey, Dr S Jones, Professor Jones, Dr P Leftwick, Dr F Marret-Davies, Professors Marshall and McGrath, Dr E Michalopoulou, Professors O'Sullivan, Park, Rempe-Gillen, Richardson and Sanderson, Dr F Shovlin, Professor Touramanis, Dr L Turner, Dr R Urbano Gutierrez, Professors Van der Hoek and Whitehead and Dr Y Zhao.

The President, Deputy President and one of the Vice-Presidents of the Liverpool Guild of Students were present as representatives of the student body.

In attendance: The Academic Secretary, the Director of Human Resources, the Head of Strategic Planning, the Senior Executive Co-ordinator and the Committee Services Administrator.

Apologies for absence were received from 22 members of the Senate.

1.   **WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS**

      The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the following new members of the Senate:

      Professor Warren Barr
      Professor Nigel Cunliffe
      Mrs Elaine Eades
      Dr Stuart Edwardson
      Professor Mark Gabbay
      Professor Blair Grubb
      Professor Terry Jones
      Dr Pete Leftwick
      Ms Rosie O'Donnell
      Professor Andy Plater
      Professor Jason Ralph
      Professor Chris Sanderson
      Professor Christos Touramanis
      Dr Liz Turner
      Dr Rosa Urbano Gutierrez

2.   **DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST**

      Members of the Senate were asked to declare any interest that could give rise to conflict in relation to any item on the agenda. No such interests were declared.

                      STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

3.   **STRATEGIC REVIEW GREEN PAPER**

      The Senate received the draft Strategic Review Green Paper prior to its discussion at Council and subsequent publication to students, staff and other stakeholders for consultation.

      (I)   **Reported**:

      a)   That the Green Paper was a working draft document and would not formally be published until after Council approval was granted on 30 September.

      b)   That it was acknowledged that the document was lengthy – this was partly as a result of the section 'closing off' the last Strategic Plan period, which staff had indicated it was important to do.

      c)   That the final document would be web based and interactive and so would be more user friendly.

      d)   That, once the Green Paper was approved by Council, there would be several opportunities for members to participate in detailed consultation sessions which would inform the development of

the White Paper and ultimately the new Strategy. The Senate would receive the outcomes of this consultation at its next meeting.

(II)   **Agreed**:

That the discussion had been constructive, and that the key points expressed by members (as summarised below) should be conveyed to Council, noting that many of these matters would be addressed at the White Paper stage.

General

a)   It should be made clear that the four strategies are interdependent and intertwined.
b)   How excellence would be measured should be clarified.
c)   Clarity should be provided regarding expectations.
d)   An environment was needed which is conducive to creativity and innovation and in which unnecessary barriers that act as a deterrent are removed.
e)   The overarching high level strategy needed to be meaningful but also robust enough to last a decade. The Research, Education and Professional Services strategies needed to be more mutable to respond to the demands of an evolving external environment.
f)   It should be flagged that a number of sub-strategies would sit under the four main strategies. Student representation on committees would ensure student consultation on the sub-strategies and some sub-strategies would warrant dedicated consultation exercises.
g)   The opportunities for consultation had encouraged engagement from colleagues and this was an impressive first step towards eliminating scepticism and disengagement.
h)   One member believed that the language used in the Green Paper included too much corporate jargon.

Research and Impact

i)   Given the importance of multidisciplinarity in securing large grants, the University's major research themes should be refreshed or restated.
j)   There was a need to determine how to reward excellent contribution against a range of research and teaching activities.
k)   The question of how to achieve excellence in both research and teaching needed to be addressed.
l)   Practical tools, e.g. workload modelling tools, were required.
m)   More detail was necessary in respect of the requirements of early and mid-career researchers.
n)   Question 1 *(Do we make the research expectations for individual staff members sufficiently clear and support the appropriate balance between 4* and 3* research?)* should be reworded to avoid the use of REF terminology.
o)   In response to question 2 *(What are the key elements of a vibrant and sustainable environment to support excellence in research and impact and which are the most important to achieve our research ambitions?),* investing in the environment would be as important as investing in staff. An environment that facilitated productive researchers at all levels would make it easier to ask questions regarding performance.
p)   More prominence should be given to postdoctoral researchers.

Education

q)   There was a need for clarity about contribution to teaching – it should not be a case of *if* you contribute to teaching, but *how*.
r)   Investment in excellence should improve teaching/the student experience as well as research.
s)   Consideration should be given to filling the gaps in curricula (entrepreneurship, employability etc.).
t)   It was vital to maintain the University's leadership in widening participation and online provision and to avoid complacency.
u)   The optimum future size and shape of the institution had yet to be determined. This year's one off significant growth in applications should not lead to complacency (especially in the context of the future demographic trends and an increasing number of providers).
v)   Excellence in teaching was not just about experience in the classroom, but also about administrative support. The outcomes of the professional services benchmarking project that was currently underway would help the University to understand the balance of professional services support and to ensure that the right type of service is delivered in the right way to reduce the administrative burden on academic colleagues.
w)   Innovation and continuous improvement were crucial.
x)   Every effort was being made to align the Research and Impact and Education strategies.

Professional Services

y)   The dual role undertaken by the professional services should be clarified, i.e. its role as provider of and contributor to the student experience and also as an enabler to academic colleagues to deliver education, research and the overall strategy.

z)   The student facing nature of activity should be made more explicit.

aa) The professional services needed to be organised to deliver effective services in the right way within the context of external pressure to demonstrate efficiency.

4.   **ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP**

The Senate received a follow up paper on academic leadership arrangements, together with a presentation by the Vice-Chancellor and Director of Human Resources providing evidence of the need for change in this area.

(I)   **Reported**:

a)   That, at its meeting held in June 2015, Senate had received a paper and presentation on proposals to develop academic leadership arrangements in the University (see minute 89). This had provoked much discussion and it had been agreed that:

   • evidence should be brought back to demonstrate the need for change around academic leadership and performance management; and
   • Council should be invited to share with Senate its particular concerns regarding the diversity of the University's academic leadership.

b)   That the evidence provided in the presentation demonstrated that 'business as usual' was unlikely to result in the comprehensive and radical improvement being sought by the University as it embarked on achieving its new strategic objectives in an increasingly competitive sector and challenging external environment. Failure to implement change was likely to lead to, at best, the University remaining static as an organisation or, at worst, it going backwards in performance and position. Through the proposals, the University could ensure that it had the right leaders, with the necessary skills and support, taking a committed, long-term and externally facing approach. The delivery of objectives that were designed to result in a step change would require Heads of School/Institute who want to undertake the role of managing change, and developing people, subjects and services to students, rather than those that view the role as an 'add-on' or as them 'taking their turn'. The proposed changes would ensure that the University was able to attract the best possible field of candidates to select from and introduce more opportunities to address the imbalance in the make-up of the existing and future academic leadership workforce.

c)   That Council members had recently reviewed the results of the Russell Group (RG) Professorial and Professional Senior Manager's pay survey and had voiced their concerns about a number of elements in the make-up of the senior academic workforce, which they see as being symptomatic of a leadership culture that has seen little change over the period of the last strategic plan. Their concerns were in relation to the lack of progress made by women in academia (79% of professors at UoL are male; 78% across the RG) and in terms of the ethnic make-up of the workforce (91% of UoL professors are white compared with 84% across the RG). The make-up of the workforce below professor level was equally as imbalanced. Additionally, the University had 'above average' length of service in the professoriate – 33% of the population had ten years or more service and 24% above 20 years' service; this was against a 9% average figure for both tenure levels in the rest of the RG. Whilst long tenure per se was not a problem, it could be where this resulted in the status quo being reinforced rather than continuous progress and improvement being achieved. According to the Equality Challenge Unit (2015), it was essential that universities tackle diversity through driving forward 'the cultural and systemic changes needed if institutions are to remain competitive and attractive to talented staff and potential students in a global market'.

(II)   **Agreed**:

That, given that some members continued to have concerns regarding how the proposals would actually address the issues faced, and around the proposed changes to tenure length, a vote should be held on whether the proposals should be endorsed. Thirty members voted in favour of the proposals and seven voted against. The proposals around the following were therefore endorsed:

   • An extended tenure for Level 1 Heads (to be appointed for five years with the option for a second period in post or to implement break points of a different timespan at regular review points).
   • The appointment of Level 2 Heads on a permanent basis.

- Ongoing development, support and review.
- Revisions to leadership expectations for each Level – with Level 2 Heads taking on the full range of managerial expectations and Level 1 Heads undertaking a coaching role with emphasis on enriching departmental and subject performance, with compulsory development and training to ensure appropriate skills and competency levels and to participate in ongoing development, support and review.
- The introduction of more extensive recruitment practices – advertising positions externally (at the same time as internally) would allow the University to benchmark against the market for Headships.
- The design and implementation of processes for succession planning and talent management to assist in developing a pipeline of potential academic leaders.
- Positive action activities to address an imbalance in the make-up of the existing and future academic leadership workforce.

5.   **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

      Reported:

      That the next meeting of the Senate would be held on Wednesday 4 November 2015 at 2pm.

                                                      …………………………………
                                                      Chair
                                                      4 November 2015