

MEETING OF THE SENATE

31 October 2018

Present: The Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Brown and Professor Hollander, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Beveridge, Professor Kenny and Professor van der Hoek, Dr S Albadri, Dr Z Alker, Professors Atkinson and Balogun, Dr K Bennett, Dr N Berry, Professors Bowcock, Caddick and Clegg, Dr E Drywood, Professor Elsheikh, Dr R Ferrero, Professors Foxhall, Gibson and Harris, Dr D Health, Professors Jones, Mair, MacEwan and Marshall, Dr E Michalopoulou, Dr S Parameswaran, Professors Scott, Sheffield and Simpson, Dr M Speed, Professor Spelman-Miller, Dr L Swan, Professor Tackley, Dr S Timme, Dr S Tufi, Professors Vieira De Mello, Voelkel and Youngson.

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 Strategic Planning and Governance and the Governance Officer.

Apologies for absence were received from 23 members of the Senate.

1. Committee and Membership Matters

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

i. Staff members

Dr Sondos Albadri, Dr Zoe Alker, Professor Peter Buse, Professor Ping Dong, Dr Eleanor Drywood, Dr Roberto Ferrero, Dr Deana Heath, Professor Charles Leek, Dr Eleni Michalopoulou, Dr Susha Parameswaran, Professor Sally Sheard, Dr Sebastian Timme, Mrs Jenny Tucker and Professor Luciane Vieira De Mello.

ii. Student members

Ms Esther Bukoye (Vice-President), Ms Shubhi Gupta (Health and Life Sciences), Mr Manoka Mbolokele (Humanities and Social Sciences) and Miss Hannah Nguyen (Deputy President).

1.2 Membership of Senate 2018-19

RECEIVED:

- i. A paper detailing the current membership of Senate.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND to Council:

- ii. Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellors should be added to the membership of Senate and the membership of Senate should be reviewed during the course of the academic year.

1.3 Roles and Responsibilities in Relation to Diversity and Equality

RECEIVED:

- i. A paper detailing the expectations of governance and management committees, as well as guidance on how to complete report templates.

NOTED:

- ii. The statement was presented at the first meeting of all committees, groups and boards each academic cycle to highlight the University's commitment to promoting equality in order to comply with the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty. It also provided members with further guidance on how to populate the diversity and equality question on the report template.

1.4 Statement of Policy and Procedure on Disclosure of Interest

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. The University policy and practice in relation to disclosure of interest circulated annually to committees, boards and groups.

1.5 Disclosures of Interest

- i. 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 20 June 2018

AGREED:

- i. The unreserved minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2018 should be approved as an accurate record.

3.2 Matters Arising on the Unreserved Minutes

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. An explanation regarding the use of pronouns in Curriculum 2021 from the Centre for Innovation in Education (minute 9xx refers).

4. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*

RECEIVED:

- i. Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

REPORTED:

- ii. Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

5. Review of Post-18 Funding and Education

RECEIVED:

- i. An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor on the Review of Post-18 Funding and Education, chaired by Phillip Augar.

REPORTED:

- ii. HEIs were currently awaiting results of the Review of Post-18 Funding and Education, which were expected in January 2019. The Office for National Statistics would influence the outcome of the review with their report on the management of university student finances in England.
- iii. The Director of Finance was currently developing a roadshow for staff and students who had concerns about finance and fee issues.

6. European Union (EU) Issues

RECEIVED:

- i. An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor on EU issues.

REPORTED:

- ii. The Vice-Chancellor had visited Brussels and had met with UK representatives, members of the Romanian Commission and the Erasmus+ office. Discussions had been positive and individuals had expressed a desire to continue to work with UK colleagues. However, the 27 nations that would continue to be part of the European Union were being prioritised.
- iii. The Vice-Chancellor had been involved and would continue to be involved in bilateral discussions with colleagues in Europe. The matter was being kept high on the agenda by the Vice-Chancellor and other organisations such as the Russell Group.

7. Migration Advisory Committee (MAC)

RECEIVED:

- i. An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor on the Migration Advisory Committee (MAC).

REPORTED:

- ii. The MAC report had been a huge disappointment in the sector. More positive recommendations had been hoped for regarding the value of International students to the UK in terms of their benefit to the economy and to communities.
- iii. Universities UK had offered to assist small and medium enterprises with visa applications, which had been welcomed by Mr Sam Gyimah, Minister of State (Universities and Science).

8. Honours and Appointments

RECEIVED:

- i. An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor on honours and appointments.

REPORTED:

- ii. The Academy of Medical Sciences had won the Royal Society Athena Prize for a scheme to increase the number of women experts in the media with the help of Professor of Cellular and Molecular Physiology, Susan Wray.
- iii. Professor Cheng-Hock Toh, Institute of Infection and Global Health, had been elected the new academic vice president of the Royal College of Physicians.
- iv. Professor Claire Taylor, Gilmour Chair of Spanish in the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures, had been appointed to the Global Challenges Research Fund Strategic Advisory Group.
- v. Dr Ross White, Associate Professor of Clinical Psychology in the Department of Psychological Sciences, had received a Best International Research Award for his work exploring cross-cultural perspectives on mental health and wellbeing. Dr White was among five winners of these first ever Health Humanities Medal awards, which were awarded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council in association with the Wellcome Trust.
- vi. Liverpool University Press Managing Director, Anthony Cond, would become the first non-North American board member of the Association of University Presses, formerly the Association of American University Presses.
- vii. Professor of Ophthalmic Bioengineering, Rachel Williams, had been elected to the prestigious Fellowship of the Royal Academy of Engineering.
- viii. Professor Soraya Shirazi-Beechey, from the Institute of Integrative Biology, had been presented with the American Society of Animal Science President's Award for International Achievements in Animal Science.
- ix. Professor Chris Sutcliffe had been awarded the Royal Academy of Engineering's prestigious Silver Medal for the development of 3D printed metal implants.

STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

9. Gender Pay Gap

RECEIVED:

- i. The Statutory Gender Pay Gap Report 2018.

REPORTED:

- ii. The University had made commitments to values and ethics in Strategy 2026 and had developed the Equality Framework, 2016-26, which set out objectives and an action plan in relation to equality and diversity.
- iii. It was proposed that a Green Paper focusing on various issues relating to equality and diversity should be brought to Senate for consideration in January 2019, followed by a White Paper to Senate in March 2019. One element of the equality and diversity paper that would be discussed today was pay gaps. The final White Paper would include a set of resolutions and actions that the University could take forward over the next three to five years, including how the University should respond to anti-Semitism occurring in the sector.
- iv. In March 2017, the University had published details of its gender pay gap for the first time in response to a Government request that all large organisations should provide this data. That report was a snapshot of March 2017 data while the report now under consideration related to March 2018 snapshot data.
- v. Individuals' hourly rates had been compared and only staff receiving 100% of their pay entitlement in that month without any deductions (e.g. for sick pay) had been included. This had included 7198 staff (up from 6817 in 2017), of whom 4015 (55.8%) were female and 3182 (44.2%) were male. The mean hourly pay gap and the median hourly pay gap had been calculated at 23.1% and 19% respectively. Bonus pay had also been calculated. The mean and median pay gaps of the University were above the national average.
- vi. Following the March 2017 analysis, a pay gap action plan had been developed, which would now be updated. Significant activity continued to be implemented via Athena SWAN initiatives (*detail redacted due to commercial interest*)
- vii. New online training modules had been launched (e.g. Harassment in the Workplace), which were available to all members of staff. Further, The Academy was offering training in leadership for minority groups. The University was planning to register for the Race Equality Charter Mark in 2019 and considerable preparation of data would be required to be awarded the Mark.
- viii. The University had a low rate of disability disclosure and a project was underway to improve processes relating to accessibility and reasonable adjustment. In addition, a working group had been established to look at addressing skills gaps and promoting awareness to improve the experience of disabled staff and students.

NOTED:

- ix. The Green Paper would highlight what the University already did in terms of equality and diversity (e.g. flexible working policy) and ascertain if practice and policy met staff/student needs and if there were gaps. Teaching outside of standard hours was an issue that would be looked at.
- x. More could be done to mentor academic staff in the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences to ensure they put themselves forward for awards. A task force would be established in January 2019 that would look at developing an award framework that could potentially be used nationally.
- xi. Expertise on data from academic staff would be welcomed by HR for data related projects such as the pay gap work.

- xii. The same information provided in the confirmation of appointment relating to equality and diversity was not included in promotion related documents.
- xiii. Declaration of mental health issues/disability, helping staff with mental health issues and what constituted a 'disability-friendly' organisation would be considered. Best practice in departments and other HEIs would be investigated in the development of the Green Paper.
- xiv. The career structure of post docs would be reviewed as part of the Cradle to Chair project. An N8 Post Doc Network was currently being developed that would investigate standardising the Post Doc role.
- xv. The Office for Students (OfS) was focusing on individual student groups and improved data was therefore being made available on individual groups such as BAME. The Directorate of Strategic Planning and Governance was leading cohort tracking work from pre-entry to post-graduation, which would be essential for meeting OfS requirements.
- xvi. The Liverpool Guild of Students was prioritising disability, working with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education.
- xvii. It would be important to also consider de-colonising curriculum-level content. The global citizenship element of Curriculum 2021 was particularly relevant to this.

AGREED:

- xviii. Senate should support the equality and diversity project and receive the Green Paper at its January 2019 meeting.
- xix. Senate members should forward further comments on the project to Professor Beveridge.

10. Annual Quality Report

[Ms Trish Barker, Head of Academic Quality and Standards, attended for this item.]

RECEIVED:

- i. A report of the outputs of quality assurance processes and the continuing quality and standards of provision across the University and its collaborative partners in the UK and overseas, together with a presentation by the Head of Academic Quality and Standards.

REPORTED:

- ii. The annual report had been a HEFCE requirement and would continue to be a requirement of the OfS. Council was required to sign off both the report and confirm that there was continuous improvement activity in the form of action planning against academic quality requirements.
- iii. OfS also required confirmation that a continuous process of periodic review was in place that involved students and external panel members.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND to Council:

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

11. Strategic Risk

RECEIVED:

- i. A presentation from the Director of Strategic Planning and Governance on changes to the risk framework and the revised strategic risks for the institution.

REPORTED:

- ii. The aim of the new risk framework was to consider risk as part of a more strategic discussion and to include opportunity. A workshop had been held on 29 October 2018 involving Council members and the Senior Executive Group where the top risks for the institution had been discussed.
- iii. The University was required to show that it was responding to risk on an ongoing basis and that processes were in place to scrutinise internal control procedures to show that the approach was improving over time.
- iv. Advice had been taken from PwC, the University's internal auditors, and from members of Council who had expertise in risk outside Higher Education.
- v. Council was responsible for approving strategic risk and setting risk appetite, which is overseen by the Strategic Planning and Governance directorate. However, every member of the University was responsible for managing risk.
- vi. The key elements of the framework were that it linked to Strategy 2026, it would prompt action that was proportionate to the risk, monitor external risk and be simple to use.
- vii. An example risk register was presented for an actual risk (the ability to grow research income) that included a description of the risk, the impact and likelihood of the risk and the actions and plans to mitigate it. Guidance on the impact and likelihood of risk would be provided.
- viii. Every six months the risk would be re-assessed and Key Risk Indicators (KRIs) would be applied. If a risk score was higher than an appetite, an action would be required to address it.
- ix. The appetite for risk would depend on the institutional position at the time and the external environment. (*Detail redacted due to commercial interest*)
- x. Departmental managers would also be expected to use a register to monitor local risks. The Strategic Planning and Governance directorate would support departments in using the risk framework.
- xi. The key risks to the University included: external risks (e.g. Brexit), strategic risks (e.g. student recruitment) and infrastructural risk (e.g. financial sustainability).
- xii. The next steps to the strategic risk work would be completion of the risk framework and approval of the framework through Council. Further stages would

include ensuring the framework was being used properly through audit, working to support departments, and reviewing risks every six months.

NOTED:

- xiii. The risk framework would not be used at an individual decision level such as investing. Judgements about risk would be made on the basis of evidence.
- xiv. The importance of continuously assessing, updating and managing risks was emphasised, and it was queried if resources were in place to enable that at every level. It was clarified that risk assessment and management would be required at University, Faculty and Institute/School level and that this work would feed into existing risk management structures and not create significant additional work.

BUSINESS FROM FACULTIES

12. Move of the Department of Psychological Sciences into the Institute of Life and Human Sciences

RECEIVED:

- i. A paper presenting the case for moving the Department of Psychological Sciences (DoPS) from the Institute of Psychology, Health and Society (IPHS) into the Institute of Life and Human Sciences (ILHS), thus co-locating it alongside the School of Psychology, under a single Dean.

REPORTED:

- ii. A forthcoming change of Level 2 leadership in the IPHS had the potential to negatively impact the management of departments in the Institute at a critical time. At the same time, it was recognised that closer integration of the teaching and research activity in Psychology would be beneficial in terms of building on recent improvements in student experience, effective performance management of staff, workload allocation, implementation and delivery of the new research-connected curriculum, and development of an integrated academic strategy to meet teaching and research objectives for Strategy 2026.
- iii. Impacts would be limited to a change of Level 2 affiliation (for staff in DoPS), a change in line management for one HoD, some minor re-organisation of PS staff and ultimately some merging of departmental committee structures where these were duplicated.
- iv. Appropriate consultation had been taken place with all affected staff and the Trade Unions had been informed of the proposals.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND to Council:

- v. The proposal to move the Department of Psychological Sciences into the Institute of Life and Human Sciences should be approved.

REPORTS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES

Education Committee

13. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Education Committee held on 10 October 2018.

14. Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership 2018/19

RECEIVED:

- i. Minor revisions to the Committee's terms of reference, constitution and membership for 2018/19, highlighted with track changes.

REPORTED:

- ii. Additional members for 2018/19 included a further representative from each Faculty, plus the Strategy Delivery Manager (Education).
- iii. Paragraph j had also been updated to remove direct reference to national surveys and had been replaced with 'core internal and external surveys'.
- iv. The Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors were members of the Committee but understandably did not often attend given the APVCEs were also members. In light of this, a discussion would be held to determine whether the EPVCs would wish to continue as members of the Committee.

AGREED:

- v. That the revised Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership for 2018/19 should be endorsed.

15. Education Action Plan

15.1 Centre for Innovation in Education Update and C2021 Implementation Plan

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received:
 - A paper providing an update on the Centre for Innovation in Education's (CIE) structure, its activities, progress to date on C2021 resources and an update to the CIE C2021 process implementation plan.
 - A copy of the Curriculum 2021 Programme Planning Self Evaluation Questionnaire (PSEQ) and Self-Assessment Rubric, designed to help programme teams engage in a three-stage process of alignment with Curriculum 2021 when developing or reviewing programme provision.
- ii. A draft process booklet which provided an overview of the process of working with CIE on the planning and design stages.
- iii. The work of CIE was structured around three key impact areas: influential, developmental and informational. This had been designed to ensure that CIE was supporting the University's overall Strategy.
- iv. To support the implementation of Curriculum 2021, 15 case studies from across Faculties and Professional Services had been completed to date, with more in development. These case studies were accessible from the CIE website and

clearly referenced which of the University hallmarks and attributes they were aligned to.

- v. The evolution of the PSEQ would be an ongoing process, and a focus would be to understand how it would routinely support programme enhancement and be used to support periodic reviews.
- vi. The role of the CIE was that of a 'partnership' rather than a 'service'.

15.2 Revised Timetabling Policy

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received and approved a revised version of the Timetabling Policy, which had been amended following consultation with the joint Trade Unions as they had highlighted wording that could cause potential confusion for staff. These revisions provided further clarification but did not change the principles of the Policy.

16. Institutional Survey Results 2018

16.1 Institutional Survey Results – NSS

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a presentation on the NSS results for 2018, including a comparison to a number of sector benchmark scores, as well as an analysis of split metrics.
- ii. The University had reached the external publication threshold at institutional level and for 25/48 subject areas in the 2018 NSS. At institutional level, overall satisfaction had increased by 1% to 84.99%, leaving the University ranked 7th in the Russell Group.
- iii. The overall satisfaction score for the sector as a whole had decreased for the second consecutive year.
- iv. An analysis of the University scores for each of the sections used in the TEF (*Teaching on My Course, Assessment and Feedback and Academic Support*), had confirmed that the gap between the University and comparator groups had reduced, with the University now just slightly below the sector and HEI mean scores for the TEF measures.
- v. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- vi. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- vii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- viii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*

16.2 Libraries, Museums and Galleries and the NSS 2018

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a paper analysing the current position of the Library in relation to the NSS 2018, as well as proposals for further improvement.
- ii. The Library had improved its score in this year's NSS by 3% to 90%, placing the University sixth in the Russell Group.
- iii. A number of enhancements were believed to have contributed to this improvement, including additional study spaces, enhanced customer services at the Library entrances, better provision of core reading books and the growth of the KnowHow service.
- iv. Additional activities identified to further enhance the Library's service for future years included the creation of additional study spaces at the Harold Cohen Library, a reorganisation of the layout of the Sydney Jones Library, as well as improved marketing of services.
- v. An analysis of the NSS data had revealed lower than average satisfaction rates for mature students and students with (non-learning) disabilities. Further investigation would be undertaken to understand how the experience of these two cohorts could be improved.
- vi. Computers in the Libraries were currently used four times as much as computers across the rest of campus, even though far more computers existed outside the Library than in it. The Committee had agreed that further analysis should be undertaken to determine the reasons why use of computers outside the Library was so low.

16.3 Computing Services Department – Student Satisfaction Surveys NSS 2018

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a paper providing a summary analysis of the NSS 2018 outcomes related to the availability of technology, as well as plans for improvement.
- ii. For question 18, 'The IT resources and facilities have supported my learning well', the University had scored an overall satisfaction rating of 87.7%, a 3.8% improvement on 2017, ranking the institution 4th against the Russell Group and 3rd against North-West sector peers.
- iii. When analysing free text comments, 50 positive comments had been received predominately relating to stream capture and Vital. In contrast, 35 negative comments had been received, with the main themes being availability of computers and printers.
- iv. Mature students were 4% less satisfied than younger students. Consideration would be given to whether it would be appropriate to carry out further analysis to

identify whether additional training could be of benefit to improve levels of capability and enhance satisfaction levels.

- v. Significant efforts had been made to improve the service offering to students with disabilities and this had made a positive impact on satisfaction levels.
- vi. A number of potential enhancements had been identified and CSD would work closely with colleagues across the University and the Liverpool Guild of Students to implement these.

17. Planning and Performance

17.1 Degree Classification Report

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a report analysing degree classifications of students.
- ii. The data related to the degree classifications of students across a three year period, split across specific cohorts relating to protected characteristics and other factors that may impact on overall degree classification. It did not include Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Education students as these students obtained awards outside of the specified classifications.
- iii. In 2018, 80.8% of students included in the data had been awarded a 1st or 2:1, the highest level for the three year data period. Gaps between split metrics remained but were closing.

18. Policy on Lecture Capture

18.1 Minor Revision to Policy on Lecture Capture

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received and approved a minor amendment to the Policy on Lecture Capture to clarify support for use of lecture capture for students with disabilities which may impact their ability to attend lectures. Section 3.2 of the Policy would be amended as follows:

Lecture capture is intended to supplement, rather than replace, student attendance at lectures. (However, where a student may be unable to attend due to a disability and where lecture recording has been identified as part of their reasonable adjustment plan an opportunity to record the lecture should still be provided.)

18.2 Lecture Capture Exemptions by Faculty

REPORTED:

- i. At the meeting of Senate held in June 2018 it had been agreed that the APVCEs should present their Faculties' lecture capture exemptions to the Education Committee in advance of each Semester (since students needed to be informed of exemptions before they started the module).

- ii. The lecture capture exemptions had not been received in time for the meeting of the Education Committee and so would be circulated to members, via email, once received.
- iii. The Chair would write to those areas who had yet to provide the required data.

19. Proposed Changes to the Education Committee and Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC) in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received and approved a proposal to merge the responsibilities and functions of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences AQSC into the Faculty's Education Committee's terms of reference, and rename the Committee Faculty Education, Enhancement and Assurance Committee.
- ii. The Academic Quality and Standards Committee had also approved this proposal, as confirmed in its report to Senate which was itemised separately on the agenda, subject to:
 - inclusion of a representative from the Careers and Employability Service in the membership; and
 - inclusion of a clause in the terms of reference relating to the receipt of periodic review reports and progress reports on periodic review action plans.

Research and Impact Committee

20. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Research and Impact Committee held on 11 October 2018.

21. Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership

RECEIVED:

- i. Revised Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership for 2018/19 for the Research and Impact Committee.

REPORTED:

- ii. It was recommended that a PGR student and Post Doc representative should join the Committee in accordance with recommendations of the Vitae Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers.

AGREED:

- iii. That the revised Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership for 2018/19 should be endorsed.

22. Cradle to Chair

REPORTED:

- i. The Cradle to Chair project aimed to affect a step change in the quality of the research environment across the University. One of the benefits would include higher quality institutional environment statements for REF. The project concerned developing individuals to their potential. Dr J Howard, Director of The Academy, was now a member of the Committee, who oversaw researcher training for the University.
- ii. It was acknowledged that the University had strengths in mentoring academic staff, but more thought needed to be given to how to encourage undergraduate students into research.
- iii. The PVC for Research and Impact was in discussion with Deans regarding setting up a pilot for a buddying scheme, which would see undergraduates working with PGR students and Post Docs who would provide mentoring to the undergraduate. It would be a reflective process and The Academy would provide training for the mentor role.
- iv. The primary incentive for PGR students was that the scheme would provide a developmental opportunity, but there were concerns about students being able to balance their work. It was thought that providing remuneration for the scheme would not be of benefit.
- v. It would probably not be possible to provide a one-size-fits-all experience, and Schools should be allowed to adapt their approach. Interdisciplinary mentoring to allow students to see how different Schools operated was suggested. It was acknowledged that more needed to be done to help PGR students to be more employable.
- vi. The buddying scheme should make it clear to participants what to expect (e.g. the number of meetings included and what the meetings should cover). Completion of the scheme could be recorded in a similar way to the Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) that undergraduates completed.
- vii. There was considerable work being undertaken on the Post Doc career pathway, and it would be investigated why many individuals went through several post doc positions and then left academia and what could be done beyond the training currently offered.
- viii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- ix. A visit had taken place by the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, which had involved the University showcasing its international research, Global Challenges Research Fund projects, the Virtual Engineering Centre and working with the city region.
- x. An event on Industrial Partnerships was being hosted with PZ Cussons, with a particular focus on science and engineering.

23. Unit of Assessment Configuration

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received a paper proposing a configuration for REF 2021, building on modelling work to date and providing further clarity for future planning and preparation.
- ii. Four years of Reading Programme data had been used until the end of 2017 (*detail redacted due to commercial interest*) together with data on the number of impact case studies in development along with who was involved. These figures had been pulled together to create a Unit of Assessment (UoA) configuration, working with the Faculties.
- iii. There were 34 UoA in REF2021 (*detail redacted due to commercial interest*). The best return and fit had been the primary consideration in formation of the UoA for the University.
- iv. The structure would continue to be assessed and refined and data for the 2018 Reading Programme would be taken into consideration, which would be completed in March 2019 and reported in June 2019.
- v. The modelling for configuration of REF2021 would continue and timescales confirmed.
- vi. Environment Statements would be assessed at UoA level and institutional level. The Institutional Environment Statement would be a foreword to the UoA Statements and would not be assessed. There was currently limited guidance on the Environment Statements for REF2021, but reference to REF2014 guidance should be avoided.
- vii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- viii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- ix. It was queried how the mock REF would operate alongside the Reading Programme and the UoAs. A UoA committee would be established, which would comprise a representative for each UoA, chaired by the PVC for Research and Impact, which would oversee the mock REF.
- x. One issue concerned which papers would be assigned to whom if the research was interdisciplinary across more than one School. A process of re-reading would be important to ensure that assessment across UoA was consistent.
- xi. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

Postgraduate Research Committee

24. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the PGR Committee held on 1 October 2018.

25. Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership

RECEIVED:

- i. Revised Terms of Reference for the Committee.

REPORTED:

- ii. With regard to section d), The Academy had taken over the management of supervisor training. However, the Committee should make recommendations concerning supervision to The Academy.
- iii. It should be clarified what was meant by the 'oversight and monitoring of the University's strategies and plans' (section a) of the Terms of Reference).
- iv. The Director of The Academy should nominate a representative from The Academy to join the Committee.

AGREED:

- v. That the revised Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership for 2018/19 should be approved.

26. Management of Sponsor Relationships for International PGR Students

REPORTED:

- i. The Postgraduate Research Committee had received a presentation on working with sponsors.
- ii. The Relations Team managed feedback to sponsors and worked with Fees, LDC, SAS, Student Experience leads and academics to provide information on students to sponsors. The Recruitment Team dealt with new business development opportunities and the signing of MoUs, negotiating discounts and meeting sponsors. The International Enrolment and Sponsor Relations Officer managed communication regarding sponsors.
- iii. The University was required to provide progress reports and regular copies of transcripts to the sponsor and alert the sponsor regarding non-attendance, failures, repeat of year, misconduct, suspension/withdrawals and other issues.
- iv. There was an opportunity to increase the number of sponsored students due to a huge demand for PGR programmes. However, many sponsors did not understand the unique nature of the UK doctoral degree.
- v. The increase in oil prices meant that some sponsors had potentially more funding to spend on sponsorships. Sponsors frequently sought discount for bringing in students to the University.
- vi. There were significant pressures on academic staff members who were posed with difficult ethical problems. Ensuring that the terms of the sponsorship were clear and understood by the University at the beginning of the process (i.e. at induction) would be essential. There was a need to better understand the various issues that could occur.
- vii. A potential PhD pathway for sponsored students had not been explored fully. Other HEIs could be managing the recruitment of sponsored students more effectively. However, before increasing the number of doctoral students, it should be ascertained if the University could accommodate them.

27. Examiner Disagreement and Major Modifications

RECEIVED:

- i. An oral report from the LDC Manager.

REPORTED:

- ii. A process for dealing with instances of examiner disagreement had been mapped and a proposal would be brought to the March 2019 meeting.
- iii. An option to allow an examiner recommendation of major modifications would be mapped and brought to a future meeting of the Committee.

28. Stakeholder Group

NOTED:

- i. A stakeholder group would be established to consider issues outside the PGR Committee meetings.

University Approval Panel

29. An update to the final summary report on the University Approval Panel (UAP), 2017/18, and revised Terms of Reference for the panel.

30. Terms of Reference 2018/19

RECEIVED:

- i. Revised Terms of Reference for the University Approval Panel for 2018/19.

REPORTED:

- ii. The proposed changes to the terms of reference were as follows:
 - to increase the number of academic staff per University Approval Panel from two to three;
 - to decrease the number of professional services representatives per Panel from one from each of the Faculties to one from any Faculty;
 - to have a representative on each Panel from both the Centre from Innovation (CIE) in Education and The Academy rather than either CIE or The Academy.

AGREED:

- iii. That the revised Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership for 2018/19 should be approved.

31. Final Summary Report from the University Approval Panel 201718

RECEIVED:

- i. The final Summary Report from the University Approval Panel 2017/18

REPORTED:

- ii. University Approval Panel activity in 2017/18 had been reported to Senate at its June meeting. That report had noted the need for an additional Panel meeting to be scheduled at the request of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education to deal with three urgent cases.
- iii. An extraordinary meeting had been held in July at which The Academy's proposed revalidation of Postgraduate Certificate Learning and Teaching in Higher Education had been approved (subject to conditions) and the programme renamed Postgraduate Certificate Academic Practice.
- iv. A second extraordinary meeting, postponed from July to 7th September, to consider the resubmission of programme modification proposals from XJTLU for BA Digital Media Arts and BA Film and Television Production that had not been approved at an earlier UAP, had been cancelled. The proposals were to be resubmitted to an April 2019 meeting of UAP.

Research Governance Committee

32. Annual report for the Research Governance Committee, 2017/18.

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. The Annual Report of the Research Governance Committee for the academic year 2016/17, together with subsequent developments up to the date of writing, in June 2018. The report described the work of the Committee to uphold and develop the robustness of the University's research governance framework and provided updates on the following: the Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body; the Joint Research Office Sponsorship Committee; the Joint Research Office Oversight Committee; the Committee on Research Ethics; Human Material Oversight Committee; the Joint Research Office Oversight Committee; Annual Statement on Research Integrity; Regulatory changes in research integrity; allegations of misconduct in research

OTHER ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT

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

33. The Senate received a report outlining action which had been taken on its behalf by the Vice-Chancellor.
34. **Chair of the Senate Committee on the Progress of Students**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the appointment of Professor Jill Rudd as Chair of the Senate Committee on the

Progress of Students for the period until 31 July 2021, to replace Professor Anu Arora.

AGREED:

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

35. Chair of Research Governance Committee (RGC)

REPORTED:

- i. The current Chair of the RGC, Professor Sarah O'Brien, was on research leave and so Professor Malcolm Jackson was acting as Chair and Named Person of the RGC. (*Detail redacted due to personal information*), acting on behalf of the Senate the Vice-Chancellor had approved the appointment of a separate person, Professor Liz Perkins, to oversee investigations to avoid delays. The Vice-Chancellor had agreed that Professor Perkins would be a suitable candidate as she had substantial experience and knowledge of governance and ethics. Professor Jackson would retain the role of Chair of the RGC and act as Named Person if Professor Perkins had a conflict of interest or was unavailable.

AGREED:

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

36. Pool of Fitness to Practise Members

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the Fitness to Practise pool of members for 2018/19.

AGREED:

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

37. Collaborative Partnerships

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved collaborative partnerships with International Medical University (IMU), Malaysia and HELP University, Malaysia

AGREED:

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

38. Standing Committee for Personal Chairs and Readerships

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the appointment of the following individuals to serve on the Standing Committees on Personal Chairs and Readerships, for the period until 31 July 2021:

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Professor Rob Kronenburg
Professor Julia Balogun (alternate)

Faculty of Science and Engineering

Professor Douglas Mair

AGREED:

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