

MEETING OF THE SENATE

30 January 2019

Present: The Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Hollander, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Beveridge, Professor Kenny and Professor van der Hoek, Interim Chief Operating Officer Mrs J Tucker, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professor Clegg, Professor Endfield, Professor Grubb, Professor Sheffield, Professor Spelman-Miller, Professor Williams and Professor S Yates, Dr S Albadri, Dr Z Alker, Professors Atkinson, Balogun and Barr, Dr R Bearon, Dr K Bennett, Dr N Berry, Professors Bowcock, Buse, Caddick, Comerford, Cunliffe and Dawson, Dr E Drywood, Professors Elsheikh and Elfring, Dr R Ferrero, Dr S Finnegan, Professors Foxhall and French, Dr L Gartshore, Professors Gibson and Guillaume, Dr D Health, Professors Hertz-Fowler, Langfeld, Leek, MacEwan and Mair, Dr F Marret-Davies, Professors Marshall and McGowan, Dr E Michalopoulou, Professor Morris, Dr S Parameswaran, Professors Sanderson, Scott, Sheard and Simpson, Dr M Speed, Dr L Swan, Dr S Timme, Professors Vieira De Mello, Voelkel and Youngson.

The Vice-Presidents of the Liverpool Guild of Students and the student representatives from the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Science and Engineering were present as representatives of the student body.

In attendance: The Governance Officers and the Head of HR Policy and Engagement.

Apologies for absence were received from 21 members of the Senate.

1. Committee and Membership Matters

1.1 Welcome to New Members

- i. The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellors and the Interim Chief Operating Officer as new members of the Senate.

1.2 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 Unreserved Minutes of the Meeting Held 31 October 2018

AGREED:

- i. The unreserved minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2018 should be approved as an accurate record.

3. Review of Post-18 Funding and Education

RECEIVED:

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

REPORTED:

- ii. HEIs were still awaiting the outcomes of the Review of Post-18 Funding and Education, which were now expected in February 2019. It was likely that tuition fees would be cut, minimum entry requirements introduced and a centrally controlled finance model recommended.

4. Brexit

RECEIVED:

- i. An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor on Brexit.

REPORTED:

- ii. A no-deal Brexit was believed possible. (*Detail redacted due to commercial interest*) would be supported in the current year but there was no guarantee that it would be supported from 2019/20 in the event of a no deal. The Vice-Chancellor had written to HEIs in the European Union alerting them to the fact that individual agreements would need to be formed in the event of a no deal and discontinuation of the Erasmus+ scheme.
- iii. As the prospect of a no deal grew, the University was stepping up its institutional planning while continuing to lobby the government. Regular government announcements were being issued and acted upon. Staff would be kept informed of progress.

STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION/DECISION

5. Equality and Diversity Green Paper

RECEIVED:

- i. An Equality and Diversity Green Paper and presentation.

REPORTED:

- ii. At the October 2018 meeting of Senate, it had been agreed that a Green Paper focusing on various issues relating to equality and diversity should be brought to Senate for consideration in January 2019, followed by a White Paper to a future meeting of Senate. The final White Paper would include a set of resolutions and actions that the University could take forward over the next three to five years.
- iii. The Green Paper raised questions across a range of equality and diversity issues, with a particular focus on staff. The wider consultation on the Green Paper that would follow, which would be web-based, giving all staff the opportunity to respond individually through a portal. In addition, the project team would liaise with staff interest groups and the trades unions. A separate consultation process would be carried out with students in liaison with the Liverpool Guild of Students. Members were asked to promote the consultation on the Equality and Diversity Green Paper with departmental colleagues.

- iv. The University's Equality Framework which was approved in 2017/18 set the objectives of becoming an Employer of Choice and embedding principles of equality and diversity in leadership practices.
- v. A pay gap report had been considered at the October 2018 meeting of the Senate. HR had worked with the University and Colleges Employers' Association to launch a report concerning actions from the gender pay gap report. The University's gender pay gap action plan was being mapped against short, medium and long-term actions to address vertical and occupational segregation and to see where the University could strengthen activity.
- vi. It was intended that the University would apply for an institutional Athena SWAN Gold level award, which would be preceded in 2020 by an evaluation of current work and prioritisation of future activity.
- vii. 4.5 per cent of staff had declared a disability while 0.8 had declared a disability in relation to mental health, which was behind sector peers. The tackling of under-reporting had therefore been identified as an issue.
- viii. Work already being undertaken on disability was outlined in the paper (e.g. the Time to Change commitment). The Consultative Committee on Health and Safety, the Wellbeing Board and other groups were involved in discussions on disability support. An Inclusive Campus Steering Group had been established.
- ix. A report on the gaps in pay between individuals of different ethnicities had been included in the gender pay gap report presented at the October 2018 meeting. The work on pay gaps would continue as part of the equality action plan. In addition, other projects relating to race equality were being undertaken (e.g. an analysis of BAME staff recruitment data).
- x. The BAME staff network wished to see the practice of anonymised recruitment investigated further. It was queried whether or not now was the right time for the University to apply for the Race Equality Charter Mark, which would result in the race equality work of the University being shaped by the work to achieve the Mark. The University would be required to apply for the Mark and then work on achieving it over the following two years. The Mark would apply to student as well as staff recruitment.
- xi. Across the sector, HEIs had been considering adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of anti-Semitism, as detailed in the Green Paper. The University had referenced anti-Semitism in the Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline since its revision in 2017/18. The University also had supplementary guidance on religious observance. Senate was asked to consider what the University's definition of anti-Semitism should be and how best to promote awareness of it and make it a visible and active value of the University.
- xii. Consideration should also be given as to how anti-Semitism training could be extended to students.

NOTED:

- xiii. Other than through the pay gap data, other ways of finding out where equality and diversity issues might exist were queried. Athena SWAN working groups considered equality and diversity questions and considerable best practice had resulted from Athena SWAN action plans. In addition, feedback was collected

through staff networks such as the Disability Network. Equality action plans had been developed as a result of consultation with departments, individuals, trades unions and staff networks. However, more would need to be done to assess completion of training programmes and its impact on decision-making.

- xiv. It was queried whether the setting of numerical goals and targets would be useful. The implications of setting targets should be considered carefully.
- xv. It was thought that Equality and Diversity related policy could be more consistently applied across the University and that more could be done to increase awareness of Equality and Diversity issues among staff and students. The reasons why Equality and Diversity training was important and necessary could be highlighted more.
- xvi. Data was provided in individual Athena SWAN submissions such as information on the gender of individual staff members that could potentially be shared with other departments.
- xvii. Nearly all University departments were in the process of applying or had applied for an Athena SWAN award, which required delivering against an action plan. Central Professional Services (CPS) was not covered by Athena SWAN but more was being done to bring the work of academic departments and CPS together. The University was further engaged in Athena SWAN through the representation of its staff on national Athena SWAN assessment panels, and these colleagues brought back best practice.
- xviii. The environment statements that would be produced by Unit of Assessments for REF2021 would be a useful tool for auditing Equality and Diversity activity and enabling the sharing of best practice.
- xix. Considerable time was spent on developing Athena SWAN applications and searching for information and data that it was felt should be more easily obtainable.
- xx. A key issue in gender inequality was thought to be workloads and the absence of a viable workload allocation model.
- xxi. Underreporting of disability could be positive or negative: it could mean that staff were receiving the support required or it could mean that they had had a negative experience or that they were afraid of reporting mental health concerns. What might be influencing low reporting rates and how the University might better support colleagues with disabilities would be investigated.
- xxii. The new disability support initiatives (e.g. the Inclusive Campus Steering Group) were welcomed by Senate.
- xxiii. Guidance for students on how to make their work more accessible when presenting to disabled audiences could be investigated.
- xxiv. The Time to Change programme promoted mental health champions and in recent years staff had been invited to volunteer for the champion role. Stigma over mental health, however, was still preventing staff getting fully involved. Ways were needed to support staff to act as champions.

- xxv. Enabling staff to refer themselves to Occupational Health concerning mental health issues without having to go through their line manager was suggested.
- xxvi. It was queried whether or not disability adjustments were being carried out effectively with the systems currently in place.
- xxvii. The University would require a range of data in order to apply for the Race Equality Charter Mark, but only parts of the required data were currently available.
- xxviii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- xxix. The Department of History had been running a project to de-colonialise its curriculum. The same procedure could be carried out with regard to the Equality and Diversity of the language used by the University in its literature (e.g. in its marketing).
- xxx. The inequality that ran back through to individuals' early academic experiences was a considerable factor, which made it difficult for individuals to achieve their aspirations (and HEIs to meet their targets) in the present day.
- xxxi. *(Detail redacted due to commercial interest).* The University needed to be mindful of the language of its advertising, website, marketing materials, and so on, and use the whole set of tools available to it.
- xxxii. It was suggested that training on the University's anti-Semitism policy should be conducted prior to students arriving at the University.
- xxxiii. Information about Islamophobia was included in the University's core Diversity and Equality training.
- xxxiv. A concern was that denial of the Holocaust gained purchase in an environment of silence.
- xxxv. The opportunity to discuss differences between religious beliefs was welcomed and ways of making the subject more 'alive' to students were requested. It was suggested that something could be added to Curriculum 2021 to enable an opening up of discussion concerning Equality and Diversity and make it a more intrinsic part of the curriculum. This would link to the de-colonisation of the curriculum.

AGREED:

- xxxvi. An anti-Semitism component should be added to the University's core Diversity and Equality training to raise awareness for all staff.
- xxxvii. Thanks should be expressed to the Head of HR Policy and Engagement and colleagues for the work to date on the Equality and Diversity project.

6. Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021 Code of Practice Green Paper

RECEIVED:

- i. A REF2021 Code of Practice Green Paper and presentation.

REPORTED:

- ii. Submission of an institutional Code of Practice was a requirement of REF2021.
- iii. A consultative approach would be taken in order to develop the Code of Practice, which would be co-created with the University community.
- iv. The Code of Practice would need to contain detailed information related to internal processes put in place to manage REF2021, which would include how staff with responsibilities for research would be identified and how outputs linked to researchers and Unit of Assessments (UoA) would be identified, including consideration of individual circumstances.
- v. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- vi. The Code of Practice had to ensure transparency in decision-making. The University would need to describe how decisions were being made and communicated with timescales and individual stages set out. It would include information on committees with their terms of reference. An appeals process would need to be created and fully described in the document.
- vii. An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) would need to be undertaken on all Code of Practice processes and procedures.
- viii. Equality and Diversity would be key in REF2021. A focus of the Stern Review, published in 2016, had been the representativeness of panels and mandatory training for panellists, which was relevant at both a national and internal level. The Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel, which the Vice-Chancellor had been a member of, would oversee Equality and Diversity for REF2021 and would review all HEI Codes of Practice.
- ix. Environment statements would be required at UoA level, which would contain UoA profiles and information on the distribution on outputs and staff development.
- x. A steering group had been formed to oversee development of the Code of Practice, comprising senior staff in the Directorate of Research, Partnerships and Innovation, and meetings had been held with key staff bodies (e.g. the trades unions) to develop the first draft (i.e. the Green Paper). Following consultation with staff via a dedicated REF2021 website during February 2019, a White Paper would be developed and brought to Senate on 27 March 2019. The deadline for submission of the finalised Code of Practice to Research England was 7 June 2019.
- xi. Further guidance was expected on REF2021 from Research England imminently. It was expected that Research England would advise HEIs to implement rules at both institutional and UoA level.

NOTED:

- xii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- xiii. The greater the number of FTE staff identified for REF2021, the higher the number of outputs and impact case studies that would be required.

- xiv. The process of selecting outputs at UoA level aligned to individual staff had not yet been defined and would be set out in the Code of Practice.
- xv. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- xvi. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- xvii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- xviii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- xix. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- xx. Flexibility in deciding whether or not a researcher was 'independent' would be important. The University wanted to be inclusive. However, REF2021 guidance had made it clear that the focus was on self-directed research. The different panels had slightly different definitions of 'self-directed' research, but were clear that it excluded Post Docs who followed someone else's direction. Responsibilities of the Principal Investigators (PI) and Co-Investigators (CoI) differed across disciplines.
- xxi. Ways of ensuring a spectrum of researchers were submitted, not just those with the most experience, were required and it was important that a representative selection was submitted. The process would go through EIA assessment, which would be key.
- xxii. There were concerns about excluding Post Docs as a matter of principle when that staff body comprised individuals of varying experience and self-directed researchers.

AGREED:

- xxiii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*

REPORTS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES

Education Committee

- 7. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Education Committee held on 16 January 2019.

8. Diversity and Equality Annual Report

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received the Diversity and Equality Annual Report 2017/18, which provided an update on activity that had taken place in academic year 2017/18 to implement the University's commitment and responsibilities to diversity and equality, as well as an overview of staff and student demographic data, policy matters, charter mark updates, staff training and future objectives.
- ii. The report highlighted some key achievements including:
 - The approval and publication of the Equality Framework Action Plan in February 2018.

- The first two schools from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences achieved their first Athena SWAN awards.
 - A project on sexual consent had been delivered with a focus on student behaviour.
- iii. Other recent highlights had included the launching of a new Carers' Framework, bringing together a central resource for carers along with new guidance for managers and employees. The University's guidance and policy on supporting Trans and Gender Non-Binary staff and students would also be reviewed and updated to bring it into line with current sector best practice.
 - iv. To further progress the Equality Framework 2016-2026 and the Action Plan, new governance structures had been established to focus on the objectives and related action. Further planned engagement with key bodies in the University, including Senate, would also continue to inform activity.
 - v. During 2017/18, the number of departments holding an Athena SWAN award continued to increase. This would assist the University's longer term aspiration of applying for an institutional Gold Award for the 2019/20 assessment round.
 - vi. Further work was required to address student attainment gaps that existed within some minority groups.
 - vii. Continued work was required to educate both staff and students on the University's expectations around diversity and equality. Improving awareness and understanding on the use of language around gender orientation was highlighted as one example.
 - viii. The CIE was developing resources around inclusive curriculum. Opportunities to align this activity with the work of the Diversity and Equality Team would be explored.

9. Degree Apprenticeships

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received an oral update on progress in developing a level seven degree apprenticeship, Advanced Clinical Practitioner, within the School of Health Sciences.
- ii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- iii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- iv. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- v. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- vi. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

10. National Student Survey (NSS)

10.1 NSS Action Plans: Targeted Subjects

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a paper providing the NSS action plans for the Departments of English, Mathematics, and Sociology, Social Policy and Criminology, as well as the School of Medicine.
- ii. To help prepare for the 2019 NSS, the PVC for Education and the Director of Student Experience and Enhancement had been meeting with the Deans of four academic areas to offer support as well as to identify and implement appropriate action plans. These areas had been selected on the basis of feedback received from students during the previous NSS.
- iii. The plans, which were detailed in content, included a number of suggested 'quick wins', but also included longer term actions to further enhance the student experience.

10.2 NSS Communications Plan 2019

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a paper providing an outline of the University's communications approach for the 2019 NSS.
- ii. Whilst the NSS opened in January 2019, the University's promotion of the survey would commence on Monday 4 February 2019, which was aligned with Ipsos Mori's communications (the agency responsible for administration of the survey), to avoid duplication and confusion
- iii. In addition to encouraging students to complete the NSS, the aim of the communications plan was to make the campaign feel like a celebration and encourage students to reflect on their time at the University. This would build on recent work to encourage students to consider their whole experience at University when completing the NSS, rather than just the last few months.
- iv. As an incentive, the University would make a £1 charity donation for each student who completed the survey to Liverpool Guild of Students' charities. Students who completed the survey would also be entered into draws for a number of different prizes.
- v. The survey would be promoted to students through a variety of activities including survey completion sessions, floor stickers, off campus advertising and leaflets. Online activities would include a paid for advertising campaign on social media, reminder emails and student news stories.
- vi. The plan also included a number of activities to support staff in promoting the survey to students. These included a resource pack, a coffee morning and a number of planned emails.

11. **Plans for National Survey of Students on Postgraduate Taught (PGT) Courses**

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received an oral update on plans for a national survey of students on PGT courses, together with a copy of the letter received from the Office for Students (OfS) inviting the University to take part in an initial research survey exercise to gather the views of students on PGT courses in England.

- ii. In its letter, the OfS had explained that the aim of this research would be to gain a broad picture of the experience of PGT students at sector level. The information collected would support the regulatory activities of the OfS and help inform thinking about what shape a future census-type survey for PGT students might take. The University had agreed to participate in the survey and was awaiting further direction from the OfS.
- iii. Whilst aggregate data from the OfS research would be published in 2019, no individual providers would be identified. However, the University would receive its own aggregate level data where student anonymity permitted it.
- iv. The University did not intend to participate in this year's Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES).
- v. Irrespective of what may happen with the OfS led survey, the University would continue to consider how it could enhance its delivery of PGT provision and improve the experience of its students.

12. Academic Advising Task and Finish Group

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received an oral update on the progress of the Academic Advising Task and Finish Group, established to focus on addressing issues related to academic advising and providing more targeted support for students during transitions.
- ii. Given the extensive role of the academic advisor, the sector appeared to be moving towards a team model. In response to this, the University was considering developing a four model approach:
 - 1. The Academic Advisor – to provide advice and guidance.
 - 2. The Student Experience Team – the front facing staff who were readily accessible and could offer support.
 - 3. A role for peer mentors – to assist students transitioning to HE and beyond.
 - 4. The student – enabling the student to take a more proactive approach rather than a traditional passive role.
- iii. The intention would be to launch the new model from September 2019.
- iv. The importance of also considering the needs of students not based on campus was highlighted.
- v. The Research and Impact Committee was also considering a mentoring system for students to assist in the transition from undergraduate to postgraduate study and beyond.

13. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*

REPORTED:

- i. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- ii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

- iii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- iv. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

14. Faculty Portfolio Plans (FPPs)

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received and endorsed Portfolio Plans for the Faculties of Health and Life Science, Humanities and Social Sciences and Science and Engineering.
- ii. The FPPs detailed a snapshot of plans, where available, for the next three years until 2021/22. The Admissions Reports provided an overview of recent years' recruitment to new programmes and could be used to assess where recruitment had not achieved ambitions.
- iii. The collation of the FPPs provided the institution with a valuable overview of planned programme development and would assist in feeding into the portfolio review.
- iv. It was important to retain flexibility in the plans to facilitate innovation and ensure areas could respond to market opportunities as and when required.

15. Learning and Teaching Fellows 2018/19

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a paper providing an overview of the changes to the Learning and Teaching Fellowship Scheme as delivered this year, plus confirmation of the 2018/19 winners.
- ii. This year the Fellowship Scheme had been coordinated by the Academy. A number of changes had been made to the process, with the intention of further emphasising the focus on practice innovation and in order to make direct links to the Education Strategy.
- iii. In addition, the timing of the process had been changed to enable applications to be considered by the panel, chaired by the PVC for Education, in the Autumn and winners to be notified early in the first Semester, thereby aligning the Fellowship with the academic year.
- iv. A review of this year's process was being conducted to inform the process for 2019/20.

16. Technology Enhanced Learning Sub-Committee – Future Arrangements

REPORTED:

- i. The Education Committee had received a paper confirming the disestablishment of the Technology Enhanced Learning Sub-Committee for the academic year 2018/19. This Committee would be replaced by the Education Systems and Services Development Board, which would in turn report into the Environment, Systems and Sustainability Board.

Research and Impact Committee

17. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Research and Impact Committee held on 17 January 2019.

18. Chair's Report

18.1 Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF)

REPORTED:

- i. A consultation on proposed metrics for the new KEF was currently open with a deadline for responses of 14 March 2019. The University had been grouped with similar Russell Group institutions for the consultation and would report back as a group on how it engaged with business. A concordat would also be developed for the KEF for which a consultation would be conducted in late January/February 2019.
- ii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

18.2 *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*

REPORTED:

- i. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- ii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

19. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*

19.1 *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*

REPORTED:

- i. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- ii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- iii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- iv. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- v. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

19.2 Supporting and Resourcing Impact Case Studies for REF 2021: Impact Taskforce

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received a summary of recent activity undertaken to assess progress and projected strength of Impact Case Studies for REF 2021.

- ii. A taskforce had been established to hold meetings with Faculties in order to review progress and determine support requirements for maximising the strength of Impact submissions.
- iii. Several meetings had been held and the APVC for Research and Impact had been reassured that Faculties were engaged. There were still concerns, however, about Impact Case Studies being ready in time. Ensuring that PIs had the time to devote to the work and received full support from Central Professional Services would be key.
- iv. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

20. Research England Funding

20.1 *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*

REPORTED:

- i. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- ii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- iii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- iv. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- v. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

20.2 International Investment Initiative (i3)

REPORTED:

- i. The Research and Impact Committee had received an oral report on the University's application to the International Investment Initiative (i3).
- ii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*
- iii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest.*

Postgraduate Research Committee

- 21. The Senate received a report on the meeting of the Postgraduate Research Committee held on 15 January 2019.

22. Major Modifications

REPORTED:

- i. The PGR Committee had received a summary of feedback received as part of the consultation process and discussion of the proposed next steps required to introduce a major modifications examination outcome.

- ii. It had been agreed to use the term 'additional' rather than 'further' with regard to research during the period of major modification to emphasise that the research was not new.
- iii. It had been agreed that a fee would not be charged during the major modification period.
- iv. A single modifications period for both minor and major modifications and a change in the terminology 'minor' and 'major' had been ruled out.
- v. Some feedback had been that vivas should be not be compulsory for major modifications. It was agreed that vivas would remain a requirement for resubmissions to ensure differentiation from major modifications.
- vi. There were concerns about certain students missing out on the opportunity to pass with major modifications. It was therefore proposed that if the change was agreed, it would affect all students from a specific date (e.g. 1 September 2019) so that all cohorts were affected, which would result in fewer appeals.
- vii. The MPhil would not be not offered as an option in the event of a student failing to complete major modifications to the examiners' satisfaction. It would need to be made clear that the student would pass subject to successful completion of the major modifications.
- viii. Departments with high numbers of professional doctorates had not provided feedback as part of the consultation. Online Professional Doctorates (OPDs) had a higher proportion of resubmission rates. OPD students were permitted six months for completion of minor modifications. It was thought undesirable to have separate regulations for OPD students with regard to major corrections as parity for all doctoral students was the objective.
- ix. It was queried what the resubmission period for major corrections should be for part-time students, with a proposal for a pro-rata equivalent period.
- x. The PGR Committee had agreed that:
 - It should be stated in the guidance that students could request clarification of the major modifications, if required.
 - All examiners (internal and external) should be asked to sign off major modifications to confirm successful completion.
 - The introduction of major modifications should affect all students from a certain date (e.g. 1 September 2019) rather than there being different regulations for different cohorts. The regulation should be applicable by the date of submission of the thesis rather than date of viva.
 - A review of Ordinances should take place in the future to ascertain if the durations for part-time students to complete minor and major modifications were suitable.

The Committee had agreed to recommend to Senate that the introduction of a major modifications examination outcome for PGR vivas should be approved.

AGREED:

- xi. The introduction of a major modifications examination outcome for PGR vivas should be approved.

23. Minute redacted due to commercial interest

REPORTED:

- i. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- ii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- iii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- iv. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- v. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- vi. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- vii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- viii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- ix. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- x. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- xi. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- xii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- xiii. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*
- xiv. *Minute redacted due to commercial interest*

24. Revisions to the Policy and Procedures on the Academic Progress of Postgraduate Research Students (PGR Code of Practice Appendix 3)

REPORTED:

- i. The PGR Committee had approved proposed changes to Policy and Procedures on the Academic Progress of Postgraduate Research Students (PGR Code of Practice Appendix 3).
- ii. Revisions included:
 - the introduction of an initial consideration filter for submissions to Faculty Progress Committees;
 - broader grounds for appeal to Senate Progress Committee;
 - new procedures for Faculty Progress Committee hearings;
 - revised procedures for Senate Progress Committee hearings.

Academic Quality and Standards Committee

25. The Senate received a report on the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC) meeting held on 27 November 2018.

26. Membership of the AQSC

REPORTED:

- i. The AQSC had agreed to recommend that the Director of Student Experience and Enhancement should no longer be an ex officio member of the Committee as the directorate was already well represented by representatives from AQSD, CES and SAS.

AGREED:

- ii. The membership of AQSC should be revised such that the Director of Student Experience and Enhancement is no longer an ex officio member.

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. **Change of the Title of the Institute of Psychology, Health and Society to the Institute of Population Health Sciences**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the change of the title of the Institute of Psychology, Health and Society to the Institute of Population Health Sciences, following the transfer of the Department of Psychological Sciences to the Institute of Life and Human Sciences.

AGREED:

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

29. **Changes to University Approval Panel Membership**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the removal of Ms Rachael Lucas from the list of professional support staff and the addition of Dr Kathy Johnson to the list of academic staff of the University Approval Panel.

AGREED:

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

30. **Changes to Membership of Standing Committees for Readerships/Personal Chairs**

REPORTED:

- i. Acting on behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had approved the appointment of Professor Callum Youngson to serve as the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences representative on the Standing Committees for Readerships/Personal Chairs during 2018/19 as both Professor Paula Williamson and Professor Sarah O'Brien were unable to attend.

AGREED:

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

OTHER ITEMS TO REPORT

31. Financial Statements of the University for the Year Ended 31 July 2018

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. Via the University website, the Financial Statements of the University for the year ending 31 July 2018, as approved by the Council at its meeting on 21 November 2018.