

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL SENATE (1023)

30 JUNE 2021 / MEETING HELD REMOTELY VIA ZOOM

Present:	<p>The Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair), Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professors Birch, Brown and Hollander, Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professors Beveridge, Kenny and van der Hoek, Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellors Professors Endfield, Harkness-Brennan, Sheffield and Yates, Dr Adeyemi, Professor Albadri, Dr Alker, Professors Barr, Bearon, Berry and Buse, Dr Colquitt, Dr Costello, Professors Chalus, Cosstick and Dong, Dr Drywood, Dr Ferrero, Professors Forkert-Smith, Foxhall, Hauskeller, Lyons, Gibson, Guillaume, Konev and MacEwan, Dr Madine, Professor Marshall, Dr Michalopoulou, Professors McGowan, Morris, O'Halloran and Speed, Dr Parameswaran, Professors Patterson, Pickard, Poole and Saunders, Dr Sedghi, Professors Schewe, Semple, Sheard, Tackley, Teubner and Welsch, Dr Timme, Professors Vieira de Mello and Watkins.</p> <p>The President and two of the Vice-Presidents of the Liverpool Guild of Students and the student representatives from the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences and Faculty of Science and Engineering were present as representatives of the student body.</p>
Apologies:	Received from 10 members of the Senate.
In Attendance:	Mr J Coe, Senior Policy Advisor; Mrs M Keeley-Adamson (Committee Secretary); Mrs E Leonard, Governance Manager; Mr P Leonard, Head of Student Administration; Mr K Ryan, University Secretary and Director of Legal and Governance/Clerk to Council; Mr W Spinks from Halpin Partnership Limited; Mr P Sykes, Director of Libraries, Galleries and Museums; and Mr S Thomson, Director, Centre for Innovation in Education.

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 Meeting held 24 March 2021

AGREED:

- i. The minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2021 should be approved as an accurate record, subject to further consideration of the accuracy of minute 4.2.iv:
'Senate agreed that the matter would be revisited once the consultation had finished, at which point discussions on this topic would be possible and legally appropriate'. This

had been raised prior to the meeting of Senate and would be dealt with outside of the meeting.

[Secretary's Note: Following the meeting, the minute was amended to read as follows:

AGREED:

The matter should be revisited once the consultation had finished, at which point discussions on this topic would be possible and legally appropriate.]

3. Project SHAPE Update

RECEIVED:

- i. A paper which provided an update on Project SHAPE.

REPORTED:

- ii. In order to ensure complete transparency and scrutiny, an external assessment of the restructuring exercise, in its entirety, would be undertaken as a part of internal audit by PwC in the next academic year.

4. Chair's Report

RECEIVED:

- i. An oral update from the Vice-Chancellor.

REPORTED:

- ii. There were several updates provided to Senate in relation to COVID-19:
 - The recruitment of international students remained a concern, but the priority was to focus on securing extensions to visas, which were needed to allow staggered start dates.
 - A dedicated board from the Department of Health would be looking at quarantining students
 - Some UK universities had been setting up vaccination centres. Where this had happened, the decision had been made by local authorities. Whilst there had been no change to UK vaccination priorities, it was hoped that students would be a part of the Liverpool local vaccination planning
 - The shortening of the length of time between two doses of the COVID-19 vaccine had been approved, but there were issues with supply
 - Planning for Autumn 2021 was underway, and there was a working group looking at guidance for September. It would be argued that students should be treated the same as the general population, and the same requirements would apply to them

- There had been conversations regarding a voluntary certification scheme for high risk events, but detail around this was vague.
- iii. There were several updates provided to Senate in relation to the Post-19 Consultations:
- There were two areas being addressed. Firstly, the Augar review recommendations, and secondly, the lifelong loan
 - The Treasury was exploring ways and means to reduce the pressure on the student loan book
 - The Government wanted to be able to enable the provision of courses, and wanted these courses to be developed in line with skills gaps in the UK. Although it was not certain exactly what the interventions might be, or what parameters would be used as a means for control, it could still be possible that Government would introduce student number controls
 - A Vice-Chancellor Advisory Group was working on trying to ensure that Government understood that the lifelong learning entitlement should support flexible learning opportunities in universities. UUK was supplying data to the Government, and was modelling consequences, eg, the economic impact in localities
 - As a sector, there was rising demand for university study. It was expected that there would be 350,000 additional 18-year olds who would want to engage in higher education between now and 2030.

STRATEGIC MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

5. Student Success Framework Measures

RECEIVED:

- i. A paper by the University's Senior Policy Advisor on the Student Success Framework.

REPORTED:

- ii. The Student Success Framework set out how the University would support students to achieve their goals during their studying. There were a set of high-level goals for academic success, which had previously been set, and were provided for information. There were also high-level goals for the personal and future success strands which had been approved by Education Committee in June 2021, and would be pursued through local action and would be monitored by their retrospective boards.
- iii. Personal success related to student wellbeing, a sense of belonging and feeling a part of the University of Liverpool Community.
- iv. Future Success related to students going out into the world, an international student experience, and preparing students for the world of work.

- v. Academic Success related to the explicit consideration of how the University could close awarding gaps.

AGREED:

- vi. The Student Success Framework Measures for academic, future and personal success, should be approved.

6. Curriculum 2021 Update

RECEIVED:

- i. A paper containing an update on Curriculum 2021 (C2021).

REPORTED:

- ii. C2021, which had formed the basis for all curriculum development activities since 2018, was the framework upon which all new programmes (validation) and refreshed programmes (revalidated) must be developed and ultimately approved.
- iii. As C2021 had a time limited factor related to it, it was now timely to revisit the framework and its name and consider how it might look post-pandemic. The Liverpool Curriculum Framework set out a vision for the next few years, and built upon the strengths of C2021. The framework had been extended to encompass modes of teaching as a more integrated curriculum approach.
- iv. Emphasis was placed on the concept of drawing graduates from the region, and providing graduates for the region. The framework highlighted that this was a regional curriculum and reflected partnerships in the region.
- v. The following recommendations in relation to the Liverpool Curriculum Framework were made:
- To retain C2021 Principles, Hallmarks and Attributes
 - To rename from C2021 to Liverpool Curriculum Framework
 - To integrate teaching modes into the framework. The framework had historically prescribed what should be included, but did not navigate how it was delivered. Four teaching modes would be added: in person on campus, in person off campus, online asynchronous, and online synchronous
 - To introduce annual learning and teaching theme
 - To specify Liverpool Online in the framework
 - To add an inclusive curriculum as a principle. This was following comments made at Education Committee and had been influenced by the work being undertaken in the University surrounding the decolonisation of the curriculum, accessibility and the work with the Race Equality Charter.

- vi. The Liverpool Curriculum Framework was intended to replace C2021 from September 2021 and would run until 2026 (until such time as a new University Strategy was developed).

NOTED:

- vii. Assurance was provided to Senate of the following:
- Student feedback had been considered and was at the heart of any curriculum design process
 - The intention of the framework was not to prescribe how everyone should use the modes, but was to legitimise modes as methods for teaching and learning.

AGREED:

- viii. The Curriculum 2021 Update paper should be approved.

7. Negotiations with Elsevier in the Context of “Plan S”

RECEIVED:

- i. A presentation to accompany a paper which was submitted by the Director of Libraries, Museums and Galleries.

REPORTED:

- ii. Plan S would bring about a large increase in the need to make journal articles and conference proceedings available on an immediate open access basis. JISC was currently negotiating the renewal of the “Big Deal” agreement (which was the term associated with the renegotiation of the terms of agreement undertaken by UK higher education libraries every five years) with Elsevier, on behalf of UK universities, and huge price increases from Elsevier were likely.
- iii. UK HE institutions, negotiating through JISC, wanted to achieve a fair deal with Elsevier, which would allow staff to read Elsevier’s output, and publish in open access form in Elsevier’s journals, without additional charge.
- iv. If the current negotiations with Elsevier were to fail to achieve success it would lead to much higher payments to scientific publishers in the future, and difficulty for researchers in publishing on an Open Access basis in Elsevier subscription journals, or both. In order to succeed in the negotiations, there would be a need to confront Elsevier with a credible threat to leave the Big Deal, and to deprive them of significant revenue.
- v. In order to give the University that credible threat to withdraw from the Elsevier agreement, the University of Liverpool Library had been leading on work with ten other university Libraries to put in place arrangements which would mitigate adverse consequences of a withdrawal from the ‘Big Deal’. There were a further six Russell Group institutions that would be likely to join. The distinctive idea behind this work was

the adoption of a shared collections approach, where the participating universities draw upon each other's holdings to satisfy the requirements of their researchers.

- vi. An exercise had been carried out which modelled how this would work in practice, which showed that, in the event of an Elsevier cancellation, the University would still be able to supply 100% of the articles that researchers needed for their work, though there would be a slight delay in respect of some titles.
- vii. The desired outcome would be to obtain a read and publish deal with no significant price increase, and to be able to publish without additional payment. This deal already existed with most publishers and thus was considered a realistic aspiration.
- viii. The consequences of negotiations being unsuccessful were as follows:
 - The University would be given the conditions that were asked for, but at unreasonable price. This would result in significant financial restraints (possibly requiring a budget top up in the millions for the Library) and could potentially unravel existing satisfactory deals with other publishers
 - The University would achieve a reasonable subscription price, but the deal would not cover open access publication for our researchers in Elsevier subscription journals
 - The relationship with Elsevier could be significantly damaged if researchers who wished to publish in the journal were to find an alternative, or public access journal.

NOTED:

- ix. Government could be lobbied regarding the matter. It was confirmed that Government had previously been made aware of the dysfunctionality of the market.
- x. This matter would affect all institutions and not just the University of Liverpool, therefore, any action taken would be on behalf of the sector.

AGREED:

- xi. The paper on Negotiations with Elsevier in the Context of "Plan S" and its proposals should be endorsed and the Director of Libraries, Museums and Galleries should be thanked for his valuable work and contributions.

8. REPORTS OF THE SUB COMMITTEES

8.1 Research and Impact Committee

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. A report of the Research and Impact Committee meeting, held on 10 June 2021, covering the following items:

- REF 2021
- Research Income
- Project Rise Update
- Negotiations with Elsevier in the Context of “Plan S”.

8.2 PGR Committee

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. A report from the PGR Committee meeting held on 2 June 2021, covering the following items:
 - Updates to the PGR Code of Practice
 - XJTLU 100% Supervision Proposal
 - PGR Recruitment Project
 - PGR Funding Extensions
 - Impact on COVID Log.

AGREED:

- ii. The updates to the PGR Code of Practice should be approved as follows:
 - All UoL PGRs must complete the mandatory training; there will be no exemptions or opportunities to opt-out
 - Non-completion of mandatory training within the specified period communicated to students by the University will result in withdrawal. Once the policy is embedded (from 21/22 onwards), all first-year students will be required to complete it during year 1 in order to progress to year 2
 - Monitoring of completion of mandatory training will be done by supervisors and will feed in to the APR
 - The mandatory training will apply to all PGRs, including those enrolled for on campus professional doctorates, MDs, collaborative partnerships etc
 - All currently enrolled candidates are required to complete the training prior to examination.

8.3 Education Committee

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. A report from the Education Committee meeting held on 2 June 2021, covering the following items:
 - Policies and Procedures
 - Policy on the Recording and Use of Student Names, Gender Identifiers and Pronouns
 - Student Attendance Policy
 - Student Success Framework Measures
 - Beyond Curriculum 2021 (C2021) – Liverpool Curriculum Framework
 - Library Regulations Update

- Student Debt, Sanctions and Terms and Conditions
- Preparations for Welcome 2021
- Updates from the Student Success Boards
- Sir Alastair Pilkington Awards and The Learning and Teaching and Student Experience Awards.

AGREED:

- ii. The following items should be approved:
- Student Attendance Policy (*dealt with as a substantive item by Senate – see minute 9 below*)
 - Student Success Framework Measures (*dealt with as a substantive item by Senate – see minute 5 above*)
 - Beyond Curriculum 2021 (C2021) – Liverpool Curriculum Framework (*dealt with as a substantive item by Senate – see minute 6 above*).

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

- iii. The following items should be approved:
- Library Regulations Update – This involved a proposed minor change to the Library Regulations to reflect updated reporting structures, and to allow more agile decision making and improve business resilience where necessary. In this updated iteration, the Deputy Director and Associate Director Engagement and Innovation had authority, in addition to the University Librarian, to suspend or alter regulations in special circumstances. The default position would be that suspension or alteration of regulations would always be approved by the University Librarian/Director when they were available.
 - Policy on the Recording and Use of Student Names, Gender Identifiers and Pronouns (*dealt with as a substantive item by Senate – see minute 11 below*).

8.4 Report on Collaborative Provision Committee's Chair Action: Renewal of the Articulation Partnership with Taylor's University, Malaysia

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. The Institutional Review of the articulation partnership with Taylor's University had taken place on 22nd and 23rd April 2021. Under the current arrangement, students registered on the Taylor's LLB Law programme who satisfied the relevant entry criteria as defined by the University of Liverpool would be able to articulate into Level 5 or 6, as appropriate, of the corresponding University of Liverpool programme.
- ii. The Institutional Review Panel was assured of the quality and standards of the provision delivered by Taylor's, and which contributed towards the University of Liverpool award. It was agreed that the arrangement continued to be appropriate and of benefit to the University, and the Panel recommended that the partnership be renewed for a further period of five years.

- iii. The recommendation to renew the partnership had been endorsed by Chair's Action, on behalf of the Collaborative Provision Committee.

AGREED:

- iv. The renewal of the Articulation Partnership with Taylor's University, Malaysia should be approved.

OTHER ITEMS FOR APPROVAL / NOTE

9. Student Attendance Policy

RECEIVED:

- i. A copy of the Student Attendance Policy.

REPORTED:

- ii. The policy had been written as the first step in the University's journey towards a more intuitive and effective system of recording and monitoring attendance: one that aligned closely with the Student Success Framework.
- iii. The policy established an important principle of students as co-owners and co-creators of their attendance data and envisaged the delivery of an enhanced and accessible system for them to record attendance and/or manage their absence within a supportive environment that encouraged interactions and strengthened the focus on their welfare and success.
- iv. The policy was expected to be rolled out for the academic session 2022/23.

NOTED:

- v. IT developments were critical with regard to this policy and there were concerns that current systems would not be able to deliver the requirements set out in the policy. It was confirmed that an enhanced system would be rolled out in tandem with the policy.
- vi. The 70% attendance requirement which was included in the policy would potentially trigger stage 1 referrals in some areas.
- vii. The policy was extensively discussed at the Attendance and Engagement Steering Group and had its full support and was scrutinised and supported by Education Committee.

AGREED:

- viii. The Student Attendance Policy should be approved.

10. Fee Payment Policy

RECEIVED:

- i. A copy of the revised Fee Payment Policy with key changes highlighted.

REPORTED:

- ii. The Fee Payment Policy established the framework for mitigating risks associated with the collection of student fees. The collection of student fees was a critical function in order to secure the financial sustainability of the University. Failure to collect fees due in a timely manner throughout the year would place a risk on the University's cash flow position; it would also place students at risk of not completing their programme which would ultimately have a negative effect on performance indicators and financial sustainability.
- iii. There were challenges in managing a complex range of payment plans. The plans for tuition and accommodation fees would be consolidated in respect to automated collection and there would be a discontinuation of the use of some plans.
- iv. The policy had been updated to accommodate the necessary annual updates to reflect the 2021/22 fee collection, refund and Student Loan Company (SLC) fee loan liability dates. Further updates had been made following on from the meeting of Formal Senior Leadership Team on 1 June 2021 to include the approved recommendations as follows:
 - To formally remove the restriction of Library services and MWS account access as an in- year academic sanction for those who remain in tuition fee debt
 - To introduce an alternative in-year sanction which restricted access to selected online administrative services
 - To retain the current end-of-year sanctions (i.e. the prevention of re-registration and graduation) to those who remained in tuition fee debt at the relevant checkpoints
 - To introduce a consolidated payment plan for all HEU (and PGR OSI) self-funded students, that aligned with the postgraduate funding disbursement schedule determined by the SLC (i.e. three equal instalments in November, January and April)
 - To retain the current consolidated payment plan for all non-PGR OSI students (i.e. 60% instalment in September and remaining 40% by February)
 - To discontinue the use of all automated instalment/collection plans, focussing instead on simplified plans with diversified online payment options, and enhanced reminder/chasing processes
 - To consolidate accommodation fee payment plans into one; offering three equal instalments, collected in October, January and April.

AGREED:

- v. The Fee Payment Policy should be approved.

11. Policy on Student Names, Gender Identifiers and Pronouns

RECEIVED:

- i. A copy of the Policy on the Recording and Use of Student Names, Gender Identifiers and Pronouns.

REPORTED:

- ii. The draft Policy on the Recording and Use of Student Names, Gender Identifiers and Pronouns had been developed to formalise the process of recording and amending students' legal names for graduation and certification purposes; and to address current limitations in how the University facilitated the recording and broader use of student names (including preferred names and honorifics), gender identifiers and pronouns.
- iii. The policy supported the University's commitment to providing an environment which recognises and values people's differences, prioritises their wellbeing and belonging, and supports students to maximise their potential to succeed. It did so by establishing how the University wished to support the use of a range of identifiers by the members of its student community, and by outlining the ways in which these identifiers were to be held, amended and proliferated throughout its associated student IT systems.
- iv. By establishing these principles and data processes, the policy provided the necessary platform for developing wider diversity and equality policies that outlined how these identifiers were to be adopted and used by members of the whole University community.
- v. The policy aligned closely with the Personal Success strand of the Student Success Framework and directly sought to foster a welcoming and supportive environment by identifying and driving actions that address current obstacles to student wellbeing and belonging (e.g. the inability for students to indicate a preferred name, and for that name to be used across University IT systems).
- vi. The policy could not be implemented successfully with IT systems as they were now, and it was therefore proposed that full policy implementation is aligned with an agreed plan for system development. A specification for these system improvements had already been developed, and consultation with CSD regarding a timeline for implementation will be developed upon approval of this policy. It was expected that a target date for full policy implementation can be agreed following the approval of the policy.

NOTED:

- vii. The policy had been subject to a detailed consultation exercise and had also recently been endorsed by the University's Formal Senior Leadership Team. Education Committee had also agreed to recommend the policy for approval.

- viii. There was some concern as to how the policy would be implemented, namely, what would happen to staff who did not comply with the policy. It was suggested that this should be discussed at the newly formed Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee.
- ix. A concern was noted as to how the use of pronouns may affect research into sociological approaches to gender studies.
- x. The policy had been backed by transgender students.

AGREED TO RECOMMEND:

- xi. The draft Policy on the Recording and Use of Student Names, Gender Identifiers and Pronouns should be recommended for approval, subject to further consideration of the concerns raised by a Senate member regarding the impact on research into sociological approaches to gender studies.

12. Academic Compliance Report for the Academic Session

RECEIVED and NOTED:

- i. A report containing the annual anonymised summary of 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. All cases related to the 2019/20 academic session unless otherwise stated.

13. Guild Articles of Association and Byelaws

RECEIVED:

- i. A copy of the Guild's Articles of Association and Byelaws.

REPORTED:

- ii. Language had been made more gender neutral and committee names had been updated along with changes to the Guild Summit and changes to societies. The Guild Summit was a democratic decision making body, which previously randomly selected students to attend. The change meant that students would be allowed to serve for one Semester. This was based on feedback received by the Guild that students enjoyed participating.
- iii. Work had been undertaken by the Guild to review current Membership levels. The Guild Bye-Laws currently listed a number of types of Membership. Based on the institutional review recommendations, feedback from students and conversations that were held with University colleagues, it was deemed that the categories of Full and Associate Membership should be reviewed. It was proposed that there should be one category of Full Member, and two types of Associate Membership. The status of Online students

had been one of the most difficult and it was proposed that Online students should remain as Associate Members. This should be reviewed in 12 months.

- iv. Moving forward, the Guild and the University would maintain a shared record of partnerships and agreements that conferred Associate Membership on relevant students. Where the University would be setting up new partnerships or agreements it was proposed that they liaise with the Guild to ascertain whether Associate Membership for relevant students would be appropriate, and if so at what level.

NOTED:

- v. A register of individual Associated Members was not currently maintained. This was because the Guild, and in some cases the University, did not have access to the lists of relevant students at partner institutions.
- vi. Many charities were going through a similar process in order to update their governing documents in order to reflect new practices due to COVID-19.
- vii. The Guild Liaison Committee was supportive of the changes.
- viii. This was the last meeting of Senate that the current Guild President would attend, and he was thanked for his contributions and work over the past two years.

AGREED:

- ix. The revised Guild's Articles of Association and Byelaws should be endorsed.

14. Letter from External Examiners

NOTED:

- i. A question was raised regarding a public letter addressed to Senate, which had been written and signed by some of the University's external examiners.
- ii. Senate was given the assurance that quality and standards were paramount, and that a response to the letter would be written once the University Board of Examiners had met. Senate was also assured that assessment and marking was being carried out in line with the Code of Practice on Assessment and Appendix 2 to Annex D, which had been agreed by Senate in 2016 and had been implemented to protect the interests of students in periods of major disruption.

15. Date of Next Meeting

NOTED:

- i. The next meeting would take place on Wednesday 10 November 2021 at 2pm.