

MEETING OF THE SENATE

26 June 2019

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Birch, Professor Brown and Professor Hollander, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Beveridge, Professor Kenny and Professor van der Hoek, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Clegg, Professor Endfield, Professor Sheffield, Professor Spelman-Miller and Professor Yates, Professors Albadri, Barr, Berry, Caddick, Chalus, Coomber and Cunliffe, Dr E Drywood, Dr R Fererro, Professors Foxhall and French, Dr L Gartshore, Professors Guillaume, Harris, Hertz-Fowler, Leek, MacEwan and Mair, Dr F Marret-Davies, Professor Marshall, Dr E Michalopoulou, Professors Morris, Sanderson and Speed, Dr L Swan, Dr S Timme and Professor Vieira de Mello.

The President of the Liverpool Guild of Students was present as a representative of the student body.

In attendance: The Director of Strategic Planning and Governance, the Governance Manager, the Director of Student Administration and Support, and the Strategy Delivery Manager (Education).

Apologies for absence were received from 25 members of the Senate.

1. 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.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

2.1 Minutes of the Meeting Held 27 March 2019

AGREED:

- i. The minutes of the meeting held on 27 March 2019 should be approved as an accurate record.

2.2 Minutes of the Meeting Held 30 April 2019

AGREED:

- i. The minutes of the meeting held on 30 April 2019 should be approved as an accurate record.

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

3. Adoption of IHRA Definition of Antisemitism

REPORTED:

- i. Senate had received an Equality and Diversity Green Paper at its meeting in January 2019. Work was progressing on this and proposals would be brought back in the autumn.

ii. In the meantime, Senate was asked to consider recommending that the University should adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism, in order that it could be embedded in training materials.

iii. The IHRA definition was as follows:

‘Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities’.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

iv. The University should adopt the IHRA definition of antisemitism.

4. Honours and Appointments

RECEIVED:

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

REPORTED:

ii. Professor Peter Butler from the Department of Physics had been elected a Fellow of the Royal Society for his ‘outstanding contribution to our understanding of nuclear structure, and for being a key figure in defining the future direction of nuclear physics worldwide’.

iii. Professor Sarah Coupland from the Department of Molecular and Clinical Cancer Medicine had been presented with an Excellence Award by the Royal College of Pathologists in recognition of her significant contribution to ocular pathology and oncology.

iv. Professor Michael Fisher from the Department of Computer Science had been awarded a highly prestigious Chair in Emerging Technologies by the Royal Academy of Engineering.

v. Emeritus Professor the Lord Trees of the Ross had been awarded the Queen’s Medal by the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons – this was the highest award that could be bestowed by the College upon an individual veterinary surgeon.

vi. Professor Luciane Vieira de Mello from the School of Life Sciences had been awarded the Biochemical Society’s 2019 Teaching Excellence Award.

vii. Professor Dame Margaret Whitehead from the Department of Public Health and Policy had been named by UUK as one of the Nation’s Top 100 Lifesavers as part of its latest MadeatUni campaign.

5. Special Committee of the Senate

AGREED:

- i. The following should be appointed a Special Committee of the Senate to deal, on behalf of the Senate, with any urgent matters which might arise between meetings of the Senate in the period from the end of the long vacation 2019 until the end of the long vacation 2020:

The Vice-Chancellor, the Chief Operating Officer, the Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Executive and Policy) and the President of the Guild of Students (on the understanding that, in accordance with normal practice, the President of the Guild will not participate in reserved business).

- ii. The Special Committee should be authorised to exercise all the powers of the Senate and to undertake all the duties of the Senate, other than the powers and duties currently delegated to other committees.

STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

6. Project SHAPE: Towards Strategy 2026 and Beyond

RECEIVED:

- i. A paper presenting the final proposals arising from Project SHAPE.

REPORTED:

- ii. Project SHAPE had been established in June 2018 to redesign the future of the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences (HLS). The process had involved extensive consultation and engagement with staff, students and external stakeholders, which was reflected within the proposals centred around three themes: Culture, Environment and Structure. Project SHAPE would re-integrate research and education activity, prioritise research strengths and strategically realign the Faculty's Professional Services support and governance structure.
- iii. It was proposed that, given the scale and complexity of the Faculty, the restructuring should be delivered across two phases. The first phase of implementation would focus on reconfiguring the senior academic and Professional Services leadership and management roles to align with the proposed new structure, and on ensuring the new Faculty governance structures were in place for the start of the 2019/20 academic year. This phase of implementation would take place between July and September 2019. The detail of the second implementation phase would be developed over forthcoming months by the Project Board.

NOTED:

- iv. The names of the Level 1 and 2 units were not definitive at this stage.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

- v. The proposed new structure for HLS, which describes four institutes and four directorates, should be approved.

- vi. The strategy for improving the performance of HLS through changes to the environment and culture should be approved.

7. Academic Portfolio Planning Framework

RECEIVED:

- i. The final draft of the Academic Portfolio Planning Framework, together with a summary of the outcomes of the consultation process, the Equality Impact Assessment and the Legitimate Interests Assessment.

REPORTED:

- ii. The Framework aimed to provide guidance on local implementation of workload planning processes and as a result improve the planning process and identify issues where workload was unmanageable. Over time, it was believed this would contribute to improved working environments and had the potential to reduce workload stress.
- iii. The original Workload Allocation Model (WAM) Framework had been developed to support the implementation of an institutional workload model and tariffs. Following a review of the WAM Project in April 2018, the Project Board had taken a decision to revise the approach to implementation to provide local flexibility in how WAM processes were delivered and allow Schools and Departments to set tariffs.
- iv. In light of this, the WAM Framework had been revised to reflect the expectations for September 2019, and to reflect feedback received from the original pilot and engagement activity. Schools would develop processes in line with the Framework from September 2019 to plan workload for the 2020/21 academic year. An extension for the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences had been given to January 2020 to align with timescales for Project SHAPE and to facilitate the integration of clinical activity.
- v. It had also been agreed that the Framework should be renamed on the basis of it being refocused to prioritise portfolio planning for academic staff, making clear links with the Portfolio of Activity which it would eventually replace.
- vi. In consultation with UCU, a 35 hour week had been suggested as a benchmark rather than the 37.5 hour week suggested using TRAC guidance. As the academic contract did not contain hours, it was suggested that the notional benchmark was removed for the first year to allow data to be reviewed and further consultation on the suggested benchmark.
- vii. Once approved, a series of implementation events would take place to raise awareness and further guidance would be developed.
- viii. Ongoing engagement with Trade Union representatives would continue to help achieve a positive environment for implementation and enhancement of processes.

NOTED:

- ix. The first year of operation would be regarded as a trial, learning year.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

- x. The Academic Portfolio Planning Framework and the proposed way forward should be approved.

[See also minutes 13 and 22 below.]

8. Research Integrity

RECEIVED:

- i. The report of an independent review of research integrity, together with an implementation plan designed to address the key recommendations from the review report.

REPORTED:

- ii. Following a recent serious misconduct case and to address recommendations made by the internal auditors in relation to research integrity, Dr Roger Platt had been approached to Chair an independent review of this area.
- iii. It had been concluded that, whilst some strong elements existed, improvements were required to the overall set of processes designed to foster and monitor research integrity across the institution.
- iv. The recommendations were designed to add value to the research environment rather than creating a tick-box exercise. They covered three areas:
 - Work on the research culture
 - Recognition of the crucial role of the Principal Investigator
 - The importance of embedding research integrity processes at an early career stage by implementing training for postgraduate research students.
- v. Research, Partnerships and Innovation would work with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research and Impact and the Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellors to deliver the recommendations across the institution. The implementation plan recognised the scale of work required and had prioritised and resourced actions that would minimise institutional risk and have a positive impact.

NOTED:

- vi. The Liverpool Doctoral College would need to oversee a change of approach from choice-led research integrity training for PGR students to obligatory training.
- vii. The suggested enhancements were welcome.
- viii. A more uniform approach to the storage of research data would be considered as part of the institutional Data Improvement Programme.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

- ix. The implementation plan should be approved.

9. Policy on Code of Practice Regarding Freedom of Speech

RECEIVED:

- i. An updated Policy and Code of Practice Regarding Freedom of Speech.

REPORTED:

- ii. The Policy and Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech had last been revised in 2016. The processes set out in the Policy had been effective and fit for purpose.
- iii. Recent guidance from the Higher Education Policy Institute and the Equality and Human Rights Commission made a number of recommendations for Freedom of Speech policies and the Policy had been updated in line with these.
- iv. The Policy ensured the University meets its obligations under the Education Act and the Prevent Duty.

NOTED:

- v. General issues around a prospective partner's approach to freedom of speech would be taken into account by the University's Due Diligence Panel when considering a proposed partnership.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

- vi. The updated Policy and Code of Practice Regarding Freedom of Speech should be approved, subject to a minor amendment in Appendix 2 to refer to animal rights and *animal welfare* issues.

[Dr Paula Harrison Woods, Director of Student Administration and Support, attended for this item.]

BUSINESS FROM THE FACULTIES

10. Business from the Faculty of Science and Engineering: Institute for Digital Engineering and Autonomous Systems (IDEAS) Level 2 Unit Proposal

RECEIVED:

- i. A proposal to create a new Level 2 unit in the Faculty of Science and Engineering.

REPORTED:

- ii. It was proposed to establish a new Level 2 unit: the Institute for Digital Engineering and Autonomous Systems (IDEAS). The Level 2 unit would have two well-connected Level 1 units under it: the Virtual Engineering Centre (VEC) and the Digital Innovation Facility (DIF).
- iii. IDEAS would have its own cost centre and staff members of VEC and DIF would be funded and paid for through the new Level 2 unit. The new structure would be cost neutral and had no effect on the size of current budgets, only on the budget streams (salaries would be directly paid through IDEAS, not through a School). No academic staff would transfer to the new IDEAS unit, but would remain in their existing School.

- iv. IDEAS would have both an Academic Director and a Managing Director. This structure would therefore be very similar to the Materials Innovation Factory (MIF), and be perfectly aligned with the current line management structure. IDEAS would have a Steering Committee with members of the Digital Steering Group and representatives from each Faculty. *(Detail redacted due to commercial interest)* would advise on efficacy of the interfaces with industry, impact and collaborative opportunities, and support IDEAS in the development of a national and international brand.
- v. *(Detail redacted due to commercial interest.)*
- vi. IDEAS, combined with the MIF, provided an opportunity for the University to expand its impact activities by providing a basis for development along the lines of some Catapults.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

- vii. The proposal to establish a new Level 2 unit in the Faculty of Science and Engineering should be approved.

REPORTS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES

Report of the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees

- 11. The Senate received an oral report on the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees. *(Detail redacted due to personal information.)*
 - i. In accordance with the provisions of Ordinance 28 (Honorary Degrees and Honorary Fellowships), the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees had met to consider nominations received for the conferment of honorary degrees and other honorary awards, and had made a number of recommendations.

AGREED:

- ii. The recommendations of the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees in relation to the conferment of honorary degrees and an honorary fellowship should be endorsed and forwarded to the Council.

Education Committee

- 12. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Education Committee held on 12 June 2019.
- 13. **Academic Portfolio Planning Framework**

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had endorsed the Academic Portfolio Planning Framework, noting that it would be important to ensure professional development activity was integrated into the Framework and that, whilst the first phase of implementation was focused on policy and processes, longer term, the development of an in-house technical solution to support the Framework was being considered.

[See also minute 7 above.]

14. Information and Digital Fluency Framework

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had approved the new Information and Digital Fluency Framework.
- ii. Developed by the Library, the new Framework aimed to align the Department's education activities with the Curriculum 2021 Framework, including the Graduate Attributes (Digital Fluency, Confidence and Global Citizenship) and the Liverpool Hallmarks (Research-Connected Teaching, Active Learning and Authentic Assessment).
- iii. The Library intended to use this Framework to inform Liaison Librarian teaching activity and the development of complementary KnowHow resources. It was anticipated that linked activities would be available to students from September 2019.

[This paper was made available on the Senate members' intranet.]

15. Review of Policy on Lecture Capture

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a report providing an amended Policy on Lecture Capture and an update on discussions between Human Resources and UCU Trade Union representatives in relation to lecture capture, together with a tabled copy of the student-focussed Equality Impact Assessment undertaken in May 2018 as part of a previous review of the Policy on Lecture Capture.
- ii. The Data Protection and Freedom of Information Manager had been asked to respond to some misunderstanding around having to gain student consent with regard to the recording of lectures and GDPR. In response to this, a number of revisions were proposed to section five of the Policy. This would also involve renaming section five 'Data Protection'.
- iii. In relation to discussions that had taken place between HR and UCU, the Centre for Innovation had agreed to undertake the following activities:
 - To complete an Equality Impact Assessment specifically relating to staff.
 - To develop guidance for Heads of Department to minimise any inconsistencies with regard to opt-out approvals and consider a single consistent opt-out format for recording and reporting purposes.
- v. The Committee had noted that it would be important for a copy of the Recording Notice to be located at all relevant spaces where lecture capture could take place, and that further consideration would need to be given to the process to be undertaken when requests were received to remove or edit a recording. This would include identifying where the final decision should reside.
- vi. The Committee had agreed that the minor revisions to the Policy on Lecture Capture should be approved.

[This paper was made available on the Senate members' intranet.]

16. Academic Advising and Student Success: Plans for Implementation

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a paper providing a brief overview of the plans to implement the new Student Success Framework in September 2019, together with a presentation from the Student Success Manager on plans for the Peer Mentoring aspect of the new Framework.
- ii. If the new Framework was to make a difference and enhance the student experience, it was believed important to identify a clear set of student experience values which all those involved in delivering the Framework could follow. Identifying, agreeing and communicating these values would be the next stage of this work and would involve consultation with both staff and students.
- iii. A sub-group had been established from the Task and Finish Group to progress the key deliverables which were required for the successful implementation of the Framework.
- iv. The aim of the peer mentoring programme was to improve retention, reduce feelings of isolation, increase belongingness within the University community, strengthen cohort identity and develop key friendships at an early stage.
- v. The Committee had noted that:
 - It was important to understand how the new peer mentoring scheme would integrate with existing schemes across campus.
 - Encouraging students to engage with the new scheme was important. Having a diverse pool of peer mentors from across disciplines would assist in achieving this.
 - The development of a methodology to assist in measuring and evaluating the success of the scheme would be a focus over the coming months.
 - It would be important to have a software solution that enabled the recording of Academic Adviser interactions in the interim period whilst a longer term solution was developed.

[This presentation was made available on the Senate members' intranet.]

17. Winners of the Learning and Teaching Prizes and Nominations for the Sir Alastair Pilkington Award for Teaching Excellence for 2018/19

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a paper providing confirmation of the winners of the learning and teaching prizes (both Faculty awards and the Sir Alastair Pilkington Awards).
- ii. The Committee had agreed that the winners of the Sir Alastair Pilkington Awards for Teaching Excellence should be approved.

[A table providing a summary of all winners and the reasons for nomination was made available on the Senate members' intranet.]

Research and Impact Committee

18. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Research and Impact Committee held on 13 June 2019.

19. Chair's Report

19.1 REF2021 Code of Practice

REPORTED:

- i. The REF2021 Code of Practice previously recommended for approval by Senate on 30 April 2019 had been approved by Council in May and formally submitted to the national Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel. A formal response was awaited.

19.2 REF Update and Forward Plan

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received a presentation on REF updates and forward plan for the next 18 months.
- ii. Key highlights on 2018/19 progress included: the development of REF Code of Practice; Impact Case Study taskforce; outputs assessment in 2018 reading programme; and over 120 colleagues undertaking equality and diversity training.
- iii. Key milestones were presented in six phases, and tasks included: Unit of Assessment (UOA) modelling refresh; communications to relevant staff on processes for declaring individual circumstances and identifying independent researchers; formal recommendations and decisions on UOA configurations to SMT; responding to Research England request for survey of submissions intentions; submission of individual or UOA level requests for reductions to Research England Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel; and ongoing systems development and data work.

20. Quarter 3 Performance Report

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received the quarter three performance report.

Research Income

- ii. *(Detail redacted due to commercial interest.)*
- iii. While it was expected that proportions of staff successfully engaging in research funding would vary according to discipline, supporting staff to attract research income remained a priority for the institution.

Annual Output Assessment 2018

(Detail redacted due to commercial interest)

Citations

- iv. The University had achieved a small increase from 15th to 13th in the Russell Group in terms of the field-weighted citation index and had retained its position of 15th in terms of the proportion of highly cited outputs.

21. Research Income Task and Finish Group

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received a paper outlining options to improve performance in relation to increased generation of research income.
- ii. Analysis had been carried out on a range of datasets and the key findings were as follows:
 - For the subject mix, income per FTE remained lower than comparators.
 - The proportion of PIs with active research council grants was not significantly lower than comparators. However, there were some areas of concern.
 - The proportion of staff holding a Col grant was lower than the proportion holding a PI grant in the majority of subject areas, suggesting that the ambition of collaborative teamwork was not matched by grant activity.
 - The proportion of Professors who did not hold a grant as PI was very high in the Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences and Science and Engineering.
 - The current budgetary model did not incentivise growth of funding.
- iii. A series of proposals had been laid out for improving grant capture:
 - *Proposal 1*: further develop our research environment under the cradle to chair initiative.
 - *Proposal 2*: maximise applications and awards – quick wins through more effective costing and fuller draw-down of funds by the end of the grant-funding period.
 - *Proposal 3*: prioritisation and incentives – reshaping the financial model so that QR funding follows performance.
 - *Proposal 4*: prioritisation and incentives – target training and incentives at large units in the lower quartile for income: Clinical Medicine, Management, Engineering.
 - *Proposal 5*: planning and forecasting – set stretch-targets informed by realistic Research Institutional Finance Forecasting Tool forecasts.
- iv. The Committee had noted that:
 - A one-size fits all approach would not work due to variances across the Faculties, and it was important to look at the activity of departments and schools holistically.
 - As well as monitoring research income, it was important to monitor research applications to ensure a strong pipeline of new research to underpin growth in research income in future years. The Research Institutional Finance Forecasting Tool that was being implemented would facilitate an improved way of predicting the impact of applications and awards on future research income.

- Improvements to success rates was also important. Good practice in this area should be identified and spread widely e.g. in one area, individuals were supported to recycle and develop their unsuccessful applications, through 1:1 coaching from a grant holder for their particular funding body. It was recognised that it was not always appropriate to do this, and judgement was needed on a case by case basis depending on feedback from the funding panel.
- v. The Committee had agreed that work should now commence on all five proposals, rather than just the priority proposals 1-3, noting the current financial risks and that proposals 3-5 worked as a package of measures. More detailed proposals should be developed around each strand.

22. Academic Portfolio Planning Framework

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had endorsed the Academic Portfolio Planning Framework.

[See also minute 7 above.]

Academic Quality and Standards Committee

23. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee held on 11 June 2019.

24. Action Planning Process

RECEIVED:

- i. A report from the Academic Quality and Standards Committee recommending a new action planning process to replace the Annual Subject Review process and Subject Action Plans from 2019/20, the process having been updated to reflect the comments of the Committee.

REPORTED:

- ii. The new process would focus on the data sets that inform TEF and consolidate actions from multiple sources into a single action plan.
- iii. The action planning process had been developed by a working group established under the Quality Assurance Process Review Group (QAPRG), had been subject to regular discussion within the QAPRG and had been consulted on with the Faculties.

AGREED:

- iv. The new action planning process should be approved to come into effect from 2019/20, replacing Annual Subject Review and Subject Action Plans.

Postgraduate Research Committee

25. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Postgraduate Research Committee held on 6 June 2019.

26. 'Pass with Major Modifications' as a PGR Examination Outcome

REPORTED:

- i. The PGR Committee had received a report recommending updates to the PGR Programme Ordinances, PGR Code of Practice and on-campus Professional Doctorate programme specifications, to facilitate availability of a pass with major modifications examination outcome for all eligible candidates on PGR programmes from September 2019.
- ii. The proposed policy updates would apply to all candidates who were due to submit their initial thesis from 2 September 2019 onwards. It had been

recommended that any candidates with an initial thesis submission date that fell during August 2019 would have the opportunity to delay submission until 2 September 2019, to offer them the opportunity to be eligible for consideration under the new guidelines.

- iii. Particular attention to tracking of individual students would be required, to ensure that the parallel sets of Ordinances arising from these policy updates were correctly applied to the respective cohorts to which they related. The period of transition would involve an increase in the complexity of PGR programme administration.
- iv. Online Professional Doctorates had been considered separately, with specific arrangements for modification and resubmission of theses for students enrolled on these programmes.
- v. The PGR Committee had approved the revisions to the on-campus Professional Doctorate programme specifications

AGREED:

- vi. The revisions to the PGR Code of Practice should be approved.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

- vii. The revisions to the PGR Programme Ordinances should be approved.

[The PGR Ordinances and PGR Code of Practice with revisions shown tracked were made available on the Senate members' intranet.]

27. XJTLU Student Placements on Liverpool Campus

REPORTED:

- i. It had been proposed that XJTLU students should spend at least three months in Liverpool with their Liverpool-based secondary supervisors.
- ii. XJTLU planned to increase its PGR student numbers. The Chair was seeking information from colleagues at XJTLU and in Liverpool about any challenges and opportunities that may arise in securing supervisors.
- iii. The Committee had noted that:
 - There were logistical considerations associated with formalising these arrangements. The optimum time of year for XJTLU students to come to Liverpool would be considered.
 - Students who came to Liverpool for 12 months may benefit in the jobs market, since a greater proportion of their programme would have taken place overseas.
 - Students who came to Liverpool for 12 months would be included in certain statistical returns, such as the Research Excellence Framework.
 - The University's response to expansion in XJTLU PGR student numbers would be informed by guidance about the subject areas in which increased numbers of students were likely to be admitted.

- In the first instance, regulations would require amendment to mandate a Liverpool-based visit of three to 12 months.

AGREED:

- iv. The proposal should be approved and the regulation mandating a placement of three months or more should apply to all students who were studying at XJTLU for a University of Liverpool-awarded PhD.

28. Late Submission of Theses

REPORTED:

- i. Overall completion rates for University doctoral students were not a cause for concern. Recent benchmarking data seen by the Liverpool Doctoral College had placed the University on a par with comparator institutions.
- ii. The number of theses that were submitted late was not insignificant.
- iii. Some University schools, departments and individual supervisors promoted timely submission of theses, whereas others had adopted a more flexible approach which was not supported by the Programme Ordinances.
- iv. In cases in which students submitted their thesis a day or two beyond their submission deadline, it was common for extension requests to be made retrospectively, which was not supported by the PGR Code of Practice.
- v. A conventional academic penalty for late submission could not be imposed, owing to the nature of PhD assessment and grading: late submission of a thesis had no relevance to the scale of the corrections mandated by its examiners.
- vi. If University Ordinances were applied, a student would be 'deemed withdrawn' should their thesis submission not meet the deadline and in the absence of a valid application for an extension.
- vii. The Committees had noted that:
 - Inconsistent practices across the institution devalued those extensions granted to applicants who had valid reasons for interruption to their studies and had submitted their extension requests in good time, and the efforts of those students who submitted their theses in a timely manner.
 - The wellbeing of the student must be balanced against the integrity of the governance of postdoctoral degree awards.
 - One measure to address concerns regarding late submission would be the definition of a 'grace period'. A grace period could not be presented outside of the University's regulatory framework, but its inclusion in regulations would signal that deadline extensions are automatic, and would contradict existing University Ordinances.
 - Another measure to address concerns regarding late submission would be the introduction of financial penalties, phased in proportion with the length of the delay in submission. However, it was also acknowledged that a financial penalty might disproportionately affect specific groups of students.

- Oversight and management of thesis submission deadlines occurred manually, which was time-consuming and vulnerable to human error. A software-based system for PGR student administration would be valuable.
- viii. The PGR Committee had agreed that: governance and practice across the University should be explored; the Guild should offer a written response to this item to the Committee ahead of its next meeting; and the Chair should discuss matters of culture and communication with University Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors and Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Research).

University Approval Panel

29. The Senate received the summary report of the University Approval Panel 2018/19.

REPORTED:

- i. The following new programmes or revalidated programmes had been approved by the University Approval Panel 2018/19, to take effect from 2019/20 unless stated otherwise:

University

New Year Abroad Annexe

Faculty of Health and Life Sciences

New MSc Advanced Clinical Practitioner (degree apprenticeship programme)
Revalidated BVSc Veterinary Science
Revalidated BDS Dental Surgery
Revalidated BSc Dental Therapy
New PG Certificate Critical Care
Revalidated BSc (Hons) Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology
Revalidated BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiology
Revalidated MBChB Medicine and Surgery
New BSc (Hons) International Leadership and Governance (pending response to conditions of approval)
New MSc High Risk Operations and Governance (pending response to conditions of approval)

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Revalidated MBA Thoroughbred Horse Racing Industries
Revalidated BSc (Hons) Business Economics
New BSc (Hons) Business Economics with a Year in Industry
Revalidated BA (Hons) Philosophy, Politics and Economics
New BA (Hons) English Language
Revalidated English Language Major, Joint and Minor Subject components
New MSc Occupational and Organisational Psychology
MMus Performance (pending response to conditions of approval)
New MSc/PGDip/PGCert/PG Award Strategic Leadership (pending response to conditions of approval)

Faculty of Science and Engineering

Revalidated BSc (Hons) Mathematics
Revalidated MMath (Hons) Mathematics

XJTLU

New MA Global Education

Modified BSc (Hons) Applied Chemistry (pending response to conditions of approval)
Modified MRes Advanced Chemical Sciences (pending response to conditions of approval)
Programmes to be delivered at the Taicang site
BSc (Hons) Supply Chain Innovation and Application (pending response to conditions of approval)
BEng (Hons) Intelligent Manufacturing Engineering (pending response to conditions of approval)
BEng (Hons) Internet of Things Engineering (pending response to conditions of approval)
BEng (Hons) Data Science and Big Data Technology (pending response to conditions of approval)
BA (Hons) Arts, Technology and Entertainment (pending response to conditions of approval)

- ii. The following new XJTLU programmes had not been approved and were to be resubmitted in June when they would be reconsidered by the relevant School Scrutiny Panel or, for the BA (Hons) Film Making, an external expert appointed by UoL, and considered for approval by the Chair of the UAP meeting of 3 April 2019 (Professor G Brown):

BEng (Hons) Intelligent Robotics Engineering (for delivery at the Taicang site)
BA (Hons) Film Making

OTHER ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT

30. Payment Policy 2019/20: Student Programme Fees, Accommodation Fees, Fines and Charges

RECEIVED:

- i. The proposed Payment Policy 2019/20: Student Programme Fees, Accommodation Fees, Fines and Charges.

REPORTED:

- ii. The Payment Policy 2019/20: Student Programme Fees, Accommodation Fees, Fines and Charges covered the payment of programme, research support and residence fees, the collection of fines levied in relation to student discipline, and the collection of charges raised as a result of damage caused and/or losses suffered in relation to University property. It also outlined the University's programme fee deposit scheme, its programme fee refund policy, and its policy towards the application of academic sanctions where a suitable arrangement to pay programme fees due had not been made, or where a student defaults on any programme fee payment arrangement.
- iii. Alongside the normal annual updates, substantive changes for 2019/20 were proposed to:
- Reflect the agreement of the Executive Board on 3 June 2019 to remove the provision of applying academic sanctions for non-academic debt, by clearly stating that it is only a failure to pay programme fees that would result in the application of academic sanctions, and that a failure to pay accommodation fees, student fines or student charges may result in the

University deploying formal external debt recovery proceedings, which may ultimately result in County Court Judgements.

- Formalise that a student in receipt of an SLC Postgraduate Doctoral Loan would be able to sign up to an alternative fee payment plan that aligns more favourably with their scheduled loan disbursements.
- Reflect decisions previously made by the Senior Executive Group regarding programme fee deposits for overseas taught postgraduate students and the abolition of fee discounts for self-funded UG/PGT overseas students.

AGREED:

- iv. The Payment Policy 2019/20: Student Programme Fees, Accommodation Fees, Fines and Charges should be approved.

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

31. The Senate received a report outlining action which had been taken on its behalf by the Vice-Chancellor.
32. **Senate Appointments to the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the appointment of the following individuals to serve on the Joint Committee on Honorary Degrees:

Professor Georgina Endfield, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (for the period until 31 July 2021)

Dr Fabienne Marret-Davies, Faculty of Science and Engineering (for the period to 31 July 2019)

AGREED:

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

33. **Protocols for Elections of Elected Faculty Representatives on Senate**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the protocols/approach to conducting the elections of elected Faculty representatives on Senate in 2019.

AGREED:

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

34. Online Education Management

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend to Council that the new body that would be established with Kaplan Open Learning to jointly develop and deliver online programmes should be an Affiliated College of the University and should be added to the list of affiliated organisations in Ordinance 27.2.
- ii. A brief summary of how the Affiliated College would have appropriate educational standing in accordance with Ordinance 27 (Affiliation, Recognition and Associate College Status) and Senate's remit had been circulated to Senate.
- iii. The President of the Council, acting on the Council's behalf, had approved the above recommendation.

AGREED:

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

35. Modifications to Programme Ordinances 46-49

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend to Council that Programme Ordinances 46-49 should be modified to reflect a number of drivers for change in the dental healthcare sector. These changes made it timely to consider integrated, but parallel degree programmes that would enable: the School of Dentistry to respond to changes in the commissioning of student places; true team working between dentists and therapists which was an educational necessity; and make the profession more responsive to the demands of public need. In addition, the School of Dentistry had noted the opportunity to further embrace the University's widening participation and employability agendas.
- ii. The changes to Ordinances 46, 47 and 48 would be effective from the beginning of 2019/20.
- iii. The President of the Council, acting on the Council's behalf, had approved the above recommendation.

AGREED:

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

OTHER ITEMS FOR REPORT

36. Elections of Elected Faculty Representatives on Senate – Results

RECEIVED:

- i. A report providing the results of the recent elections.

REPORTED:

- ii. The annual elections had been held recently to fill a number of vacancies for representatives from each Faculty elected by and from among the academic staff employed on substantive contracts on either Teaching and Research or Teaching and Scholarship pathways, for the period 1 August 2019 to 31 July 2022. The outcomes of the elections were as follows:

Faculty of Health and Life Sciences

Dr Jill Madine
Professor Calum Semple
Dr Francine Watkins

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Professor Bruce Gibson
Professor Michael Hauskeller
Dr Kenneth Forkert-Smith

Faculty of Science and Engineering

Dr Daniel Colquitt
Professor Sven Schewe
Dr Gita Sedghi
Dr Thomas Teubner

37. Admissions Appeals and Complaints for Entry September 2019

RECEIVED:

- i. A report detailing the appeals and complaints received in relation to applications for entry in September 2019.

REPORTED:

- ii. *(Detail redacted due to commercial interest.)*

38. Retiring Members of Senate

- i. The Vice-Chancellor extended thanks to the following members of the Senate whose term of office was due to end prior to the next meeting:

Professor Rachel Bearon
Professor Kate Bennett
Professor Corina Constantinescu
Dr Stephen Finnegan
Dr Fabienne Marret-Davies
Professor Frank Shovlin
Professor Paul Simpson
Dr Laura Swan
Dr Stefania Tufi

And the student members:
Esther Bukoye

Jonathon Foster
Shubhi Gupta
Rory Hughes
Manoka Mbolokele
Lorna Nixey

39. Date of Next Meeting

REPORTED:

- i. The next meeting would be held at 2pm on Wednesday 6 November 2019.
- ii. The remainder of meetings for 2019/20 would be held as follows:

Wednesday 29 January 2020 – 2pm
Wednesday 25 March 2020 – 2pm
Wednesday 24 June 2020 – 2pm