

MEETING OF THE SENATE

22 MARCH 2017

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Birch and Professor Brown, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Badcock and Professor Beveridge, Professors Atkinson, Balogun and Barr, Dr R Bearon, Dr K Bennett, Professors Caddick, Dawson, Dougan, Eades, Foxhall, Gabbay, Gibson and Grubb, Dr L Harkness-Brennan, Professors Herzberg, Hollander and Jones, Dr P Leftwick, Professors MacEwan and Mair, Dr F Marret-Davies, Professors McGowan, McGrath, Morris, Plater, Poole and Ralph, Dr N Savage, Professor Shovlin, Dr L Swan, Professor Tackley, Dr S Tufi and Dr R Urbano Gutierrez.

The President and Deputy President of the Liverpool Guild of Students and the student representatives from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and Faculty of Science and Engineering were present as representatives of the student body.

In attendance: The Head of Corporate Governance and Support and the Governance Co-ordinator.

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

1. Disclosures of Interest

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

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**AGREED:**

- i. The unreserved minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 2 November 2016 as an accurate record.

3. Report on the Business Circulated by Email Following the Cancellation of the January 2017 Meeting of Senate**RECEIVED:**

- i. A report on the business circulated by email following the cancellation of the January 2017 meeting.

REPORTED:

- ii. Papers relating to the following had been circulated:
 - Teaching Excellence Framework Narrative
 - Report of the Collaborative Provision Committee meetings held on 29 June 2016, 21 October 2016 and 9 December 2016
 - Report of the Education Committee meeting held on 13 January 2017
 - Report of the PGR Committee meeting held on 19 December 2016
 - Report of the Research and Impact Committee meeting held on 11 January 2017
 - Financial Statements of the University for the Year Ended 31 July 2016.
- iii. No comments or concerns had been raised and the Vice-Chancellor had subsequently taken Chair's action on behalf of the Senate to approve the recommendations contained within the reports (as outlined in minutes 29 and 30 below).

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. Honours and Appointments

REPORTED:

- i. Dr Suzanne Gage from the Institute of Psychology, Health and Society, had been chosen by the American Association for the Advancement of Science to receive the 2016 Early Career Award for Public Engagement with Science.
- ii. Professor John Gosney from the Institute of Translational Medicine had been given a prestigious lifetime achievement award by the British Thoracic Oncology Group.
- iii. Professor Jane Hurst from the Institute of Integrative Biology had been awarded the 2016 Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour (ASAB) medal.
- iv. Dr Praveetha Patalay from the Institute of Psychology, Health and Society had been featured on Forbes' prestigious '30 under 30 Europe' list for her research into the population-level causes and effects of depression in children and adolescents.
- v. Professor Liz Sheffield, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education in the Faculty of Science and Engineering, had achieved Principal Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy.
- vi. Dr Susanne Voelkel from the School of Life Sciences had been awarded a National Teaching Fellowship by the Higher Education Academy. Dr Voelkel had developed and pioneered a number of teaching innovations that had now been adopted by various departments within the University and other UK HEIs.

STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

5. Access Agreement Update – Entry 2018-19

[The Director of Student Recruitment, Admissions and Widening Participation attended for this item.]

RECEIVED:

- i. A paper providing an update on the development of the University's Access Agreement for 2018-19 entry which would need to be submitted to OFFA by 26 April 2017.

REPORTED:

- ii. In developing the Access Agreement the University would be mindful of the strategic guidance issued by OFFA, which made clear that the focus should now be on the maturity of arrangements, with much more attention to be paid to student attainment and success than might previously have been the case. Similarly, there was a much greater emphasis on the quality of outcomes rather than a more quantitative approach.
- iii. The University was already well placed in relation to many of OFFA's requirements, but there was scope for further work to be undertaken around the retention and success of students once they arrive. As such, work was underway around the provision of support for groups of students entering with non-traditional qualifications, and ways to encourage WP students to engage with activities which help them to build the social and cultural capital to which their non-disadvantaged peers were more likely to have ready access, such as the option of studying abroad, undertaking work placements and receiving mentorship by alumni and engaged employers.

NOTED:

- iv. Comments and suggestions relating to: the enhancement of support/funding for summer internships; the importance of work on transitions and outcomes; the potential for offering support to schools around Extended Project Qualifications; utilising the student body to assist with initiatives; and the need for oversight and management of requests/approaches made to schools from across the University.

6. Staff Survey 2016 – Focus on Responses from Academic Staff

[The Director of Human Resources attended for this item.]

RECEIVED:

- i. An overview of the data and key themes arising from the Staff Survey carried out on behalf of the University by Capita in November/December 2016, specifically in relation to the responses of academic staff.

REPORTED:

- ii. The overall response rate of 57% (against a sector benchmark of 68%) had been identified as requiring improvement.
- iii. There had been a 48% response rate from academic staff compared to 64% for professional services staff. However, the academic group overall was big enough that the confidence level was strong.
- iv. There were significant variations in response rate by job group and for some roles the percentage of respondents was not representative of the percentage of the role in the workforce as a whole (e.g. Research Associates, Lecturers).
- v. Further analysis would be carried out along with consultation including pulse surveys and focus groups to understand more about the differing responses, where strengths exist and can be built on and the potential actions to address concerns identified.
- vi. Only a third of academic staff agreed with the statement 'On the whole the different parts of the University communicate effectively with each other'.
- vii. It would be important to investigate the academic response to the statement 'I find my current workload too much and I am struggling to cope', as the percentage of professional services staff agreeing with the statement was significantly lower.
- viii. The percentage of staff currently experiencing bullying and harassment and those who felt discriminated against did not vary significantly between staff groups and was reflective of the HEI benchmark, but it clearly required addressing.

NOTED:

- ix. As a result of feedback received during the Strategy 2026 consultation exercise, a Task and Finish Group was already working to address the issues experienced by researchers in the early stages of their career.
- x. Focus group work would be undertaken with Readers across the institution to identify the issues specific to that group and what might be done to improve levels of satisfaction, noting that consideration could be given to moving away from use of the title.
- xi. In order to improve communication, summaries were now issued following meetings of the Senior Executive Group, Education Committee and Research and Impact

Committee. In future, summaries would also be provided following meetings of Council. It was recognised that communication also needed to improve within and between areas.

- xii. Issues of workload possibly related to the working patterns of academics and a lack of clarity over these. The workload allocation model should facilitate thinking in this area.
- xiii. Consideration would be given to running something similar to the Guild's 'Call It Out' campaign. There was a need to clarify what bullying, harassment and discrimination looked like and to show that it would not be tolerated at any level and would be tackled.
- xiv. Regular feedback would be provided to highlight the action being taken to respond to the issues identified by the Staff Survey.

7. Strategy and Investment Meetings 2017

RECEIVED:

- i. A paper setting out the process and provisional outcomes of the 2017 Strategy and Investment Meetings (SIMs).

REPORTED:

- ii. SIMs provided Planning Units with an opportunity to present improving performance to the Senior Management Team (SMT) and identify areas for growth and investment ahead of detailed planning.
- iii. SIMs had now taken place with all Schools and areas of professional services. The tone had been constructive, with all areas showing a clear understanding of the University's strategy and how they might contribute to its delivery.
- iv. The following priorities for further investment had emerged across academic and professional services meetings:
 - Leadership
 - PGRs
 - 4* research outputs
 - Research support
 - IT systems
 - Careers, employability and enterprise
 - Meeting demands of the growth in student numbers and research activity.
- v. SMT would now prioritise the requests for additional resourcing, and detailed student numbers, staff FTE and financial planning would take place to finalise Plans for 2017-2020 to ensure that they were ready for approval by Council in July.

REPORTS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES

Postgraduate Research Committee

- 8. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the PGR Committee held on 7 March 2017.

9. Approval of Minor Revisions to Appendix 11 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy on Off-site and Split-site Research Degree Study (for a Single University of Liverpool Award)

REPORTED:

- i. The PGR Committee had approved minor revisions to Appendix 11 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy on Off-site and Split-site Research Degree Study (for a Single University of Liverpool Award), as follows:
 - To clarify that the requirement for completion of off/split-site agreements should be sought from the Academic Quality and Standards Division in the following circumstances:
 - where the candidate is requesting off/split-site arrangements with an institution that has an established agreement with the University of Liverpool;
 - where the candidate is part of an established Research Council cohort or DTE arrangement.
 - To reflect the revised process for approval and reporting of off-site, split-site and independent off-site arrangements.

10. Approval of Minor Revisions to Appendix 8 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy on Research Degree Examinations and Examiners

REPORTED:

- i. The PGR Committee had approved a minor update to Appendix 8 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy on Research Degree Examinations and Examiners. The revision consisted of a clarification of a candidate's use of and access to computers, the internet and/or electronic communication during the viva, and included reference to Appendix 9 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy and Procedures for Conducting Remote Viva Voce (Viva) Examinations for Research Degrees.

11. Approval of an Exemption to 4.2d of Appendix 8 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy on Research Degree Examinations and Examiners

REPORTED:

- i. Chulalongkorn University had requested an exemption to 4.2.d of Appendix 8 of the PGR Code of Practice, which prohibits supervisors from attending the viva, in the case of the existing University of Liverpool Joint PhD programme with Chulalongkorn University and the Dual Award PhD programme under development.
- ii. The PGR Committee had agreed that:
 - It would be clearly undesirable if a failure to harmonise procedures at the two institutions resulted in a requirement for students to undertake two separate viva examinations.
 - The attendance of the supervisor at the viva should therefore be permitted in the case of this partnership, subject to a written agreement providing full details that should be signed by both parties.

12. Approval of Actions to be Added to the Liverpool Doctoral College Action Plan

REPORTED:

- i. The PGR Committee had agreed that a number of actions that had been identified following a Periodic Review of the Institute of Ageing and Chronic Disease should be incorporated into the Liverpool Doctoral College Action Plan, as follows:

- Assessment of core training requirements should form part of supervisor-student discussion over Development Needs Analysis at a meeting after three months of registration;
- Development of a more thorough induction process;
- Development of progress and assessment at the end of year two;
- Better preparation of students for writing their theses;
- Investigation into whether more active academic oversight over ratification of examiners' recommendations on the award of PGR degrees was required.

Education Committee

13. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Education Committee held on 7 March 2017.

14. Languages Strategy

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a presentation on the Languages Strategy and the newly clarified teaching framework for modern language teaching at the University.
- ii. Priorities for 2016-17 included:
 - Creating state of the art virtual and physical spaces for language learning;
 - The launch of a Centre of Excellence for Language Teaching and Learning;
 - Preparing the institution wide language programme, Open Languages, for launch in September 2017.
- iii. The Education Committee had agreed that the Languages Strategy should be endorsed, subject to some practical and administrative matters being addressed, e.g. making the Open Languages programme attractive to students, timetable scheduling, potential fee bursaries and opportunities for PGR students.

15. Teaching Excellence Framework

15.1 Communication Plan and Proposals in Response to the TEF

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a presentation from colleagues in External Relations, Marketing and Communication who were developing a communication plan to respond to a number of different scenarios in respect of the University's potential TEF outcomes.
- ii. A focus of the work would include raising the profile of the Education Strategy. In addition to this, the next steps would include unpacking the positive messages in the University's TEF narrative submission into a marketing piece.
- iii. The communication plan would focus on three audiences with adjusted messaging: prospective students; current students and staff; and other key stakeholders.
- iv. The potential impact of the recent defeat in the House of Lords on an amendment to break the link between TEF and fees was not yet known. The communication plan would be a valuable piece of work and would be progressed irrespective of what might happen with the TEF.

15.2 Subject Level TEF Update

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received an oral update on the progress of the TEF and planned subject-level TEF and had noted that the intention was for the subject-level TEF to be piloted for two years, rather than one as initially indicated.

16. Employability

16.1 Employability Change Programme

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a presentation on the emerging Employability Change Programme which had been designed to support the University's Education and Research Strategies and associated implementation plans.
- ii. A shortlist of examples of institutional best practice within the sector had been identified and would be explored further.
- iii. The next stage of the project would involve stakeholder consultation and mapping of current provision to develop a comprehensive project plan.

16.2 Careers and Employability Service Report

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a paper highlighting the achievements and activities of the Careers and Employability Service (CES) in the last year and its future plans, and had agreed that the CES should be congratulated for being shortlisted in four categories for the National Undergraduate Employability Awards 2017.

17. Strategy and Investment Meetings

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received an oral update on the progress of the recent Strategy and Investment Meetings which had included good engagement with the Education Strategy. There had been significant discussion around Schools' plans in relation to employability and placements, staff teaching qualifications and portfolio activity.

18. NSS Update

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received an update on the University's current 2017 NSS response rates.
- ii. Launched on 6 February, the University's NSS response rate as of 6 March 2017 was 24%. The response rates varied considerably across departments, ranging from 9% to 38%.
- iii. The University's response rate was 10% below the same stage in the 2016 survey. However, the Ipsos MORI schedule for contacting students had changed substantially. Nationally, the response rate was 9% ahead of the equivalent point in 2016. The University was currently 28% behind the average response rate for institutions with the same launch date.

- iv. A response rate of 50% would be required to meet the NSS publication threshold. If this was not achieved there was the possibility that results might be combined with data from previous years.

Research and Impact Committee

- 19. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Research and Impact Committee held on 8 March 2017.

20. Strategy and Investment Meetings

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received an oral report on the recent Strategy and Investment Meetings (SIMs).
- ii. Themes had included research income, REF management, thematic priorities, the generation of 4* outputs, recruitment of PGR students and the Liverpool Doctoral College, and the configuration of Professional Services for research and impact objectives.

21. Progress Against Research Ambitions KPI 4 and KPI 6

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received a report summarising the University's progress against ambitions to grow world-leading outputs (KPI 4 of Strategy 2026) and the volume of research meeting policy principles 3* and 4* (KPI 6).
- ii. Progress was being made but there remained a significant gap between current performance and Strategy 2026 targets, particularly with regard to KPI 4. Considerable work had already gone into changing cultural practice and embedding strategy, but more needed to be done.
- iii. One issue was meeting policy principles while also ensuring that the University generated as much 4* research as possible. Some researchers aimed for the security of 3* rather than taking a risk and waiting for something more ambitious in the long term. In addition, under the new terms of REF2021, it was likely that there would be a requirement for one output per individual rather than a concessionary zero.
- iv. A likely consequence of the reconfiguration of REF2021 was that in practice the 4* benchmark would increase, making it more difficult to achieve 4*.

22. The University's Partnerships Framework

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received a presentation on the University's Partnership Framework from the Head of Consultancy and Partnerships, Business Gateway.
- ii. A survey conducted by Business Gateway had found different types of organisations used the University in different ways.
- iii. In the Dowling Review of Business-University Research Collaborations published in July 2015, ten factors that were key for the success of collaborations had been listed. The work of the Business Gateway team focused upon several of these factors: relationship development, availability of funding and opportunities, simplifying and accelerating contracts and organisational support and senior management buy-in.

- iv. Future Business Gateway work would include the development of new training sessions and correlation with impact case studies and research themes. Business Gateway had recently been working with the Values and Ethics Task and Finish Group to identify gaps in values and ethics specifically related to partnerships and consultancy.

23. Chair's Report

23.1 REF 2021 Consultation

REPORTED:

- i. The University was in the final stages of preparing its response to the REF2021 (Stern Review) Consultation. A broad consensus on the second REF had been reached among University departments and the draft included the following points:
- Discontent with the allocation of staff according to HESA cost centres.
 - Acceptance of the decision that 100% of research active staff must be submitted, alongside concerns around definitions of independence in researchers.
 - Support for a minimum submission of one output per individual rather than zero.
 - Support for a maximum of four outputs rather than six.
 - Preference for non-portability of outputs until the next REF.

23.2 Global Challenges Research Fund

REPORTED:

- i. The strategic planning group for the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) was now well embedded and there had been several GCRF successes: a number of MRC Foundation Awards, a NERC Award, two Royal Society Challenge grants, and a Royal Academy of Engineering grant.

Research Governance Committee

24. Annual Report of the Research Governance Committee 2015-16

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. The Annual Report of the Research Governance Committee, providing updates on the following: the Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body; the Joint Research Office Sponsorship Committee; the Clinical Trials Oversight Committee; the Committee on Research Ethics; oversight of Human Tissue; the Joint Research Office Oversight Committee; an RCUK audit; the Draft Policy on Research Misconduct; the Draft Policy on Research Integrity; and a report on research misconduct.

25. Draft Policy on Misconduct in Research

RECEIVED:

- i. A draft Policy on Misconduct in Research.

REPORTED:

- ii. The University's Policy for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct (approved in 2012) required review as feedback from individuals involved in research misconduct investigations revealed that the Policy lacked clarity on the steps taken at each stage. The review also provided the opportunity to update the Policy in light of guidance from learned societies.

- iii. The revised draft Policy borrowed heavily from the UK Research Integrity Office's *Procedure for the Investigation of Misconduct in Research* and RCUK's *Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research Policy*.
- iv. Consultation had been undertaken with the following groups: Academic Secretary's Office; Human Resources; individuals who had chaired previous formal investigations; Research Councils UK; University and College Union; and UK Research Integrity Office. The current draft attempted to incorporate suggestions from the above groups, and it had received approval from the Research Governance Committee.

AGREED:

- v. The Policy on Misconduct in Research should be approved.

26. Draft Policy on Research Integrity**RECEIVED:**

- i. A draft Policy on Research Integrity.

REPORTED:

- ii. The Universities UK *Concordat to Support Research Integrity* required institutions to support researchers in understanding and acting according to expected standards, values and behaviours in research.
- iii. The Policy provided a framework to ensure that all research is conducted in accordance with good research practice.
- iv. The Policy had been sent to the UK Research Integrity Office for comment and it had been reviewed by and received approval from the University's Research Governance Committee.

AGREED:

- v. The Policy on Research Integrity should be approved.

OTHER ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT**ACTION TAKEN BY THE VICE-CHANCELLOR ON BEHALF OF THE SENATE**

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

28. Senate Appointments to the Board of Discipline**REPORTED:**

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed that the following individuals should be re-appointed to serve a second term of three years on the Board of Discipline, until 31 July 2019:

Dr A Boyle, Earth, Ocean and Ecological Sciences
 Ms J Crane, Health Sciences
 Professor J Ralph, Electrical Engineering and Electronics
 Professor J Rudd, English.

29. Timetabling Policy**REPORTED:**

- i. The review and re-drafting of the existing Timetabling Policy had been essential in order to support the successful implementation of the revised approach to timetabling that was planned for March 2017.
- ii. A thorough consultation exercise had taken place resulting in a significant amount of valuable feedback, most of which had been included in the draft Policy. There were, however, a number of issues highlighted which fell outside the remit of the Policy, but which must be addressed in order to achieve the intended improvements to timetabling; these issues had been developed into an action plan, the implementation of which would be overseen by the Timetabling Project Board.
- iii. Following the cancellation of the January 2017 Senate meeting, the draft Timetabling Policy, which had been recommended for approval by the Education Committee, had been circulated for consideration by Senate members. No objections had been raised and, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed that the Timetabling Policy should be approved for implementation.

30. PGR Committee Recommendations

- 30.1 Revisions to Ordinances 57(A): Degree of Doctor in Philosophy (applicable to students who commenced their studies in 2014-15 and subsequently), 57(B): Degree of Doctor in Philosophy (applicable to students who commenced their studies between April 2011 and the end of 2013-14) and 57(C): Degree of Doctor in Philosophy (applicable to students who commenced their studies between 2008-09 and March 2011)

REPORTED:

- i. Following the cancellation of the January 2017 Senate meeting, proposed revised Ordinances 57(A)¹, 57(B)² and 57(C)³ had been circulated for consideration by Senate members. The revisions had been made in order to define completion of studies for Tier 4 PGR students, in accordance with UKVI requirements. No comments or objections had been received and, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to recommend to Council that the revised Ordinances should be approved. Council had approved the recommendation at its meeting held on 22 February 2017.
- 30.2 Major Revisions to Appendix 5 of the PGR Code of Practice: Policy and Procedures for PGR Students Undertaking Teaching Duties

REPORTED:

- i. Following the cancellation of the January 2017 Senate meeting, an updated Policy and Procedures for PGR Students Undertaking Teaching Duties had been circulated for consideration by Senate members. The updated Policy addressed the following key issues and changes:
 - Consistency of approach with the PGR Code of Practice and its other Appendices, and other University Codes.
 - Capturing good practice within the sector.
 - Reflecting current Faculty structures and the Liverpool Doctoral College.
 - Signposting students and staff to sources of further information.
 - Clarification of the scope of the Policy's jurisdiction.
 - Provision of definitions to provide clear explanations of the terminology used.
 - Differentiation between those undertaking wider GTA duties and those appointed to undertake a role of demonstrator in practical classes only.
 - Clarification regarding the activities that a GTA is/is not permitted to undertake.

- Articulation in some detail of the training and mentoring required to adequately prepare and support a PGR student undertaking GTA duties.
- Reinforcement of the requirement to ensure that appointment to undertake GTA activities will not adversely affect a PGR student's own studies.
- Setting out of the responsibilities of both the appointing School/Institute and GTA and the requirements for appointing a GTA.

No comments or objections had been received and, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the revised Policy and Procedures for PGR Students Undertaking Teaching Duties.

30.3 New Annexe to the Code of Practice on Assessment – PGR Examinations and Assessment: Protecting the Interests of Students in the Event of Major Disruption

REPORTED:

- i. Following the cancellation of the January 2017 Senate meeting, a proposed new Annexe to the Code of Practice on Assessment – PGR Examinations and Assessment: Protecting the Interests of Students in the Event of Major Disruption – had been circulated for consideration by Senate members. The PGR policy on this issue had not been as explicit as that for taught programmes and the new Annexe therefore filled a gap in policy.
- ii. No comments or objections had been received and, acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the Annexe.

OTHER ITEMS FOR REPORT

31. Annual Complaints Monitoring Report for the Academic Session 2015-16

RECEIVED:

- i. The annual summary report on student complaints.

REPORTED:

- ii. The new Student Complaints Policy and Procedure, which had been introduced in September 2015, included a requirement for an annual summary report on complaints considered under Stages 1 and 2 to be made to the Senate and the Council. This was the first such report under the new Policy, although it had been preceded in the previous eight years by annual reports to Senate and Council under the previous Policy.
- iii. The revised Student Complaints Policy and Procedure provided the opportunity for the early resolution of issues of concern. If students were not satisfied with any attempt to resolve concerns informally, then they could raise a complaint formally at Stage 1 through Heads of School/Institute/Service. If they remained dissatisfied with the outcome at Stage 1, there was scope to escalate matters to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor under section 2. If they remained dissatisfied having completed the internal procedures, they might have recourse to take a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).
- iv. 16 Stage 1 complaints had been received during the reporting period. The complaints received covered a wide range of topics and some complaints covered more than one issue but they had broadly been categorised into the following areas: academic matters; discrimination and human rights matters; service issues; and financial matters.
- v. 13 Stage 2 complaints had been received during the reporting period. The complaints related to various matters including: an unexpected additional fee; eligibility for a financial award; reasonable adjustments; failure to provide a programme as described; delays in handling Stage 1 complaints; supervision; use of facilities in the Guild of Students'

Building for lectures; academic support; the Laureate Complaints Procedure; handling of an Academic Integrity investigation; PGR supervision; and feedback. Of these, three had been found to be not justified, nine to be partially justified and one to be justified.

- vi. The OIA had completed its consideration of 14 cases during the reporting period. Nine of these had been deemed to be not justified, two to be partially justified, and in three cases it had been agreed by all parties that the matter should be taken back by the University for reconsideration. As only two of the cases closed by the OIA during 2015-16 had been considered partially justified (and then only in relation to minor breaches of procedures) and none wholly justified, this suggested that the University's procedures had been followed correctly in considering student cases and that those procedures and the decisions taken were adjudged by the OIA to be fair and reasonable.

32. Academic Compliance Report for the Academic Session 2015-16

RECEIVED and **NOTED**:

- i. The annual anonymised summary of the cases brought before the Assessment Appeals Committee, the Research Degree Appeals Board, the Board of Discipline and the Board of Appeal, the Fitness to Practise Panel and the Senate Committee on the Progress of Students during the 2015-16 academic session.

33. Quarter 2 Performance Report

RECEIVED and **NOTED**:

- i. A report detailing institutional and Faculty level performance against KPIs and SPIs.

34. Date of Next Meeting

NOTED:

- i. The next meeting of the Senate would be held on Wednesday 21 June 2017, at 2pm in the Brett Building.

Appendices

¹ Ordinances 57(A): Degree of Doctor in Philosophy (applicable to students who commenced their studies in 2014-15 and subsequently)

² 57(B): Degree of Doctor in Philosophy (applicable to students who commenced their studies between April 2011 and the end of 2013-14)

³ 57(C): Degree of Doctor in Philosophy (applicable to students who commenced their studies between 2008-09 and March 2011)

THIS PAGE HAS DELIBERATELY BEEN LEFT BLANK

MEETING OF THE SENATE

22 MARCH 2017

Part II: Reserved Business

35. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

AGREED:

- i. The reserved minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 2 November 2016 as an accurate record.

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

36. Students' Individual Academic Arrangements

RECEIVED:

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

AGREED:

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

37. Appointment of External Examiners

RECEIVED:

- i. Via the Senate members' intranet, a report on action notwithstanding the Code of Practice on External Examining which had been approved by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education².

AGREED:

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

38. Appointment of XJTLU External Examiner

RECEIVED:

- i. Via the Senate members' intranet, a report on the appointment of an external examiner at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University which had been approved by the head of subject at UoL and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education³.

AGREED:

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

39. Report on the Appointment of Academic Staff

RECEIVED:

- i. Via the Senate members' intranet, a report on the appointment of academic staff⁴.

Appendices

- ¹ Report on actions notwithstanding Ordinances and Regulations in relation to students' individual academic arrangements
- ² Report on actions notwithstanding the Code of Practice on External Examining
- ³ Report on the appointment of an external examiner at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University
- ⁴ Report on the appointment of academic staff