

MEETING OF THE SENATE

1 NOVEMBER 2017

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Birch, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Badcock, Professor Beveridge and Professor Burgoyne, Professors Atkinson and Balogun, Dr R Bearon, Dr K Bennett, Professors Bowcock, Clegg, Comerford, Cunliffe and Eades, Dr S Edwardson, Professors Elsheikh, Foxhall, French and Gabbay, Dr L Gartshore, Professors Gibson, Grubb and Guillaume, Dr L Hancock, Professors Hertz-Fowler, Herzberg, Langfeld, MacEwan and Mair, Dr F Marret-Davies, Professors Marshall and Morris, Dr G Pentassuglia, Professors Plater, Ralph, Scott, Sheffield, Shovlin and Simpson, Dr M Speed, Professor Spelman Miller, Dr L Swan, Dr G Turner, Professor van der Hoek, Dr S Voelkel and Professor Welsch.

The President, Deputy President and Vice-Presidents of the Liverpool Guild of Students and the student representatives from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences and the Faculty of Science and Engineering were present as representatives of the student body.

In attendance: The Director of Human Resources, the Director of Strategic Planning and Governance and the Governance Co-ordinator.

Apologies for absence were received from 17 members of the Senate.

1. Welcome to New Members

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

Staff members

Professor Themis Bowcock
Professor Eithne Comerford
Professor Tom Elfring
Professor Neil French
Dr Laura Gartshore
Professor Yves Guillaume
Dr Lynn Hancock
Professor Christiane Hertz-Fowler
Professor Sarah O'Brien
Dr Gaetano Pentassuglia
Professor Hazel Scott
Professor Liz Sheffield
Professor Paul Simpson
Dr Mike Speed
Professor Kris Spelman Miller
Dr Susanne Voelkel
Professor Carsten Welsch

Student members

Mr Ismail Al-Cazimi
Mr Jonathon Foster
Mr Rory Hughes
Miss Lorna Nixey

2. Committee and Membership Matters2.1 Powers and Duties and Membership of Senate

RECEIVED and **NOTED:**

- i. The powers and duties and membership of Senate.

2.2 Roles and Responsibilities in Relation to Diversity and Equality

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. A statement agreed as part of the University's Diversity and Equality Framework which makes clear the role of committees in ensuring appropriate approaches to diversity and equality are embedded in the way the University conducts its business. Further guidance on how to complete the Diversity and Equality section on the standard report template was also provided.

2.3 Statement of Policy and Procedure on Disclosure of Interest

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. The University's Statement of Policy and Procedure on Disclosure of Interest, in accordance with the Policy requirement that 'at their first meeting of the academic year, each committee within the University should have a standing item on their agenda about conflict of interest'.

2.4 Disclosures of Interest

Members were asked to disclose any interest that could give rise to conflict in relation to any item on the agenda. No such interests were disclosed.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

3.1 Unreserved Minutes of the Meeting Held 21 June 2017

AGREED:

- i. The unreserved minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2017 should be approved as an accurate record, subject to the inclusion of the Vice-Presidents of the Guild in the list of those present.

3.2 Matters Arising on the Minutes

3.2.1 *Framework for Quality and Standards Relating to PGR Provision (Minute 19 refers)*

NOTED:

- i. The Framework for Quality and Standards that had been approved by Senate covered taught as well as PGR provision. Although the recommendation had been submitted by the PGR Committee, the Academic Quality and Standards Committee had also endorsed the Framework.

4. Vice-Chancellor's Report

REPORTED:

- i. Recent immigration data published about international students demonstrated that over 90% of students returned to their home country following completion of their studies, with the remaining numbers fully accounted for.
- ii. International competition for students was increasing, with the UK now seeing a reduction in demand from overseas students for the first time in many years. Alternative nations such as Canada, which offered the opportunity for graduates to remain in the country for ten years after graduation, were seeing increases in demand and recruitment.
- iii. The Migration Advisory Committee was undertaking two consultations on EEA mobility, covering staff and students.

5. Honours and Appointments

REPORTED:

- i. Professor Nandini Das from the Department of English had been appointed as a member of the Council of Research England.
- ii. Professor John Gowlett from the Department of Archaeology, Classics and Egyptology had been elected as a Fellow of the British Academy.
- iii. Professor Neil Jackson, who was based at the University of Liverpool in London, had been elected as President of the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain.
- iv. Dr Sandeep Parmer, a Senior Lecturer in the Department of English, had won the inaugural Ledbury Forte Poetry Prize for second collections, for her work *Eidolon*.
- v. Professor Matthew Rosseinsky from the Department of Chemistry had been awarded one of the Royal Society's most prestigious awards, the Davy Medal, in recognition of his advances in the design and discovery of functional materials, integrating the developments of new experimental and computational techniques.
- vi. Professor Paula Williamson from the Department of Biostatistics had received a prize on behalf of the Core Outcome Measures in Effectiveness Trials (COMET) Initiative for reducing waste in research from the Cochrane-REWARD competition.
- vii. Professor Susan Wray from the Department of Molecular and Cellular Physiology had been elected as the first Vice-President of the International Union of Physiological Sciences at its recent congress in Brazil. IUPS represented and promoted the world-wide community of physiological scientists and educators and had the mission to foster the study of physiology worldwide.

STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

6. Staff Benefits Green Paper

RECEIVED:

- i. A Green Paper proposing the commencement of consultation on changes to staff benefits.

REPORTED:

- ii. Staff benefits should enable the attraction and retention of employees, contribute towards the wellbeing and engagement of the workforce and be a driver of appropriate behaviour and the achievement of objectives. There was currently a well-established range of benefits on offer which appeared to be valued, but little work had been done on assessing alignment of these benefits to values and ethics and the University's people strategy or whether they supported the achievement of Strategy 2026 goals. In preparation for the next planning round, consideration would be given to the issues and opportunities impacting on the University's ability to achieve its aims.
- iii. Challenges facing the UK higher education sector appeared to be increasing every year and because universities were 'people businesses' many of those challenges had a knock on effect on the workforce, impacting on the way in which staff (or future staff) viewed their employment relationship with the University.
- iv. The paper suggested that an initiative was needed to see if there should be a greater degree of flexibility and responsiveness in the University's reward and benefits practices.
- v. Following endorsement of such a direction of travel, consultation would commence with stakeholders. A further report summarising the results of the consultation and a White

Paper would then be produced. Ultimately, newly developed benefits would need to be approved through the University's governance structure and communicated to staff at a series of roadshows. Take-up of new benefits and management of a flexible benefits structure would be monitored and reported to the Senior Executive Group, Senate, Planning and Resources Committee and Council.

AGREED:

- vi. The direction of travel should be endorsed, and Senate's initial feedback (below) should be noted:
- A flexible 'cafeteria style' benefits approach, as was common in the private sector, would enable the staff experience to be enhanced by allowing staff to choose benefits within a financial envelope (noting that it would not necessarily be possible to provide all the benefits an employee might need at a particular stage of their life/career). Such an approach reflected that 'one size does not fit all'.
 - Staff should be asked what benefits might be missing from the list already available.
 - Caution should be exercised where there might be sensitivities for some staff, e.g. private healthcare for those with links to the NHS.
 - A flexible benefits structure should be cost effective and streamlined.
 - Benefits to improve knowledge and skills amongst the workforce should be considered.
 - A flexible benefits structure would need to be accompanied by the provision of appropriate advice for staff.

7. Annual Report of Quality Assurance for Taught and PGR Programmes

[The Head of Academic Quality and Support attended for this item.]

RECEIVED:

- i. The Annual Report of Quality Assurance for Taught and PGR programmes covering: activity during 2016/17; external matters; approvals of new activity; monitoring and review activities; development and enhancement activities; and evaluation and oversight of processes.

REPORTED:

- ii. The contents of the paper were based on other reports that had been considered by the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, Collaborative Provision Committee and Education Committee.
- iii. Council would receive this report as part of the Annual Accountability Return 2017 to HEFCE.

AGREED:

- iv. The outputs of the quality assurance processes and confirmation of the continuing quality and standards of provision across the University and its collaborative partners should be endorsed.

8. University of Liverpool Heritage and Culture Strategy 2017-2022

RECEIVED:

- i. The University's new Heritage and Culture Strategy, noting that Senate was being asked to comment on the Strategy as part of the consultation process that was underway.

REPORTED:

- ii. In line with the steer given by the Heritage, Arts and Culture Committee, this:
- moved the strategy beyond the care of collections, especially through inclusion of activity related to the Heritage research theme;
 - linked heritage and culture related activities and collections directly to the University's overarching Strategy 2026; and
 - promoted public as well as member engagement.
- iii. Many events were scheduled to take place during 2018 to celebrate the tenth anniversary of Liverpool being European Capital of Culture. The University would be an official supporter of the anniversary year.

AGREED:

- iv. The Heritage and Culture Strategy should be endorsed and Senate's feedback regarding the following should be taken into consideration: highlighting more clearly the city's maritime heritage, links with development and fundraising, and opportunities to link to placement activity; and including reference to the Institute of Popular Music collection.

9. Senate Effectiveness Review**RECEIVED:**

- i. A paper presenting the findings of an exercise undertaken over the summer to gather feedback from members on how they feel Senate is operating.

REPORTED:

- ii. The feedback showed that Senate as it was reconfigured in 2012/13 was functioning effectively and fulfilling its primary role of promoting research, promoting and regulating learning and teaching and maintaining the quality and standards of the University's academic provision. The review had demonstrated the commitment of Senate members to contributing to strategic decision making and had indicated that improvements in the operation of some of the protocols agreed in 2013 would enhance its effectiveness further.
- iii. The key issues raised centred around:
- Perception that there is a lack of ability to influence decisions or strategy and that Senate is often asked to rubber stamp business
 - Lack of effective links between Faculty and Senate activity
 - Communication of outcomes from Senate
 - Too much starred business
 - Cancellation of meetings.
- iv. In response to the above concerns:
- A number of Green Papers would be developed to ensure that Senate was involved earlier in decision making processes, e.g. in relation to: research policy principles/4* incentives; reputation; and city region matters.
 - The Scheme of Delegation had been developed to minimise the 'referring up' of business. However, it should be noted that there was conflict here as Senate had previously agreed that it did not wish to delegate the approval of major academic policies. Furthermore, with HEFCE now requiring providers to submit assurance statements that reflect the governing body's oversight of academic governance arrangements, Senate's role in helping Council to oversee academic governance was crucial.

- The Director of Strategic Planning and Governance and the Governance Co-ordinator would work with the Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors and Faculty Directors of Operations to review the linkages between Faculty and central governance structures.
- A Senate briefing similar to the communications issued following Senior Executive Group, Education Committee and Research and Impact Committee meetings would be produced after each meeting and circulated to the Leadership Forum and made available on the Strategic Planning and Governance intranet.
- The reports of the sub-committees and recommendations relating to other operational business for which Senate had responsibility were starred in an attempt to free up time to debate substantive strategic issues. These matters had typically already been considered by academic staff through the sub-committees. Members were, of course, welcome to request that starred items be unstarred.
- The work underway to develop Senate's forward plan, to improve links between Senate and Faculty activity and to schedule Green Papers for discussion should help to ensure that meetings were not cancelled owing to a lack of business.

AGREED:

- v. The suggested improvements should be implemented.

REPORTS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES**Education Committee**

10. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Education Committee held on 11 October 2017.

11. Revised Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership 2017/18**RECEIVED:**

- i. The Committee's terms of reference, constitution and membership for 2017/18.

REPORTED:

- ii. New members of the Committee for 2017/18 included the Director of the Academy, the Interim Director of the Centre for Innovation in Education and the Director of Strategic Planning and Governance.
- iii. Changes to the terms of reference included: paragraphs f and o had been updated; an additional sentence had been added to paragraph k which sought to highlight the work the Committee undertook in placing the University in an optimum position for external assessments; and references to the TEF and university league table rankings had been moved.

AGREED:

- iv. The revised terms of reference, constitution and membership for 2017/18 should be endorsed.

12. Education Action Plan – Update on Academic Advisor Developments**REPORTED:**

- i. The Education Committee had received an update on developments to the Academic Advisor Framework in the context of the Education Action Plan and recent external review.

- ii. The Academic Advisor Handbook had been updated to incorporate additional information such as benefits of mobility and employability skills development and a template for recording meetings for areas that lacked recording mechanisms.
- iii. The recording of information was not consistent across the University. The short-term objective would be to ensure all areas were recording information in a way that could be monitored. A longer term solution would be to develop a consistent recording mechanism through the Student Journey Review.

13. Institutional Survey Results 2017 – NSS/PTES/PRES

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a presentation on the Institutional Survey Results for 2017.

National Student Survey (NSS)

- ii. A direct comparison with 2016 results had not been possible owing to a number of factors including changes to the questionnaire, data reporting and changes to sector data. The NUS led boycott had also resulted in a lower response rate for the University of 43%, which was below the publication threshold, compared to 76% in 2016. 12 of the University's subjects had reached the external publication threshold. In total, 12 institutions were below the institutional publication threshold.
- iii. 'Teaching' and 'learning community' had been identified as priority areas to address.

Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)

- iv. There continued to be low engagement with the PTES. The University had achieved an overall response rate of 21%, down 3% from 2016, with a drop in score in six out of eight sections.

Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES)

- v. The University had received a response rate of 36% in this biennial survey, compared to 37% in 2015, with an increase in score in five out of nine sections.
- vi. The NSS, PTES and PRES feedback would be considered collectively alongside any other student feedback and would help inform the Faculty Subject Action Plans.
- vii. Given the low engagement with PTES, consideration would be given to whether an alternative survey could be sought.
- viii. Given the changes in funding for postgraduate students, in particular the introduction of Master's loans, there was an intention from the Government to provide PGT students with the same opportunity as undergraduates to feed back on their experience through a national PGT survey. A pilot project was expected to be developed in the near future. Clarification would be sought on whether the Liverpool Online cohort could participate in the pilot project.

14. Centre for Innovation and Education

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had endorsed the Centre for Innovation in Education's (CIE) mission, vision, remit and strategic priorities.

- ii. Formally established on 1 August 2017, CIE sat within the Directorate of Student Experience and Enhancement. Its core purpose was to enhance student education and engagement and to support delivery of the Education Strategy. Its priorities included: the development of an institutional curriculum framework, and processes for its implementation in programme development and programme review; and the development of online pedagogical resources for staff use.

15. Update on the Employability Change Programme

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received an overview of work currently being undertaken as part of the Employability Change Programme.
- ii. Enhancing student employability was a major theme in Strategy 2026. To achieve the associated institutional KPIs, a number of short and longer term actions would be developed with academic colleagues. Subject to approval by the Senior Executive Group, the Employability Change Programme was expected to take place between November 2017 and January 2018. This would be supported by a thorough consultation process.

16. Project Proposals to Investigate Priority Equality Concerns Identified through the TEF Split Metrics

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had endorsed two project proposals to investigate the following priority equality issues identified through analysis of the TEF split metrics:
 - The graduate destination of black students;
 - The experience of disabled students in relation to academic support, assessment and feedback.

Research and Impact Committee

17. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Research and Impact Committee held on 5 October 2017.

18. Revised Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership 2017/18

RECEIVED:

- i. The Committee's terms of reference, constitution and membership for 2017/18.

REPORTED:

- ii. The Head of Research Strategy and Development had been added as a member of the Committee.
- iii. Governance arrangements for research and impact activity had been revised. The Research and Impact Operational Group (RIOG) and the REF Planning Group had been combined to create the new Research and Impact Strategy Committee (RISC). RISC would be more strategic than RIOG and would include blue sky thinking and REF planning. The Committee would be run in two parts: RISC A (covering Strategy 2026 and delivering medium and long-term strategy) and RISC B (concerning REF planning).
- iv. Decision-making and formal consideration of policy would take place at the Research and Impact Committee. Any matter related to policy or procedure would first come to this Committee. This might mean that on some occasions decisions would need to be carried out outside the meetings. Owing to the Committee's new remit, the co-opted members had been added to the Committee's membership.

AGREED:

- v. That the revised terms of reference, constitution and membership for 2017/18 should be endorsed.

19. Chair's Report

19.1 Enterprise

REPORTED:

- i. The enterprise strategy remained a high priority. Professor Hollander would continue to attend Enterprise Board to provide enterprise leadership and enterprise would be kept within his portfolio of work. The Director of Student Experience and Enhancement had taken over the student enterprise programme, which would be incorporated fully into Careers and Employability.

19.2 Connecting Capabilities Fund (CCF)

REPORTED:

- i. An outline bid had been submitted concerning entrepreneurial training and business leadership at the early stages of IP development. Helpful feedback had been received on the Expression of Interest, and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and Impact, Dr Sonja Vujovic and Dr Emma Nolan of Business Gateway were developing the full bid.

19.3 EPSRC Impact Acceleration Account

REPORTED:

- i. The University had been awarded an EPSRC Impact Acceleration Account of £1m over three years and Mr Ben Slater had been appointed to manage the scheme. Mr Slater's primary remit would be to accelerate impact outcomes, but he would also be involved in other work such as setting up networking events. In addition, an oversight committee had been established comprising Council Lay Officer, Dr Andrew Scott, and other industrialists who would provide guidance.

19.4 Visit to China

REPORTED:

- i. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and Impact would visit a number of institutions in China. Policy was being developed to align existing links with Chinese research-intensive universities to Liverpool's research themes, and potential new Chinese partners were being sought. The University had performed well in terms of educational links through XJTLU and other Chinese universities, but had not performed as well in such areas as PI collaborations, and large grant and Official Development Aid funding.
- ii. The Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellor and the Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and Impact from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) would also visit China. The Faculty had previously been visited by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, who were keen to form a partnership with the University in subjects both within and outside HSS. There would be a focus on Global Challenges Research Fund by the HSS group.

19.5 Priorities 2017/18

REPORTED:

- i. The following priorities had been presented:

- REF2021
 - Incentivising 4* outputs and impact cases
 - Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF), Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund and partnerships
 - Developing research staff
 - Research themes
 - The Liverpool USP – ‘delivering health, wealth and justice for all’.
- ii. A key theme of REF and GCRF was interdisciplinary working. More interdisciplinary panellists were to be recruited for REF2021.
- iii. Developing research staff was a crucial long-term goal and would also involve a change in culture in terms of aspirations of individual researchers. More outward thinking would be required such as involving researchers in Research Council peer review or engagement with the wider research community. An example of accreditation criteria for researcher development/promotion might be to spend a period of time at another university.
- iv. The University’s research would be featured in a Times Higher Supplement in February 2018. The Research Strategy and Development team would be writing exemplars for the supplement.

20. Planning for REF

20.1 Response to HEFCE Survey on Output Open Access Policy Post-April 1 2018

REPORTED:

- i. The University had been one of 19 pilot institutions that had been consulted regarding obstacles to meeting open access requirements. The exercise had been useful as the University had been influential in changing some of the questions in the HEFCE survey.
- ii. HEFCE’s current plans were for open access compliance to be judged on deposits in the institutional repository within three months of acceptance, which would commence from April 2018. This had always been planned by HEFCE, but a two-year grace period had been given to HEIs, which had enabled deposits in the institutional repository within three months of publication.
- iii. The University had stated in the HEFCE questionnaire that it would prefer the option to submit within three months of publication, which was felt to be the most straightforward of the two options and something that staff were used to. Two-thirds had agreed in HEFCE’s latest survey on the issue.
- iv. In the new HEFCE guidance, there was a requirement for units submitting to REF to outline their strategies on open research, which included open access, and the Library and Research, Partnerships and Innovation teams would work jointly on helping REF Units of Return to develop their statements on this.
- v. A policy on open research would be developed at institutional level, which would show what the University was doing as a whole. Units of Assessment (UOA) would also show what additional things they were doing in their specific areas.
- vi. Any individual at a UK institution at that point in time would be included in HEFCE policy (e.g. International students).

20.2 The Future of the Gold Open Access Fund

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received a report on the funding of Gold Open Access.
- ii. The University had over-spent on its institutional fund for Gold Open Access by £80,000 this year, and a way of better managing the fund was therefore required. There were three sources of funding for open access, two of which were external (an RCUK block grant and the Wellcome Trust's Charity Open Access Fund).
- iii. Four options were presented for managing demand (i.e. limiting the funding that the University spent). If it was decided that demand would be limited, Option One was recommended as the preferred option. Funds from the Wellcome Trust and possibly the RCUK grant, which would increase, would probably not need to be limited.
- iv. There were concerns about implications on the REF if the University was to restrict publication in certain journals. The quality of papers was a key driver in the University's goal of becoming a top 100 HEI.
- v. It was suggested that papers could be pre-read, assessed and rated as potentially 4* in order to receive the funding. This could be a way of incentivising the pre-reading programme and driving up the quality of papers, although there would be demands on staff time. It was suggested that the negative result of this could be grade inflation.
- vi. Another suggestion was that the Gold Open Access Fund could be restricted to a premium set of journals. However, this would go against the Code of Practice for Assessment of Individual Research Performance, which did not permit journal-based indicators to be used as a measure of quality.
- vii. The publication landscape was changing and by the next REF there might be many more high quality open access journals that would require payment with submission.
- viii. Anything that would restrict academic staff from submitting high quality papers to high quality journals and limit them being read and cited would be counter-productive to the University's REF ambitions.
- ix. The budget for the institutional Gold Open Access Fund was £300,000, which was managed by the Library. In taking into account the £80,000 over-spend, it was suggested that the budget should be £400,000.
- x. The Committee had agreed that there should not be any restrictions placed on academics' freedom to publish and that the issue should be taken away and given further consideration. Additional resource needed to deliver the unrestricted approach should be identified.

20.3 HEFCE Initial Decisions on REF2021

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received an oral report on HEFCE's initial decisions on REF2021.
- ii. The weighting for Impact in REF2021 had increased from 20 to 25 per cent.
- iii. The environment statement would focus on interdisciplinary research, impact and the UOA's approach to collaboration.
- iv. There would not be an institutional environment statement in REF2021. A pilot would run in the future to test use of an institutional environment statement, and the University would

need to decide if it wished to be involved in this pilot. Environment statements would be produced at UOA level, and some institutional level information would be included.

- v. Institutional impact case studies would not be required for REF2021, but there would be a second pilot on this area, which HEIs would be asked if they wished to participate in.
- vi. HEFCE had been undertaking a further consultation on staff output portability, and the University had been involved. There had been a focus on two options: (i) a hybrid model for which there would be a deadline within the REF period, which was thought would be burdensome to administer and (ii) a simplified model which would allow old and new institutions to benefit from the outputs of staff who had moved institutions. The University supported the simplified model.
- vii. There was also a consultation underway to define research active and independent staff.
- viii. Every academic staff member would be required to submit at least one paper for REF2021, but any further submission requirements had not yet been defined. HEFCE had asked for an indication of how many staff were likely to submit per UOA for each HEI.
- ix. Sub-panel chairs were being sought for REF2021, and this would be an opportunity for Liverpool staff to influence REF criteria. A summary of what had been agreed at SMT regarding incentives would shortly be forwarded to the Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors for consideration at their Faculty groups.
- x. Further announcements regarding changes to REF2021 would be made in November 2017.
- xi. The Committee had agreed that an open meeting should be organised to seek volunteers for REF sub-panel membership.

20.4 4* Outputs and Impact

REPORTED:

- i. Plans were in place to monitor progress in terms of achieving more 4* outputs and the Peer Review College was being further developed.

20.5 The Next Reading Programme

REPORTED:

- i. Work was underway to populate the Elements/Tulip output assessment module, which would be launched for the first time as part of the new reading programme. The Elements/Tulip module would be pre-populated with historical data, and internal timescales for submission were being finalised. Ongoing support would be provided on impact case studies and progress with the development of case studies would be closely monitored.
- ii. For the next cycle of the reading programme, guidance on joint authorship would need to be much clearer. A ranked list of individuals in the UOA was suggested. A tactical decision would then need to be made as to who to allocate the research to. Criteria should be followed so that each member of research active staff was returned in the REF. This was thought to be the most effective way of submitting the best of the institution's papers by UOA. Papers were generally judged on the quality of the output rather than on the individual/s involved.
- iii. It was likely that portability would be covered by one or two papers being submitted by both institutions, and a list of staff who had left Liverpool would therefore be required. The new regulations on portability would need to be built into the reading programme framework.

- iv. A new system had been developed which broke down REF categorisation even further by using a 13 point ranking. This would allow a single category, e.g. 4*, to be further assigned high, medium or low.
- v. In the past the same paper could be returned to more than one UOA, but this may change under REF2021.
- vi. There were still issues in terms of the usability of the Elements/Tulip system, but development of modules had been held back by procedures for the REF having not yet being finalised. In the meantime, a Tulip application had been developed that interfaced with the Elements system so that the outputs assessment process could be run through it.

20.6 Review of Code of Practice and Policy Principles, Including Initiatives and Plans for Growing 4* Outputs

REPORTED:

- i. The Code of Practice and Policy Principles related to the methodology of the last REF and were now out of date. However, the Policy Principles were still being used for performance management purposes.
- ii. The ideal time to review the Code of Practice and Policy Principles was when work had been completed on incentivising 4* outputs as this would set out the University's ambitions and methodologies. The documents would need to align with this policy.
- iii. The Policy Principles were used to advise on standards required in order to reach particular levels of research quality, and these definitions had been helpful.
- iv. There were concerns about dropping the KPI linked to the percentage of Research and Teaching Staff at 3* level.
- v. Staff being reviewed every year put pressure on researchers to submit a paper on an annual basis. In some subject areas it took much longer to create outputs.
- vi. It was suggested that in future, in order to fulfil a contract as a researcher, performance at 3* level had to be shown. In order to gain promotion, researchers should show they were performing at 4* or progressing towards that level.
- vii. The Committee had agreed that: Policy Principles should be separate from the reading programme during 2017/18 and the Code of Practice and Policy Principles should be reviewed in six months' time once work on incentivising methodologies had been completed.

21. The UK Industrial Strategy: University of Liverpool Strategy and Delivery Plan 2017-2021

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received a paper on the University's approach to the Government's Industrial Strategy, through which £4.7 billion of additional research and impact funding was available.

Collaborative Provision Committee

22. The Senate received a report on the meetings of the Collaborative Provision Committee held on 28 June 2017 and 18 October 2017.

23. University of Liverpool and Laureate Online Education Reaccreditation

REPORTED:

- i. The Collaborative Provision Committee had received the report and accompanying action plan from the Reaccreditation Visit to Laureate Online Education (LOE) that had taken place in Amsterdam on 14 and 15 June 2017.
- ii. The Visit Panel had found no substantial issues and was happy to recommend renewal of the accreditation agreement for the standard period of five years. The Panel had confirmed that it had full confidence in the quality and standards of the provision delivered in collaboration with LOE. The Committee had agreed to recommend that the renewal of the accreditation agreement should be approved.
- iii. The action plan would be monitored by the Online Programmes Operational Group. If any issues arose that required elevating, these would be referred to the Collaborative Provision Committee; otherwise, end-of-year progress would be reported to the Committee in due course.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

- iv. The accreditation agreement between the University and LOE should be renewed for a further five years.

24. XJTLU

24.1 Year in China

REPORTED:

- i. The Collaborative Provision Committee had received an oral update on some student experience issues related to the Year in China scheme. In response to the issues, a Year in China Working Group had been established to ensure institutional oversight of the scheme, agreement had been reached with XJTLU as to actions required to resolve the issues, and students affected by teaching failings in the Chinese Language modules would be flagged at the Final Awards Boards so that this could be taken into consideration when determining their degree classifications.

24.2 XJTLU Policies and Procedures

REPORTED:

- i. The Collaborative Provision Committee had approved the guidance for approving XJTLU programmes, produced in response to the new approval processes at the University of Liverpool.

24.3 XJTLU Chief External Examiner and UoL Chief Moderator Reports

REPORTED:

- i. The Collaborative Provision Committee had received the 2016/17 reports from the Chief External Examiner and UoL Chief Moderator for XJTLU.
- ii. XJTLU would produce an action plan, based on the issues raised in the reports, which would be discussed at the Annual Monitoring Visit which was scheduled to take place on 6-8 November 2017.
- iii. The Committee had agreed that both reports confirmed confidence in the quality and standards of the provision.

24.4 Approvals

REPORTED:

- i. The Collaborative Provision Committee had approved:

Outline Approval applications for the following programmes, for delivery at XJTLU:

- MA China Studies
- PG Cert Learning and Teaching in Higher Education

The following programmes, for delivery at XJTLU:

- XJTLU BA Digital Media Arts
- XJTLU BA Film and TV Production
- MA Mass Media Translation

25. **Study Abroad**

REPORTED:

- i. The Collaborative Provision Committee had approved:

New student exchanges with the following international institutions:

- Australian National University, Australia
- Western Sydney University, Australia
- University of Waikato, New Zealand
- Northern Arizona University, USA
- Steven's Institute of Technology, USA
- Ewha Womans University (EWU), South Korea
- Universidad Nacional de San Martín (UNSAM), Argentina
- Griffith University, Australia
- Florida International University (FIU), USA

Renewal of the student exchange with the following international institution:

- University of Toronto Canada

Postgraduate Research Committee

26. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the PGR Committee held on 26 September 2017.

27. **Approval of the Revised Postgraduate Research Taxonomy of Collaborative Provision**

REPORTED:

- i. The PGR Committee had received and approved a revised Postgraduate Research Taxonomy of Collaborative Provision.
- ii. Minor revisions had been made to the taxonomy document in relation to International Institutional Visiting and Exchange Agreements.

28. **Approval of an Updated PGR Collaborative Register**

REPORTED:

- i. The PGR Committee had received and approved an updated PGR Collaborative Register.

OTHER ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT

ACTION TAKEN BY THE VICE-CHANCELLOR ON BEHALF OF THE SENATE

29. The Senate received a report outlining action which had been taken on its behalf by the Vice-Chancellor.

30. **Offer of an Honorary Degree to Professor Jane Dacre**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend that Professor Jane Dacre, current President of the Royal College of Physicians, be invited to accept the honorary degree of Doctor of Medicine.
- ii. The President of the Council, acting on the Council's behalf, had approved the above recommendation.

AGREED:

- iii. That the above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate should be endorsed.

31. **Protocols for Election of an Elected Senate Representative on Council 2017**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the protocols for/approach to conducting the election of an elected Senate representative on Council.
- ii. The President of the Council, acting on the Council's behalf, had approved the above recommendation.

AGREED:

- iii. The above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate should be endorsed.

32. **Minor Revisions to the Policy on Misconduct in Research**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the revised Policy on Misconduct in Research. The Policy had been approved by Senate at its meeting held on 22 March 2017 but, since then, further minor changes had been made at the request of the Liverpool Guild of Students. The changes were minor and consisted only of signposting updates and an expansion of a procedural route which had been implied but was now expressly stated.

AGREED:

- ii. The above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate should be endorsed.

33. **Appointments to the Board of Discipline**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the re-appointment/appointment of the following individuals to serve on the Board of Discipline, for the period from 1 August 2017 to 31 July 2020:

Re-appointments

Dr Zainab Hussain
 Professor Helen O'Sullivan
 Dr Andrew Plowman
 Dr Kieron Salmon
 Dr Thomas Teubner

New appointments

Dr Amel Alghrani
 Professor Nandini Das
 Professor Rodi Herzberg
 Dr Giles Hooper
 Dr Xu (Judy) Zhu

AGREED:

- ii. The above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate should be endorsed.

34. Appointment of an Acting Chair of the Senate Committee on the Progress of Students**REPORTED:**

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the one-off appointment of Dr Ian O'Neil as Acting Chair of the Senate Committee on the Progress of Students owing to a conflict of interest for the Chair, Professor Anu Arora.

AGREED:

- ii. The above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate should be endorsed.

35. Renaming of the Heads of Level 2 Schools and Institutes as 'Deans'**REPORTED:**

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the change of title of all heads of Level 2 Schools and Institutes to Dean¹.

AGREED:

- ii. The above action taken by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Senate should be endorsed.

36. Thanks**NOTED:**

- i. This was the last Senate meeting for the Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellor for the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Professor Bob Burgoyne.

AGREED:

- ii. Senate's sincere thanks for the contributions made by Professor Burgoyne should be recorded and he should be wished a long and happy retirement.

37. Date of Next Meeting**NOTED:**

- i. The next meeting of the Senate would be held at 2pm on Wednesday 24 January 2018 in the Brett Building.

Appendices

- ¹ Case for Renaming of the Heads of Level 2 Schools and Institutes as 'Deans'.

MEETING OF THE SENATE

1 NOVEMBER 2017

Part II: Reserved Business

38. Reserved Minutes of the Previous Meeting

AGREED:

- i. The reserved minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 21 June 2017 should be approved as an accurate record.

**ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS IN RELATION TO
ACADEMIC MATTERS**

39. Students' Individual Academic Arrangements

RECEIVED:

- i. Via the Senate members' intranet, a report on actions notwithstanding the Ordinances and Regulations in respect of students' individual academic arrangements which had been approved by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education¹.

AGREED:

- ii. The action taken in respect of the students listed should be endorsed.

40. Appointment of XJTLU External Examiners

RECEIVED:

- i. Via the Senate members' intranet, a report on the appointment of several external examiners at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University which had been approved by the head of subject at UoL and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education².

AGREED:

- ii. The appointment of the external examiners listed should be endorsed.

41. Report on the Appointment of Academic Staff

RECEIVED:

- i. Via the Senate members' intranet, a report on the appointment of academic staff³.

Appendices

- ¹ Report on actions notwithstanding Ordinances and Regulations in relation to students' individual academic arrangements
- ² Report on the appointment of external examiners at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University
- ³ Report on the appointment of academic staff