University of
Reading

Senate

22/19   A meeting of the Senate was held in G07 Chancellor's on Thursday 23 June 2022 at 2.15 pm.

Present:

The Vice-Chancellor (Chair)

Dr Tabarak Ballal   Professor David Stack
Professor Adrian Bell   Professor Katja Strohfeldt
Professor Kat Bicknell   Dr Hong Wei
Professor Ingo Bojak   Dr Karin Whiteside
Dr Simon Clarke   Professor Adrian Williams
Professor Phil Dash   Dr Hong Yang
Ilan Dwek   Professor Dominik Zaum
Professor Mark Fellowes
Dr David Field
Professor Richard Frazier   **Students**:
Professor Becky Green   Bethany Nugus, RUSU Education Officer
Dr Chris Jones   Ben Knowles, RUSU President
Professor Rodney Jones   Amy Sheffield, RUSU Activities Officer
Dr Marrisa Joseph   Grace Loweth, RUSU Welfare Officer
Professor Daniela La Penna   Oscar Minto
Dr Tim Lees   Poppy Lidsey
Professor Elizabeth McCrum   Jem McKenzie
Dr John McKendrick   Harry Everitt
Dr David Marshall   Sheldon Allen
Dr Mary Morrissey
Professor Simon Mortimer
Professor Keiichi Nakata   **In attendance**:
Professor Adrian Palmer   Louise Sharman (Secretary)
Professor Helen Parish   Dr Richard Messer
Dr Karen Poulter   Tony Oliver (interpreter)
Professor Amy Smith   Sally Pellow

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the new RUSU Officers to their first meeting of the Senate and recorded his thanks to the departing RUSU Officers and wished them well in the future.

The Vice-Chancellor outlined the format of the meeting to Senators encouraging them to raise any additional items for discussion under the Vice-Chancellor's report.

The Vice-Chancellor paid tribute to the following who had died since the last meeting of the Senate:

Dr James (Jim) Adams – Jim joined the University in 1995 as a Professor of Latin and Head of Department, before being elected as a Senior Research Fellow at All Souls College, Oxford from

1998-2010.

Emeritus Professor Gordon Birch – Gordon joined the University in 1982 as a Professor of Food Chemistry and retired in 1999.

Dr Ian Richardson – Ian undertook his undergraduate degree and PhD at Reading and officially retired in 1986.

Angela Crum-Ewing – Angela joined the University in 1965 as a part-time secretary in the Italian department, during her career she progressed through senior roles to Deputy Registrar in 1992, she retired in 1995.

Professor Sir David Cox – honorary degree recipient in 1982.

Dr David Lee – David joined the Department of French in 1971 and worked at the University until 2000.

Professor Percy Allum – Percy joined the University in 1966 and worked in the Politics Department up to his retirement in 1996.

22/20   The Minutes (22/3 – 22/18) of the meeting held on 3 March 2022 were approved.

Items for presentation and discussion

22/21   Presentation on the REF Results 2021 (item 4)

The Senate received a presentation from Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Zaum on the REF Results 2021.

In particular the Senate noted:

- That it was not yet known what the impact of the results would be on research funding; further information was expected from Research England.
- REF 2021 assessed submissions – 60% outputs, 25% impact, and 15% environment, from U to 4*
- Key changes implemented for REF 2021 were:
  - A requirement for institutions to return all Category A staff with significant responsibility for research which lead to a significant increase in overall submission size (+68%)
  - Return of an outputs portfolio for the unit – of a size equal to 2.5x Unit FTE; with a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 5 outputs attributed to a single member of staff
  - Ability to return outputs of staff who had left the institution by the census date
  - This limited comparability of data between 2014 and 2021
- Key changes to the REF 2021 submission were:
  - No submission to Geography UoA, but staff were submitted to International Development instead

- - No submission to Engineering, but staff were submitted to Computer Science instead
    - Biomedical staff were submitted to UoA 5 (Biological Sciences) in 2014, but to UoA 3 (Subjects Allied to Medicine) in 2021
    - UoA 5 submission in 2021 now only comprised the Ecology and Evolutionary Biology research division
    - Linguistics (both DELAL and PCLS) were submitted to Education in 2014, but to Modern Languages in 2021
- In terms of numbers:
    - 2021 FTE 699.75, 2014 FTE 590
    - Submissions 2021 - 23 (22), 2014 - 23 (21)
    - Outputs 2021 - 1662, 2014 - 2330
    - Impact case studies 2021 - 72, 2014 -82
    - PhD completions 2021 - 1918, 2014 -1091
    - Research income total 2021 - 263,097,814, 2014 - 177,627,379
- The overall Reading REF Profile showed an increase in 4* research from 2014 and a decline in 1* research
- The University was ranked 47th by GPA (2014: 48th), ranked 35th by research power (2014: 27th). The decline reflected lower growth compared to sector average (19% compared to 68% sector average)
- The highlights overall included:
    - Archaeology (UoA 15): top ranked by GPA
    - Earth Sciences (UoA 7): ranked 9th by GPA, ranked 3rd by research power
    - Typography (UoA 32B) ranked 10th by GPA
    - Significant improvement in rankings of Allied Health (UoA 3) – 15 places; and Psychology (UoA 4) – 10 places and FTT (UoA 33) – 14 places
    - Business and Management (UoA 17) in top quartile for research power
    - Good performance of two new UoAs (Computer Science, Development Studies) – both in Q2, from Q4 in 2014.
- The highlights for the sub profiles were:
    - **Outputs**
      Top quartile for Allied Health (19th), Archaeology (1st), Politics (6th), Education (17th), English (6th), Typography (14th) and FTT (12th)
    - **Impact**
      Top quartile for: Psychology (13th), Earth systems (9th), Computer Sciences (13th), BE & architecture (9th), Development Studies (4th), Typography (8th)
    - **Environment**
      17/23 have 100% 4* + 3* environment
      Earth Sciences (1st), Archaeology (4th), Allied Health (19th), Typography (9th); and UoR as a whole
- Disappointments included:
    - **Bottom Quartile**
      Biological Sciences (UoA 5) – low impact GPA (1.75); relatively low environment score
      Agriculture/ Veterinary/Food (UoA 6) – 34% of impact 2*/1*; only 27% of outputs 4*
      Chemistry (UoA 8) – only 10% of outputs 4*, relatively low environment score
      Classics (UoA 31) – 23% of outputs at 2* ad 1*, in a v strong, small UoA

- o **Others**:

  Law (UoA 18) – over 30% of outputs at 2*, 40% of impact 2*

- Wider considerations:
  - o **Outputs:**

    Overall improvement in line with sector

    Some units retained significant "tail" of 2* and below – was this a question of selection or publication quality?
  - o **Impact:**

    Improvement below the sector

    Reasons for lower scores from confidential panel feedback: strength of evidence, maturity of case studies

    Question about sustainability of small units – where will future impact case studies come from?
  - o **Environment:**

    Improvement significantly above the sector

    Very positive – foundation for next REF, reflects improvements in key metrics (research income, PGRs) that would feed through, and wider cultural change (D&I, open research, researcher development)

- Size matters
  - o Small Units were disproportionately affected by changes to REF rules

    Requirement of minimum of 2 impact case studies, regardless of unit size

    Less choice on outputs, especially if affected by circumstances

    Greater challenge to demonstrate a vibrant and sustainable research environment, especially where significant infrastructure investments are required
  - o Positive relationship between unit size and REF outcome

- Going forward:
  - o **REF Review -** UoA level; Institution-level: fewer but larger UoAs?
  - o **Improving output quality and selection -** Improving ROSS; More extensive external review
  - o **Impact – scale and sustainability** - Impact strategy and funding; Impact Accelerators; Support for impact and KE
  - o **Research Culture and Environment** - Open Research; EDI; Leadership Development; Research Income and PGR numbers

- It was important to note that the University was already more than a quarter into the next REF period.

The following questions and comments were raised by the Senate:
- In looking at the 'tail' of outputs, in one particular School, it appeared that those colleagues who were stronger researchers co-authored and collaborated more. For those with higher teaching and administrative loads there was less co-authoring and collaboration. If teamwork were steered strategically then this could the 'tail' but this would need to be put in place now in terms of planning for the next REF.

  Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Zaum confirmed that the REF reviews would look to develop strategies at School/Department/Research Division levels.
- It was obvious that in many UoA universities had acted strategically in ensuring that all staff had at least one 3* paper.
- RI colleagues were possibly carried in other parts of their role by those colleagues undertaking teaching and administration. There needed to be a *quid pro quo* with RI staff

- carrying some workload.
- The slide on size matters showing the correlation between GPA and submission size did not acknowledge the complexities between being too large or a smaller specialist institution.
- The post REF reviews would need to look further at improving forecast mechanisms.
- Would there be an exercise to evaluate the impact on research by gender? There was a concern that the pandemic would have had a greater impact on colleagues in terms of research outputs; particularly given the increase in teaching workload. Something should be done to acknowledge the impact on research and to shift the onus to institutional accountability rather than onto the individual.
  Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Zaum confirmed that work on EDI matters would be addressed as part of the review; data on EDI was not yet fully available but there was no evidence that quality of research differed by gender, only on quantity.
- There were some concerns that there could be unintended consequences in using ROSS as a measure.
- Support would need to be given to smaller units so they could continue to submit to REF. It was suggested that consideration might be given to aggregating a number of smaller units/realigning research divisions. If any aggregation took place, it would be important to maintain disciplinary identity and not to undermine it.
  It was suggested that it would also be important to look at other universities who had small units to learn from them.

The Senate thanked Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Zaum for the report.

The Vice-Chancellor asked that when the review had been completed that a report be submitted back to the Senate with proposals for change and identifying any impact by discipline.

22/22   Updates on the Individual Expectations Framework (Item 5)

The Senate received an update on progress on the Individual Expectations Framework from Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Dominik Zaum who highlighted in particular:

- At its meeting in November 2020, Senate had discussed two proposals made by the Research Workstream of the then Phase 2 COVID recovery programme:
  o That the University set clear, externally benchmarked expectations with regard to the minimum requirement for Research and Teaching performance for units and individual staff.
  o That the University establish a University-wide workload model linked to performance management that enabled the University to achieve excellence in research and teaching.
  Senate had concurred with the recommendation that better management of workloads and expectations would be beneficial and provided valuable feedback to inform future work.

- In 2021 the University established the Strategic Foundations Programme and within it, the Expectations and Workloads Pathway. The Pathway focused on further developing these two proposals and explored how they could be implemented.

- As part of this work, an Individual Expectations Framework for academic staff had been developed, addressing the first proposal previously discussed by Senate. The proposed Framework was submitted for Senate's consideration. It was noted that the Framework should be read in the context of other work being undertaken within the Strategic Foundations Programme, notably the Portfolio Review and the Strategic Alignment Pathways.

- The Individual Expectations Framework was an institutional approach to setting individual expectations for academic staff in terms of quality and productivity. Recognising that academic excellence was a collective endeavour, the Framework aimed to support the setting of expectations that support people's academic ambitions and performance and those of their teams, Departments and Schools, fostering in this way a sense of collective responsibility. The Framework was aligned to the Excellence and Community elements of the University Strategy.

- The proposed approach was a nested framework that spanned from University level to individual level, and a set of principles that all expectation-setting should follow. This approach would enable every member of staff on an academic contract to have a clear agreement with their reviewer on what was expected of them in a defined multi-year period in terms of teaching, research and other activities (in terms of quality and productivity), for this to be done on an equitable basis, and to be supported appropriately (e.g. training, workload allocation, mentoring) to meet those expectations and plan for promotion. The guiding principles for setting individual expectations were:

  o Expectations and support should be visibly equitable across a given role within a discipline. With that transparency, any individual should be free to raise any perceptions of unfairness with their management. This assessment of equitability must take into account issues related to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI).

  o Expectations should increase from Probationary Lecturer to Lecturer to Associate Professor (AP) to Professor (P) (and subsequent professorial grades).

  o Recruitment and promotion criteria should be aligned to expectations across Research Intensive, Teaching Intensive & Teaching & Research roles.

  o Expectations and support should be set at a level that provides an opportunity to work towards or meet promotion criteria.

  o In a given 'unit' (School, Department, Team), the sum of the individual expectations of all academics in that unit must be sufficient to meet the unit's needs and objectives (e.g. Research Division research income targets, REF/TEF/KEF objectives).

  o There should be reasonable consistency (benchmarking) in expectations between similar types of discipline in different Schools.

  o Expectations should mostly be set over several-year time periods. Progress towards meeting these expectations should be discussed at least annually and more

frequently where this is required, and this reflection translated into support, training and career-development actions (through the future PDR process).

- o Review and discussion of progress towards meeting expectations should be informed by a basket of appropriate metrics and indicators. These will range from self-reflection and peer-review, through to various simple metrics, with an explicit awareness of the limitations of each of these.

- A set of generic expectations together with a basket of associated generic indicators to inform progress against meeting expectations had been developed. These would guide Schools/Departments in developing a range of typical expectations relevant to each role, grade and discipline, as well as setting appropriate ranges/baselines for linked indicators, incorporating them in revised contextual statements. Revised contextual statements would guide the setting of individually tailored expectations for staff.

- There were a range of challenges linked to operationalising the Framework. To address these pilots were being undertaken with two Schools (SMPCS and IoE). The pilots would help understand:

  - o Whether the proposed indicators were right and whether the data supported the implementation of the framework.

  - o Whether the process for setting expectations could be effectively and efficiently run and whether the process could be integrated into wider staff management practices

  - o Whether the process provided clarity of expectations to staff

  - o How the processes developed through the pilots could be scaled up, and what were the systems requirements to do this.

- It was intended to complete the pilots and evaluate their outcomes by December 2022 and develop detailed implementation schedule and necessary guidance during Spring and Summer 2023 with a view to begin implementation in 2023/24.

The Senate were asked to approve the Individual Expectations Framework.

The following comments and questions were raised by the Senate:

- There were a number of questions that could only be answered at School level.
- There would be a need for the framework to align with existing processes
- The principles behind the framework aimed to be transparent and fair around expectations.
- Under point 5 there was mention of 'the sum of the individual expectations of all academics in that unit' – what adjustments would be made in units were vacancies were being carried? How would personal circumstances be taken into account in adjusting expectations? It was reported that the framework was a set of principles not equations – it was expected that by setting expectations over a multi-year period that Heads of School could adjust expectations where there were personal circumstances or vacancies.
- The baskets of indicators were to help support colleagues over a multi-year period and to provide stronger evidence that could be used in discussions.

- The pilots would not be able to test the framework in the longer term, it would be impossible to wait 5 years to see the outcome before introducing it, so it was important for the Senate to take a review on whether it wished to approve the framework now so that further work could be taken forward along with work to inform other parts of the pathway.
- What would happen if colleagues did not meet the expectations, was there a plan?
  It was the intention to link the framework with work on the PDR process – support could then be provided to colleagues who were not meeting expectations
- The basket of indicators on research outputs included both qualitative and quantitative measures. Given that peer review as part of REF was quite arduous to do this for all outputs would be challenging. There were also concerns around using ROSS.
  It was noted that the two pilots would not used ROSS but a measure of productivity instead from CENTAUR with bibliometrics as a cautious proxy to start conversations but not as an indicator of quality.
  The pilots would use contextual information to inform discussions on quality.
- Work was in hand to review ROSS.
- Was linking the framework into PDR's a fudge for performance management? There were a number of indicators in the basket that would give tainted data. Would there be an appeal process if the framework were used for an appraisal of performance?
  The framework was around setting expectations, it was a set of principles to support colleagues. Setting expectations in a clear and transparent way was important especially for more junior colleagues. There was no intention that the framework would be punitive.
- EDI considerations would be taken into account as part of the pilot.
- HBS had been using a similar framework for a while and colleagues had found it useful in discussions.

The Vice-Chancellor noted that the results of the pilot would be brought back to the Senate at future meeting for further discussion, possibly in the Spring Term 2023.

The Senate were asked to vote on whether they were in favour of the framework. The vote cast was 26 in favour and 9 opposed. It was therefore agreed that the framework was approved.

22/23   <u>Review of Senate</u> (Item 6)
At its meeting in November 2021 the Senate had approved the establishment of a review of the effectiveness of Senate in 2021/22, undertaken by the Senate itself. An update on progress had been made to the last meeting of the Senate on 3 March 2022, and the draft review circulated for comment via the Senate team. The final report was now received.

In addition to the Review the Senate also received from the Senate representative on the Council (Professor Richard Frazier) the sub-group report on the Review of Council-Senate Effectiveness which would be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 4 July 2022

Professor Katrina Bicknell highlighted to the Senate that there were 37 main recommendations in the review, broadly these could be grouped into common themes. The review had covered:

- The impact of the previous review undertaken in 2016/17
- Comparison of the University's Senate against others in the sector
- Considerations around how Senate sat withing existing University structures

- Complexities around internal reporting lines
- The changing national regulatory context in specifically assigning responsibility for educational quality and standard to the governing body Council.
- The need for Senate to have earlier insight into items coming forward with time for consultation and debate, rather than time pressured decision-making.
- A clear separation between Senate's consultation and decision-making roles
- For Senators to be clear on their role as a member of the Senate
- Improved induction for Senators
- The need to ensure that all voices were heard in meetings
- The introduction of a pre-meet if required for the Senate to formulate questions/responses on particular items of business
- Increased use of voting so that Council could understand the views of the Senate
- Improved engagement between the Council and the Senate
- The need to move away from small groups of membership
- The need to improve equality, diversity and inclusion

The following comments were made on the review:

- Recommendation 29 referred to changing the method of appointment of Teaching & Learning and Research colleagues from formal election to selection by submissions of expression of interest.
  - There was some concern from Senators that this would change Senate away from a democratic process – the principle of Senators being elected was important
  - Other colleagues were supportive of the change to expressions of interest as formal elections were often intimidating, confrontational and sometimes put off colleagues from putting themselves forward
  - Often with elections some candidates stood unopposed particularly with the small membership categories currently in place
  - A buddy system would help support colleagues wishing to stand for election
  - It was important to acknowledge with election system many colleagues would not put themselves forward
  - The recommendation as put forward had been designed to remove any barriers for those not confident

- In regard to recommendation 21 it was noted that the Student Experience Committee did a good job of getting the student voice to Council. On Senate UBTLSE undertook this role. There was possibly a danger of some duplication with this recommendation.
- In regard to recommendation 34 it was noted that a few colleagues had been unable to attend Senate at the last minute because of illness and the train strikes.
  - Online Senate's had been helpful during the pandemic as the meeting chat function had allowed better interaction.
  - Equally being in person also had huge benefits.
  - It was recognised that hybrid meetings could be challenging particularly for very large meetings of Senate's size in terms of sound/video quality as well the ability to participate in break out groups.
  - The review had not recommended that hybrid be discounted but instead had recommended that this format not be used until there had been improvements in technology.

       o   The Staff Disability Network had asked that the University explore hybrid meetings as the default option and that the onus should be on the University to enable more hybrid meetings.

The Senate noted that implementation of all of the recommendations would take some time, particularly around membership and induction. The implementation of the recommendations would be worked through during 2022/23.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Senate whether they wished to accept the recommendations of the Senate Review subject to recommendations 29 Elections and 31 Hybrid meetings being taken back to the review group for further consideration. The Senate voted 34 in favour of accepting the report subject to reconsideration of recommendations 29 and 31. The Senate were reminded that there was a need to retain a full Senate in place in terms of membership whilst implementation of the recommendations took place.

The Senate for its part approved the Report of the Sub-Group on Council and Senate Effectiveness, cognisant that the Council would need to give it final approval.

The Senate recorded its thanks to all those available in the review.

22/24   Report of the Vice-Chancellor (Item 7)

The Senate received the Vice-Chancellor's address to the Senate, noting in particular:

Community

Birthday List honour for Parveen Yaqoob - Professor Parveen Yaqoob, Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor Research and Innovation has been appointed an OBE for services to higher education.

Freedom of Speech - The Queen's Speech included the Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill, which was aimed at higher education institutions and student unions. The Bill was now at report stage, ready for its third reading.

Earlier in the term the University held a research seminar which brought the issues of academic freedom into sharp focus here. The event generated a significant amount of attention on social media, local press, and correspondence to senior colleagues. There was also a peaceful protest on the day. In response to some concerns expressed as to whether the University had acted lawfully and had created a hostile environment for trans and other colleagues, students and visitors, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Peter Miskell reviewed the circumstances and processes around the event to see if we had properly followed our own policies. The Vice-Chancellor was of the view that whilst the University strived to offer a safe space for people of all backgrounds, orientations and perspectives, creating safe spaces could not be used for shutting down genuine academic debate and restricting academic freedom.

Balancing freedom of speech with the duty of care for colleagues and students was a sector-wide issue, and relevant policy and practice were underdeveloped.

New Chancellor - Paul Lindley OBE would take up the role from July and plans were underway for his installation and a smooth transition from Lord Waldegrave's tenure.

Mental health awareness week - The University took the opportunity of mental health awareness week last month to highlight the services it offered to students and colleagues through both social media and staff portal. University Executive Board took the decision to sign up to the University Mental Health Charter.

Excellence

Collaborative Awards for T&L 2002 winners - the recipients of these awards had been announced, which recognised and rewarded groups of staff and students who had made exceptional contributions to the student learning experience.

Engagement and Impact Awards Shortlist announced - This year's finalists in the Research Engagement and Impact Awards had been announced, selected from 28 applications received from a wide spectrum of research disciplines.

Teaching Learning Framework for 2022/23 and 2023/4 - The expectations for students' learning experience at Reading for the next two academic years had been published, based on the premise that there would be no pandemic-related restrictions on activity. This interim framework was for the next two years before the future approaches were implemented in the 2024/25 academic year under the Portfolio Review pathway. The main mode of teaching from Autumn 2022 would be on-campus face to face and students will be expected to engage in their programmes in-person.

Online Delivery of Learning - There had been tremendous growth across the sector in universities engaging with external partners to provide online delivery of learning, helping attract distance learners from across the world. The University began conversations about developing partnerships in 2015, and in 2018 the initial decision was made to consider what this might look like for the University, with the ambition to grow student numbers and income in areas that complements our strengths. Following a thorough procurement process, delayed considerably by the pandemic, the University was approaching the end of that tendering process and had identified a preferred bidder.

Sustainability

Pay Award 2022-2023 - UCEA had written to the unions with a final offer for 2022-23. This offer included an uplift of 3.6% which equated to 3% on most spinal points and then up to 9% for staff on the lowest spinal points. Whilst the University formally sits outside the JNCHES process (as a result of the phase 1 agreement with the UCU Reading branch and Staff Forum), it was very mindful of the rapidly rising cost of living and the impact for colleagues. In consultation with the UCU Reading branch and the Staff Forum, the University would review the impact of the pandemic on the University's finances again in September, taking into account the 2022 recruitment numbers, to ensure it could make a timely decision on whether to locally adopt UCEA's final offer.

Engaged University

Natural History Museum - The University of Reading had agreed a formal partnership with the Natural History Museum (NHM), part of which will create a state-of-the-art science and digitisation centre at the Thames Valley Science Park (TVSP). The agreement with the NHM

would bring around 120 science staff and curators to TVSP, as well as millions of objects and specimens.

Local Elections Results for Wokingham and Reading - The results of the recent local elections had led to a change in leadership in Wokingham Borough Council. The Conservatives lost overall control (for the first time for 23 years). The Liberal Democrats had announced a formal partnership with Labour and the two independents. At Reading Borough Council, Labour continued to have overall control with the Greens winning more seats to become the official opposition.

Sanctuary Scholarships - Up to 10 sanctuary scholarships were being offered for people from Ukraine who took up residence through the government scheme. This was in addition to the existing 12 scholarships offered to sanctuary seekers of any background or nationality.

Items for report and approval

22/25   Report of the University Executive Board (Item 8)

There was no report on this occasion.

22/26   Report of the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience (Item 9)

The Senate received the Report of the meetings of the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience (UBTLSE) held on 15 March, 3 and 16 May and 7 June 2022

The Senate noted updates from UBTLSE on:

- • Portfolio Review Pathway
- • Examiner Nominations
- • Compliance with the revised 'B' Conditions of Registration
- • Key decisions and changes to policies
- • Revisions to the Learning Capture Policy
- • Student Contract Amendments 2023/24
- • Inclusive Practice in Teaching and Learning: A Vision Statement
- • Annual Statement from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator 2021
- • Student Voice and Partnership

In addition, the Senate noted that UBTLSE had approved the semester calendar dates model to be implemented from academic year 2024/25.

The Senate approved:

1)   Proposed amendments to the Ordinances as they related to Aegrotat Awards
2)   Proposed amendments to the Student Complaints Procedures.

22/27   Report of the University Board for Research and Innovation (Item 10)

The Senate received the report of the University Board for Research and Innovation held on 15 June 2022.

In particular, the Senate noted that the Board:

Research-related diversity and inclusion data - The Board received a report covering some research-related diversity and inclusion data across the following areas: staff demographics; representation amongst Research Division Leaders and committee membership; research awards and applications; research students; and research output volume. The Board had agreed to share sections of the report with relevant individuals and groups to inform context and further actions, noting that differential impact of COVID on particular groups was a possible factor.

Research and innovation performance data - The Board received some recent research and innovation performance data, notably

- o **THE Global Impact rankings 2022**. The University was ranked in the 101-200 in the overall ranking band with top 30 rankings in SDGs 1, 2, 8, 12, and in the top quartile for research scores (27%) in all but one SDG.
- o **QS World University Rankings 2023**. The University's world ranking dropped from 202 to 229, and was ranked just outside the top 16% of ranked institutions. Amongst the 90 UK institutions, the University was ranked 28th (from 27th in 2021).
- o **Research awards and applications 2021/22 to date**. The University had received £27.4m in awards in the year to date, which was in line or above the equivalent position in previous years at this stage in the cycle. At £89m in value, applications were somewhat down on previous years. Compared with the 2021/22 University target, the University was at 65% three quarters through the year.
- o **UKRI competitive funding decisions 2020/21**. The University received 17 awards from 83 applications (as Lead organization) in the recently published data on sector outcomes of competitive UKRI body (including Research Councils) funding decisions. The overall award value £12.8m was in line with recent years, but a lower success rate than previous years (c. 20%) and below the sector average. As co-applicant, the University was part of successful awards to the value of £18m, notably from NERC.

Research policy approval - The Board had noted and approved the following policies: Acceptance of research and innovation funding, and Technical Services acknowledgement guidelines.

Knowledge Exchange Framework: second iteration - The Board had received information about the second iteration of the Knowledge Exchange Framework, planned for September 2022.

Annual statement of compliance with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity

The Board approved the annual statement of compliance with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity for onward transmission to Senate and Council.

The Senate approved the Annual Statement of compliance with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity for onward transmission to the Council.

22/28   Report of the Global Engagement Strategy Board (Item 11)

The Senate noted that there was no report on this occasion.

22/29   Student Recruitment and Admissions Update (Item 12)

The Board received and noted a report from Global Recruitment and Admissions on the current recruitment position. Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Fellowes informed the Senate that the University was in a good position for this round of recruitment but there were issues in some Schools with the decline in applicants from the EU.

Volunteers would be welcomed for both Graduation and Clearing this Summer.

22/30   Report from RUSU (Item 13)

The Senate received reports from the outgoing RUSU Officers highlighting their achievements over the last year. Members of Senate thanked the Officers for all their work.

The Senate also welcomed the incoming RUSU Officers and noted their plans for the coming year.

22/31   Report of the joint Standing Committee of Council and Senate on Honorary Degrees

The Senate received and approved the report from the Joint Standing Committee of Council and Senate on Honorary Degrees.

The Senate noted that with the new process implemented this year that a greater diversity of nominations had been received.

Items for note

22/32   Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Examination Results (Item 15)

There was no report on this occasion.

22/33   Report of the Student Appeals Committee (Item 16)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Student Appeals Committee held since the last meeting and noted the outcomes of the Committee's decisions.

22/34   Report of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct (item 17)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct held since the last meeting and noted the outcomes of the Committee's decisions.

22/35   Report of the Standing Committee on Academic Engagement and Fitness to Study (Item 18)

The Senate received the Report of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Academic Engagement and Fitness to Study held since the last meeting and noted the outcomes of the Committee's decisions.

22/36   Report of the Standing Committee on Fitness to Practise (Item 19)

The Senate received and noted the Report of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Fitness to Practise.

22/37   Report of the Standing Disciplinary Committee (Item 20)

The Senate received and noted the Report of the Standing Disciplinary Committee on disciplinary sanctions including those imposed in the Halls of Residence.

22/38   Items approved by Chair's Action (Item 21 a)

The Senate noted the following items had been approved by Chair's Action: minor amendments to the Ordinances for 2022/23.

22/39   Appointments to Committees and other bodies (Item 21 b)

In respect of appointments, the Senate: -

Noted that:

- One vacancy remained on the Joint University/UCU Committee
- One vacancy remained on the Research Ethics Committee

The Senate made the following appointments/reappointments:

• Professor Sarah Brewer to the Research Ethics Committee to 31 July 2025.
• Dr Anne Thies to the Research Ethics Committee to 31 July 2025.
• Dr Tim Lincoln to the Research Ethics Committee to 31 July 2025.

22/40   Chancellor Emeritus (Item 21 c)

The Senate approved a proposal that the title of Chancellor Emeritus be conferred upon Lord Waldegrave from 20 July 2022.

22/41   Retirement of Professors (Item 21 d)

The Senate approved that under the provisions of Ordinance B7 the title of Emeritus/ta Professor be conferred with effect from the date indicated on:

Professor Alistair Murdoch (1.6.22)
Professor Anna McMullan (31.8.22)

22/42   Other Retirements (Item 21 d)

The Senate approved that that the following be accorded the title of Honorary Fellow for a period of five years with effect from the date indicated:

Mary McAuley (31.3.22)
Dr Kevin White (31.3.22)
Jonathan Smith (31.3.22)
Claire Tolley (31.3.22)
John Brady (1.4.22)
Fiona Simmonds (30.4.22)
Eveline Bentley (4.5.22)
Roger Pearson (22.5.22)
Andrew Lomas (4.6.22)
Louise Bourguignon (10.6.22)
Judith Fox (30.6.22)
Dr Eileen Hyder (31.7.22)
Dr Gaynor Bradley (31.7.22)
Theodora Read (26.8.22)
Dr Roger Brugge (31.8.22)
Helen Marlow (15.9.22)
Dr David Ward (30.9.22)

22/43   List of Meetings 2022-23

The Senate received the final version of the list of meetings for 2022-23 for its information.

....

Student representatives withdrew from the remainder of the meeting

....

RESERVED BUSINESS

22/44   Reports of Examiners for Higher Degrees by thesis (Item 24 a)

The Senate approved recommendations for the award or otherwise of Higher Degrees.

22/45   Examinations for Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (Item 24 b)

The Senate authorised the Vice-Chancellor to approve May/June/July 2022 examination results on its behalf.