MEETING OF THE SENATE

21 MARCH 2018

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair, items 1-10), Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Birch, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Badcock, Professor Beveridge (in the Chair for close of item 10 and items 11-38) and Professor Kenny, Professors Atkinson, Balogun, Clegg, Comerford, Cunliffe and Eades, Dr S Edwardson, Professors Elsheikh, Foxhall, Gibson, Grubb, Guillaume, Hertz-Fowler, Herzberg, Langfeld, MacEwan, Mair, Marshall, Morris, Ralph, Sanderson, Scott, Sheffield and Shovlin, Dr M Speed, Dr L Swan, Professor van der Hoek, Dr S Voelkel and Professor Welsch.

The President, Deputy President and a Vice-President 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 Officer.

Apologies for absence were received from 14 members of the Senate.

1.   **Welcome to New Members**

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

      Staff members
      Professor Louise Kenny
      Professor Chris Sanderson

2.   **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 1 November 2018

      AGREED:

      i.   The unreserved minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2018 should be approved as an accurate record.

4.   **Report on the Business Circulated by Email Following the Cancellation of the January 2018 Meeting of Senate**

      RECEIVED:

      i.   A report on the business circulated by email following the cancellation of the January 2018 meeting.

      REPORTED:

      ii.   Papers relating to the following had been circulated:

            • Report of the Collaborative Provision Committee meeting held on 12 December 2017
            • Report of the Education Committee meeting held on 10 January 2018
            • Report of the PGR Committee meeting held on 18 December 2017

- Report of the Research and Impact Committee meeting held on 11 January 2018
- Financial Statements of the University for the Year Ended 31 July 2017.

iii. No comments or concerns had been raised and the Vice-Chancellor had subsequently taken Chair's action on behalf of the Senate to approve the recommendations contained within the reports (as outlined in minutes 29 and 30 below).

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

5. **USS Pensions Scheme Industrial Action**

    RECEIVED:

    i. An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor on the latest situation concerning USS pension scheme industrial action.

    REPORTED:

    ii. Talks with the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) between Universities UK (UUK) and the University and College Union (UCU) were ongoing following rejection of the latest proposal, but there was good will on both sides to find a resolution. A further meeting between UCU, UUK and ACAS was scheduled to take place that day and the joint negotiating committee would next meet on 28 March 2018. The UUK would hold an emergency meeting on Friday 23 March 2018.

    iii. Rules were set by the Pensions Regulator, which had to be abided by. A 60 day consultation period was required to consider any proposals and a deadline of 30 June 2018 had to be met.

    iv. The recent jointly negotiated proposal had received considerable support from HEIs but had been quickly rejected by the UCU.

    v. Colleagues at UUK were working to achieve the best resolution for all, but many had been the victim of vicious harassment, particularly through social media. It was important to call out harassment and bullying and individuals should work together constructively and give credit to the good intent of those trying to reach a resolution.

    vi. There was considerable misinformation circulating with regard to pensions, which had resulted in heightened anxiety among staff. It was important that the work done by staff who had continued to work during the strikes was not overshadowed by the negativity of the campaign.

    NOTED:

    vii. The University should focus on its duties and continue with improvements to the student experience and its research.

6. **Honours and Appointments**

    REPORTED:

    i. Professor Peter Clegg, equine vet and Head of the University of Liverpool Institute of Ageing and Chronic Disease, would be awarded the prestigious Queen's Medal from the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) in London on 13 July 2018. The Queen's Medal was the highest honour the College could bestow upon a veterinary surgeon and recognised a distinguished career in the profession.

    ii. Professor Chris Dowrick from the Institute of Psychology, Health and Society had been awarded the 2017 George Abercrombie Award for 'special meritorious literary work in general practice' by the Royal College of General Practitioners (RCGP).

iii. Dr Alan Greeves from the Department of Archaeology, Classics and Egyptology had achieved Principal Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy (HEA) via the University of Liverpool Teaching Recognition and Accreditation Framework (ULTRA).

iv. Professor Sir Munir Pirmohamed from the Institute of Translational Medicine had been named as President Elect of the British Pharmacological Society for two years after which he would become President in 2020.

v. Professor Matt Rosseinsky from the Department of Chemistry had been awarded a prestigious Royal Society Professorship for a further five years for his work leading a research group to enhance the fundamental knowledge of physical and chemical properties of new materials.

vi. The Department of Molecular and Clinical Pharmacology had been honoured with a Queen's Anniversary Prize in recognition of its work to improve the safety and effectiveness of medicines.

STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

7. **Contributions to Civic Agenda Green Paper**

   RECEIVED:

   i. A Green Paper and presentation highlighting some of the University's key activities in relation to its civic mission presented by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Cultural Engagement (PVCCE).

   REPORTED:

   ii. The work focused on how the mutual benefits to be derived from the University's programme of local and regional engagement might be effectively enhanced.

   iii. The paper was not comprehensive and some Senate members had informed the PVCCE of several additional activities since its circulation.

   iv. The Heseltine Institute (HI) served as an important focus point for the University's civic engagement activities. The priorities of the HI were to generate Thought Leadership, High-Impact Academic Research and the Analysis of Key Issues. The HI was a gateway for organisations within the city region to connect with academics and co-produce strong research.

   v. The Knowledge Quarter was a dynamic environment for the city's healthcare and education assets, which improved connectivity, encouraged enterprise and attracted investment. The University's new Paddington Village complex, which was currently under construction, would be the location of the new Royal College of Physicians headquarters, among other organisations.

   vi. Research and impact was key in the University's civic mission and there were multiple ways in which the University's research delivered public benefit. A new research theme in Health, Wealth and Social Justice had been established and various projects related to the University's research were being undertaken such as the Comics Youth initiative, which support the literacy of young people in the region through drawing on the University's research expertise in this area.

   vii. In addition, there was an impressive range of initiatives under the Education umbrella, which showed the University's ambition to take on major challenges. For example, the Scholars Programme had an outstanding record of supporting students from under represented sectors to study at the University of Liverpool and other HEIs.

viii. The University had recently launched its new Strategy for Heritage and Culture, which had been endorsed by the Senate. Increasing the University's involvement in culture and heritage was central to its civic mission and partnerships were particularly important (e.g. the Tate partnership).

ix. A range of projects had been initiated by the Liverpool Guild of Student (LGoS) such as the Volunteering Liverpool project, which had 340 local organisations registered.

x. HR and the Academy ran numerous projects such as the Pre-Apprenticeship Programme and the Apprenticeship Programme, which had an encouraging record of success.

xi. These activities highlighted the University's profile. Staff involved in this type of activity found it satisfying and felt like they were making a contribution.

NOTED:

xii. It was suggested that a register of voluntary activity related to the civic mission should be established that would classify the different types of activity as many staff were engaged in activity that was not formally recorded.

xiii. The schools where University staff acted as school governors wished for greater interaction with the University and it was queried how that could be done.

xiv. The various initiatives running across the University such as the programme of public engagement and Continuing Education could be better connected. The branding of the University also needed to be more visible and a more consistent approach adopted.

xv. The University Partnerships Programme (UPP) Foundation, which provided grants to develop civic initiatives, had launched its civic commission and was calling for evidence regarding this agenda.

xvi. Information on the University's civic mission should be incorporated in briefings, welcome events and other activities.

AGREED:

xvii. A briefing note to highlight events and activities related to civic engagement should be circulated to staff periodically.

8. **Proposal for Incentivising 4* Research White Paper**

RECEIVED:

i. A paper proposing revised research expectations and associated academic promotions criteria presented by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and Impact (PVCRI).

REPORTED:

ii. A working group chaired by the PVCRI and comprising the APVC for Research and Impact in each of the Faculties together with HR and other Professional Services representation had formulated revised research expectations and promotions criteria for Teaching and Research (T&R) seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor. The new criteria were intended to set clear standards of academic activity to be demonstrated by candidates seeking promotion in order to meet strategic objectives to increase 4* impact.

iii. In 2016, Senate had approved the University's Research and Impact Strategy within Strategy 2026 including the underpinning policy principles. A revised code of practice on the assessment of individual research and performance was subsequently approved by

Senate in June 2016, which emphasised 'a step change in impact performance...' and 'research outcomes of world-leading (4*) or internationally excellent (3*) standards'.

iv. However, current annual review procedures did not distinguish between internationally excellent (3*) and world-leading (4*) research, and a way of rewarding 4* activity was therefore not in place. In addition, current procedures did not effectively take into account that an impact case study developed for REF could not be fully validated until the end of a REF cycle, so it would take seven years until validation of the University's contribution to an impact case. The new procedure would therefore measure progress towards 3* or 4* impact activity and reward it without having to wait until the end of a REF cycle.

v. The current procedures for T&R staff did not make clear the minimum level of teaching contribution that would be expected or the minimum level of research contribution.

vi. Faculties would need to develop additional local Faculty criteria, particularly concerning the definition of a lead author or a Principal Investigator (PI) and expectations regarding research funding.

vii. The intention was to progress in two stages: revised forms and guidance would be ready for 2018 and further revisions would be made for 2019, which would link to the proposed Teaching Quality Framework to be considered under item 9.

viii. It was emphasised that a strong research environment would encourage the best research activity, particularly with regard to supporting early career researchers (ECR). Interviews for appointing an APVC for Research Environment and Postgraduate Research had taken place and the new APVC would work with the PVC on the development of the enhanced research environment.

NOTED:

ix. The working group had recognised that the contribution of the Co-Investigator (Co-I) was important. However, grant funding was measured externally by PI and there was no methodology for awarding research that crossed more than one School/Department/Institute. The proposed revised promotion criteria required increased responsibility as staff moved up the academic career ladder, so the criteria for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer did not include a requirement to have been a PI. However, for more senior roles, leadership experience would be required.

x. It was queried whether the requirement to produce two 4* outputs was fixed. A key issue was that the University was under performing on a number of 4* outputs and 4* impact case studies it produced per FTE and that it was not matching comparator institutions. The kind or behaviour that led to improvements would therefore need to incentivised.

xi. It would be discussed further whether or not a third professional practice pathway could be introduced for staff undertaking clinical research that was valuable in terms of the training of residents and the future of the profession.

xii. The methodology also rewarded research income and PGR supervision, not just 4* research.

xiii. Concerns that collaborative research would be disincentivised under the methodology were raised. The University would endeavour to deliver on 4* activity without undermining collaborative activity and the effect of the new procedures on collaborative activity would be monitored.

xiv. Excellence in research would be decided by the individual's grant funding, doctoral studentships, Knowledge Exchange and leadership. Candidates would select outputs and impact cases for consideration and provide a rationale. Departments would validate the academic staff member's application and external advisors would comment on the

outputs and impact. A panel would then assess the application and an interview would be held.

xv.   Panels for REF2021 would each have a member with oversight of the assessment of interdisciplinary research, so problems with regard to interdisciplinary research were expected to improve on the last REF.

xvi.   The timeframe that stated that there should be a minimum of three years between promotions was a guideline.

xvii.   A retention procedure for staff was in place, which required a business case to explain the rationale.

xviii.   The value of an impact case study was worth more than several outputs, and it was queried whether two case studies would be too difficult for some disciplines. However, rewarding the journey towards excellence was the key aim.

xix.   Concerns that the bar for 4* activity had been set too high were noted and this would be monitored.

AGREED:

xx.   A definition of 'lead author' should be added to a prominent location in the guidance.

xxi.   Further comments on the proposal should be forwarded via email to the PVC for Research and Impact.

9.   **Teaching Quality Framework Green Paper**

RECEIVED:

i.   A green paper on the Teaching Quality Framework, which was presented by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education (PVCE) and the Associate-Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education in the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences (APVCE FHLS).

REPORTED:

ii.   Metrics for the University's overall Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) ranking were still indicating Bronze. In the Subject Level TEF, 4 subject areas would be Bronze, 22 would be Silver and 2 Gold. If the University was to achieve an overall Gold rating by 2021, a step change was required.

iii.   A summary of performance in the NSS since 2016 showed the University was losing ground against its competitors. In Academic Support the University was below average and significantly below the top quartile. The University had improved in Academic Support but at the same pace as its competitors. The University had been working to improve Academic Advice for several years with little progress.

iv.   There was a huge disparity between some subjects. Some issues could be addressed through changes to the curriculum, but academic staff needed to improve the quality of their teaching. However, the University did not have robust teaching metrics by which to measure teaching quality.

v.   A new Teaching Quality Framework was proposed that had been developed from a University of Colorado, Boulder, model, which focused on Student Feedback, Peer Observation and Self-Reflection/Evaluation. In addition, the proposed University of Liverpool model would also focus on Developing the Teacher through Excellence in Professional Practice and the Attainment of Teaching Qualifications and on Leadership and Advice through Course Leadership and Organisation and Academic Advice and Guidance.

vi. These requirements would comprise a portfolio of activity, which would be monitored using Evasys. Any criteria specific to a local teaching context or environment could also be defined and added to the portfolio. The aim of the Framework was to support academic staff to do a good job. The scoring system was indicative and departments would be able to decide how to define teaching quality for their discipline.

vii. The consultation on the proposal would ask if the criteria were fit for purpose, if there was anything missing and the best way of incorporating the Framework into staff PDR.

viii. A pilot would run in the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences during summer, 2018. The Framework would then be revised and launched in 2018/19.

NOTED:

ix. Teaching quality would be measured holistically as individual feedback on modules was inherently biased. There were still problems with large class sizes, but not all problems with teaching quality stemmed from this.

x. The Framework would be linked to the portfolio of assessment.

xi. The Framework could be used in an informative way when considering the promotion of an academic staff member and would link to the proposed new research promotion process.

AGREED:

xii. Comments on the proposal should be fed back to the PVCE and APVCE FHLS.

xiii. A workshop to consult further with Senate on the Framework should also be arranged.

xiv. The green paper should be endorsed by the Senate and the implementation of the pilot study in FHLS in 2018 should be approved.

10. **Towards Strategy 2026 – In Support of World Leading Teaching and Research**

RECEIVED:

i. A presentation entitled Towards Strategy 2026 – In Support of World Leading Teaching and Research presented by the Vice-Chancellor, the PVC for Research and Impact, the PVC for Education and the Director of Human Resources.

REPORTED:

ii. Discussion regarding the University's Education and Research performance had begun last autumn when the Senior Management Team and the Senior Executive Group had reviewed progress against Strategy 2026 and had identified key challenges, which had included improving National Student Survey results, student experience, the research, environment and student employability.

iii. There had been indications that current and ongoing work on improving student employability and NSS results would make a positive difference.

iv. Strategy 2026 was about maximising the positive impact of the University, through delivering high quality teaching and research in order to progress towards the University's ambition of being a top 100 university globally. To achieve these aims, the University needed to tackle the fact that its performance had in recent years weakened against key measures either in real terms or because improvements had been made at a slower rate than those in comparable institutions. The University's ambition was to make itself the

strongest and most successful it could be for the benefit of its students, staff, the wider community and its stakeholders.

v. The Senior Management Team had given these issues detailed consideration, working with the Deans. The proposal would help the University to address its performance challenges. Following Senate, the proposal would be taken to the UCU and then announced more widely. It would be a challenge for leaders, and a supportive environment for delivering the approach would be discussed.

vi. Data presented showed that the University's research performance was poor in comparison to several similar size and type institutions. For example, HEFCE funding had decreased from being in the middle of the group of institutions in 2009/10 to being at the bottom of the group in 2016/17. This was due to a change in the way that funding was awarded with more funds going towards 4* research.

vii. With regard to Education, student feedback in the NSS on teaching quality had placed the University 338 out of 465 institutions. 25 out of 43 subjects were in the bottom quartile.

viii. Few subjects were pushing towards a Gold ranking in the subject level TEF. Two subjects were predicted as being in a position to achieve Gold: Nursing and Chemistry.

ix. A voluntary severance scheme for T&R and T&S staff would be launched, which would give staff who were uncomfortable with carrying out the changes that were necessary to achieve the University's strategic aims a supportive way to help them move into different career opportunities.

x. The voluntary severance offer would include 12 months' pay and would open from 26 March to June 2018, with a leaving date of 31 July 2018.

xi. The scheme was not in any way connected to the dispute concerning pensions. Support would be available to staff considering the scheme on pensions and career transitioning.

xii. The scheme had been modelled against 220 T&R/T&S staff leaving, which would deliver £20 million for reinvestment into many different areas, particularly improvements to performance and the student experience.

xiii. An email to all staff announcing the opening of the scheme would be circulated on 21 March 2018, and a letter would be sent to all T&R and T&S staff from the Director of HR about the application procedure. Deans would review applications and hold discussions with individuals. The impact of individual redundancies on the achievement of the University's Education and Research priorities would be considered.

xiv. Each Faculty would have a project group to consider the impact of requests and ensure consistency. A Strategic Project Board would maintain oversight and have overall responsibility for the scheme.

xv. The University was keen to push for a voluntary scheme. However, if the change was not achievable through voluntary means, other options would be considered including compulsory redundancy.

xvi. If nothing was done, the University's performance would remain unchanged or might worsen. Other options had been considered such as institutional restructuring, which would have put enormous pressure on staff, and opting for compulsory severance, which had been deemed to be unfair.

xvii. When considering reinvestment, the University would look at such areas as NSS remedial action, employability activity and strengthening UoAs through the targeted recruitment of 4* staff.

NOTED:

xviii. HR Business Partners would be put in place to help with the process. Each HR Business Partner would be aligned to a Faculty project group. Guidance, Q&As and scripts would be available. Issues could be taken back to the Strategic Project Board, where required.

xix. There were concerns that an all staff email to communicate the scheme would create anxiety among staff who were not affected. However, problem areas were uneven and were not concentrated within just one Faculty. It was a voluntary process and staff were therefore free to apply, but it would be at the discretion of the Deans to manage discussion in their areas and encourage good staff to stay.

xx. T&S staff would also be encouraged to apply where it was felt their level of contribution was inadequate, but the focus was on T&R staff.

xxi. It had been decided not to include Professional Services (PS) staff in the scheme. At other HEIs voluntary severance schemes for PS had failed as PS had needed to grow again over time and the scheme had not achieved the original objectives. The One PS Strategic Change project would redesign and reimagine Professional Services for the future to provide resource where it was needed. This would be done over a longer period as part of the Strategic Change programme, which would assess if resource was being invested in appropriate areas.

xxii. It was not anticipated that there would be problems meeting teaching needs and the scheme would not be driven by the need for teachers on individual modules.

REPORTS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES

Education Committee

11. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Education Committee held on 7 March 2018.

12. Code of Practice on Support and Safety of Students Off-Campus

REPORTED:

i. The Education Committee had received the new Code of Practice (CoP) on Support and Safety of Students Off-Campus.

ii. This CoP had been developed following the meeting of the Education Committee held 2nd June 2017, where it had been agreed that the three existing University Codes of Practice in this area should be brought together in the form of one Code which would regulate all off-campus student activity, both in the UK and abroad.

iii. Following a review of the document and a number of suggestions, the Committee had agreed to recommend approval of the CoP.

iv. Given its broad remit and safety aspects, the CoP would be submitted to the Health and Safety Governance Committee prior to Senate and Council for formal approval. A more detailed account of discussion, plus a final version of the CoP would be submitted to the meeting of the Senate scheduled for 20 June 2018.

13. Education Action Plan

13.1 *Academic Experience Survey*

REPORTED:

i. The Education Committee had received a presentation analysing the results of the University's first internal Academic Experience Survey (AES).

ii. Sent to second and third year students in October 2017, the AES sought to identify key issues affecting students' experience and inform how we might address these. Whilst not designed to replicate or predict NSS scores, its results provided an opportunity for additional insight.

iii. The survey received 3000 responses with an overall response rate 24%. At subject level, response rates varied between 9% to 66%.

iv. Whilst the AES covered similar broad topics to NSS question areas its structure and audience differed. Despite these differences, a reasonably strong correlation existed between NSS satisfaction and the AES findings for both Teaching and Academic Support.

v. The Committee had agreed that further analysis should be undertaken to identify priorities.

13.2 From DLHE to Graduation Outcomes

REPORTED:

i. The Education Committee had received a presentation on current Destination of Leavers of Higher Education (DLHE) survey performance as well as a review of the incoming Graduation Outcomes survey.

ii. For the 2016/17 survey, the University had now achieved the required DLHE response rate of 80% for full-time UK graduates. Whilst still unverified, current performance was positive and a significant improvement on last year. This was attributed to a more targeted approach to data collection, as well as recent successful interventions such as the Kickstart intern scheme and enhanced extracurricular activity in Schools and Departments.

iii. For future years, the DLHE survey would now be replaced by the new Graduate Outcomes survey. New changes included the census date moving from six to 15 months, the survey being collated by a central collection centre (rather than institutions) and new questions focusing on the 'graduate voice'.

iv. The first Graduate Outcomes survey would commence in December 2018 for those students graduating between August and November 2017.

v. Whilst a significant amount of progress had been made, further work was required to further align the activities of the Careers and Employability Service and the employability activities undertaken by Schools and Departments.

vi. The success of the Kickstart intern scheme and the continued positive feedback received from colleagues highlighted the quality of graduates the University was producing.

13.3 Learning and Teaching Space Update

REPORTED:

i. The Education Committee had received a presentation on Learning and Teaching Space enhancements, as well as FRCS' response to NSS feedback.

ii. FRCS related NSS free-text feedback could be broken down into four key themes:

- Catering;
- Estate conditions and functional use;
- Residential accommodation;
- Security and safety.

iii. Positive comments relating to the condition of the estate had been received. Negative comments related to space issues were now being addressed by the Learning and Teaching Space Steering Group.

iv. Recent enhancements had been made to the lecture theatres in the Brodie Tower, the School of Architecture and the Ashton Building. 126 Mount Pleasant had also undergone significant investment and refurbishment.

v. New collaborative learning facilities were being trialled in some areas and feedback would be sought from staff and students as to the work completed during 2017, which would inform future planning.

vi. The new Lecture and Teaching Hub (building 502) was set to open in September 2018 and would include three large lecture theatres as well as teaching rooms and study spaces.

14. UUKi Outward Mobility Strategy – University of Liverpool Go International: Stand Out Campaign Pledge

REPORTED:

i. The Education Committee had received a paper detailing the University of Liverpool's commitment to the Go International: Stand Out campaign, co-ordinated by Universities UK international (UUKi) as part of the UK Outward Mobility Strategy, of which UUKi was the co-ordinating body.

ii. The Go International: Stand Out Campaign aimed to support the UK Outward Mobility strategy by asking UK higher education providers to sign up to the campaign under four guiding principles:

1) Increase the percentage of UK students who study, work or volunteer abroad as part of their higher education programme.
2) Promote the value of study, work and volunteering abroad.
3) Enhance the accessibility of studying, working and volunteering abroad.
4) Improve the collection and reporting of data on study, work and volunteering abroad.

iii. As part of our commitment to the campaign, the University of Liverpool had pledged to the following:

1) Providing an increased range of short-term mobility opportunities through offering more summer schools.
2) Introduce a new programme 'Engineering with a Year Abroad' and summer undergraduate research projects in Engineering.

3) Exploring the possibility of featuring outward student mobility in our Access Agreement to increase the provision of our Liverpool Bursary from a 50% to a 100% contribution for students from lower income backgrounds spending a year abroad.

4) Fostering an institutional culture which was positive about mobility by disseminating the benefits of mobility to Academic Advising Champions and Academic Advisors, and providing them with the necessary tools to promote mobility to students.

5) Raise visibility of international opportunities by participating in campaigns, especially through social media channels. Working more closely with our Guild of Students to promote mobility was of particular importance to us.

Research and Impact Committee

15. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Research and Impact Committee held on 8 March 2018.

16. **REF 2021**

    REPORTED:

    i.   REF preparations were on going for all Faculties and an impact stocktake had taken place.

    ii.   An audit of the reading programme would take place shortly with a deadline of 1st April 2018, which would reveal more about the University's position in terms of 3* and 4* outputs and outputs in general.

    iii. An initiative looking at REF Environment across the University would take place later in 2018. Research Policy had developed a template for the collection of data for the project.

17. **China Strategy**

    REPORTED:

    i.   The China Strategy had been launched. A visit had taken place from the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences to the FHSS and a Memorandum of Understanding on student mobility and research collaboration had been signed.

18. **UK Research and Innovation (UKRI)**

    REPORTED:

    i.   The new UKRI would commence from 1 April 2018. UKRI was a merger of all the Research Councils, Innovate UK and the research part of HEFCE. As part of these changes, there had been a refresh in terms of membership of some of the Research Councils and calls for individuals to join Research Councils were expected.

19. **Liverpool Doctoral College (LDC): Physical Location**

    REPORTED:

    i.   The Research and Impact Committee had received a report entitled Liverpool Doctoral College: Physical Location by the LDC Manager.

    ii.   The report detailed what the University of Warwick, the University of Birmingham and the University of Nottingham were providing in terms of provision for PGR students and physical and virtual space. The report proposed a strategic case for establishing a

physical space for the LDC, providing various ways where there was an interaction between space and the PGR community

iii. The institutions selected for comparison were recognised as providing high quality PGR provision and had invested considerable financial resource in the area.

iv. The costs provided in the report were related to the originally proposed space at 128 Mount Pleasant, which was now being used by another department.

v. The Committee had approved the proposal in principle and had agreed that a shorter more visionary and aspirational paper should be developed, which should recommend physical space in order to meet strategic objectives. This paper could include perspectives from PGR students and should avoid including a figure for suggested investment The PVC for Research and Impact should be consulted with regard to the specifics of the paper. The new APVC for Research Environment and Postgraduate Research should lead on this initiative once in post.

20. Research Excellence – Revised Academic Promotion Criteria

REPORTED:

i. The Research and Impact Committee had received a paper entitled Research Excellence – Revised Academic Promotion Criteria.

ii. There had been a discussion about anonymity of applications. It was agreed that Heads of Department and Schools were best placed to judge research in their discipline area and the applicant's overall contributions to research but also teaching and administration, so it was thought that anonymity would not be of benefit to the applicant.

iii. The policy stated that the candidate would be required to either submit two 4* output paper publications or two 4* impact cases. The REF stated one impact case study per ten members of staff. The impact cases were therefore much more difficult to achieve so it would be more straightforward for staff to submit paper publications.

iv. There were concerns about the University not doing the things that were important for social benefit if those initiatives did not qualify specifically as impact case studies.

v. KEF would be a third strand in the future along with the TEF and REF and should therefore be mentioned in the criteria.

vi. The forms requested a personal statement of up to 4,800 words but the current requirement was 1,800. Concerns about the volume of the reading required for people reviewing the documents was voiced.

vii. It was queried whether 'ethics committee' could be added to the list of examples in Questions 5.

viii. The Committee had agreed that comments made by the Committee should be fed back to the PVC for Research and Impact and the working group.

Postgraduate Research Committee

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

22. Update to Appendix 7 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy on Submission of a Research Degree Thesis for Examination

REPORTED:

i.   The PGR Committee had received a revised version of Appendix 7 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy on Submission of a Research Degree Thesis for Examination.

ii.   The amendments sought to clarify the requirement that PGR students should submit a declaration of academic honesty prior to examination.

iii.   The Committee had agreed that:

- references to 'academic integrity' in paragraph 3.2.g should be renamed 'academic honesty' to align with the proposed amendments;

- the suggested additional sentence in paragraph 4 was considered unnecessary and as such should be removed;

- the changes to Appendix 7 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy on Submission of a Research Degree Thesis for Examination should be approved, subject to the minor amendments detailed above.

23.   PGR Student Engagement – PGR Community

REPORTED:

i.   The Committee had received a paper highlighting plans for enhanced PGR engagement activity, including the proposal for a University-wide PGR showcase event.

ii.   The showcase would align with LDC's wider project aimed at enhancing the postgraduate research experience, increasing the satisfaction of UoL postgraduate researchers, and ultimately, improving the quality of the research they do. A paper had been submitted to the upcoming meeting of the Research and Impact Committee detailing such plans.

OTHER ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT

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

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

25.   Renewal of Joint PhD in Biomedical Sciences and Biotechnology, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

REPORTED:

i.   Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the recommendation of the PGR Committee that the joint PhD programme in Biomedical Sciences and Biotechnology between the University of Liverpool and Chulalongkorn University should be renewed.

AGREED:

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

26.   Partnership with Singapore Institute of Technology

REPORTED:

i.   Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the recommendation of the Institutional Review Panel and the Collaborative Provision Committee that the

University's partnership with the Singapore Institute of Technology (SIT) for the delivery of the UoL BA Criminology and Security at the Temasek Polytechnic campus should be continued for the duration of the renewed contract.

AGREED:

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

27.   Appointments to the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees

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 Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees, for the period to 31 July 2020:

　　　　Re-appointment
　　　　Professor Anthony Hollander
　　　　New appointments
　　　　Dr Georgina Turner
　　　　Dr Susanne Voelkel

AGREED:

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

28.   Appointment to the Board of Discipline

REPORTED:

i.   Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the appointment of Professor Diana Williams to serve vice Professor Helen O'Sullivan on the Board of Discipline, for the period to 31 July 2020.

AGREED:

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

29.   Revised Laureate Online Education Quality Assurance Operational Framework

REPORTED:

i.   Following the cancellation of the January 2018 Senate meeting, a report from the meeting of the Collaborative Provision Committee held on 12 December 2017 had been circulated.

ii.   The Committee had agreed to recommend that the revised Laureate Online Education (LOE) Quality Assurance Operational Framework should be approved.

iii.   The Framework, which details the principles by which the University assures itself of the quality and standards of the provision delivered in partnership with LOE, had been subject to an extensive rewrite and consultation. The original version, drafted in 2013, no longer accurately reflected current practices.

iv.   No comments or objections were received and, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the Framework.

AGREED:

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

30. Update of PGR Ordinances

REPORTED:

i. Following the cancellation of the January 2018 Senate meeting, a report from the meeting of the PGR Committee held on 18 December 2017 had been circulated.

ii. The Committee had agreed to recommend approval of proposed updates to the following Ordinances:

56A Degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil)
57A Degree of Doctor in Philosophy (PhD)
58A Degree of Doctor of Medicine (MD)

iii. The updates related to:

- the correction of a typographical error that appears in each of the Ordinances in relation to maximum available registration periods for students who transfer from PhD or MD to MPhil. Currently, students transferring to an MPhil from another PGR programme are given a longer maximum registration period in comparison with individuals who register for an MPhil from the outset; and
- the addition of a sentence to each of the Ordinances to confirm that any books or published papers submitted as part of the student's research degree thesis should have been written during the student's period of registration.

iv. No comments or objections were received and, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend to Council that the revised Ordinances should be approved.

v. The President of the Council, acting on the Council's behalf, had approved the above recommendation.

AGREED:

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

31. Appendix A to the Student Complaints Policy and Procedures – Procedure for Student Complaints in the Event of Major Disruption

REPORTED:

i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend approval of amendments to Appendix A to the Student Complaints Policy and Procedures – Procedure for Student Complaints in the Event of Major Disruption.

ii. The Industrial Action Planning Group had been made aware of a number of student concerns relating to their academic experience which may be impacted by the industrial action. As a result, the Group had identified a need for an expedited Student Complaints Procedure for complaints. The intention was to focus on the actions which would mitigate the impact of the disruption and remove some of the administration from the process so that staff could focus on getting things right for the students rather than on the administration of complaints. The procedure also set out some practical steps which Heads of Department should take to resolve complaints which would ensure a consistent approach across the University.

iii.   The President of the Council, acting on the Council's behalf, had approved the above recommendation.

NOTED:

iv.   The Deputy President of the Liverpool Guild of Students expressed concerns regarding the revised Appendix and proposed further revisions to make it more robust. However, not having agreed procedures in place during a period of industrial action was thought to be problematic as it would create uncertainty.

AGREED:

v.   The Deputy President should forward his concerns about the Appendix to the Secretary of the Senate, who would forward them to the relevant colleagues for consideration and further action, where appropriate.

OTHER ITEMS FOR REPORT

32.   Annual Complaints Monitoring Report for the Academic Session 2016-17

RECEIVED:

i.   The annual summary report on student complaints.

REPORTED:

ii.   It was a requirement that an annual summary report on complaints considered under Stages 1 and 2 is made to the Senate and the Council.

iii.   24 Stage 1 complaints had been received during the reporting period. The complaints received covered a wide range of topics and some complaints covered more than one issue but they had broadly been categorised into the following areas: academic matters; discrimination and human rights matters; service issues; and financial matters.

iv.   19 Stage 2 complaints had been received during the reporting period. The complaints related to various matters including: dissertation supervision; the PGR examination process; the handling of a case under the Assessment Appeals Procedure; alleged bullying and homophobia; a School's handling of concerns about a student's level of professionalism; an additional fee; poor communications; teaching and support for a module run in Session 2015/16; sexual and other harassment and discrimination; feedback on a module grade; handling of a Stage 1 complaint; maintenance and disrepair issues in University residential accommodation; administration and disability provision within a School; misleading information regarding requirements for a coursework assignment; advice, marks and feedback for assignments on a module; and designation of a student's mode of study as part-time. Of these, five were upheld, two were partially upheld, eleven were not upheld and one was referred to be handled as a disciplinary matter.

v.   The OIA had completed its consideration of 14 cases during the reporting period. Ten of these had been deemed to be not justified, one was not considered as it was out of time and one case was not considered by the OIA and the matter was rectified to the student's satisfaction outside of formal procedures. One issue was not considered by the OIA as the student had not completed the University's complaints procedure. The student subsequently submitted a Stage 2 complaint but it was considered more appropriate to refer the matter to Extenuating Circumstances procedures. One case was taken back to the University and settled: the Chair of the Faculty Progress Committee took Chair's action to uphold a progress appeal without a further hearing and the student was reinstated on their programme of studies.

vi.   As none of the cases closed by the OIA during 2016-17 had been considered justified, this suggested that the University's procedures had been followed correctly in considering student cases and that those procedures and the decisions taken were adjudged by the OIA to be fair and reasonable.

33.   Academic Compliance Report for the Academic Session 2016-17

RECEIVED and **NOTED**:

i.   The annual anonymised summary of the cases brought before the Assessment Appeals Committee, the Research Degree Appeals Board, the Board of Discipline and the Board of Appeal, the Fitness to Practise Panel and the Senate Committee on the Progress of Students during the 2016-17 academic session.

34.   Date of Next Meeting

NOTED:

i.   The next meeting of the Senate would be held at 2pm on Wednesday 20 June 2018 in the Brett Building.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL   SENATE (1011)

MEETING OF THE SENATE

21 MARCH 2018

Part II: Reserved Business

35.   Reserved Minutes of the Previous Meeting

AGREED:

i.   The reserved minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 1 November 2017 should be approved as an accurate record.

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

36.   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 Education[1].

AGREED:

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

37.   Action Not Withstanding the Code of Practice on External Examiners

RECEIVED:

i.   Via the Senate members' intranet, a report on actions notwithstanding the Code of Practice in respect of external examiners, which had been approved by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education[2].

AGREED:

ii.   The action taken in respect of the external examiners listed should be endorsed.

38.   Report on the Appointment of Academic Staff

RECEIVED:

i.   Via the Senate members' intranet, a report on the appointment of academic staff[3].

Appendices

[1]   Report on actions notwithstanding Ordinances and Regulations in relation to students' individual academic arrangements
[2]   Report on actions notwithstanding the Code of Practice in respect to the appointment of external examiners
[3]   Report on the appointment of academic staff