Present: Professor T Jones (Vice-Chancellor, Chair), Dr A Adeyemi, Dr A Alsalloum, Professor L Anderson, Dr H Arnolds, Professor K Atkinson, Professor M Baylis, Professor R Bearon, Dr C Belfrage, Professor K Bennett, Dr M Berenbrink, Professor G Brown, Professor P Buse, Professor R Chiverrell, Professor K Crolley, Professor K Coleman, Dr S Cornell, Dr L Corner, Dr C Costello, L Dubbins (Guild Vice-President), Professor G Endfield, Professor C Eyers, Dr K Furman, Professor B Gibson, Professor L Harkness-Brennan, E Hatch (Guild Vice-President), Professor A Hollander, Professor B Konev, A Lavercombe (Student Representative), Dr H Little, Professor G Lynall, Professor D MacEwan, Professor D Mair, Dr C Malathouni, K Manley (Guild Deputy President), Professor A Marshall, Professor P Murray, Professor V Mitsilegas, Dr E Ormandy, Dr S Parameswaran, Professor E Patterson, Professor I Prior, Professor S Rocha, Dr M Rose, Professor H Scott, Professor S Sheard, Professor L Sheffield, Professor M Speed, Professor J Surroca, Professor T Teubner, Professor M Towsey, Professor W van der Hoek, Professor F Watkins, Professor C Welsch, Professor R Williams, Dr B Wilm and Dr J Wolf.

Apologies: A Al-Irhayim (Student Representative), Professor J Balogun, Professor N Berry, Professor F Beveridge, Professor J Bridgeman, Professor I Buchan, Professor P Clegg, Professor J Curran, Professor M D’Onofrio, Professor A Fell, Dr L Gahman, Dr N Helassa, B Holt (Student Representative), Professor D Jeater, Professor L Kenny, Professor C Leek, Professor A Lyons, Professor C McGowan, Professor K O’Halloran, Professor S Pickard, Professor D Prescott, Professor P Shirlow, Professor R Smith, Professor H Stafford, V Samuels (Guild President) and Professor T Walley.

In Attendance: University Secretary and General Counsel, K Ryan, Governance Officer, M Keeley-Adamson, and Head of Governance and Deputy Secretary, E Leonard.

1. Disclosures of Interest

Members of the Senate were invited to disclose any interests in relation to the items on the agenda. None were raised.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

2.1 Minutes of the Meeting Held on 16 November 2022

AGREED:

i. The minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2022 should be approved, subject to the following amendments:

- Minute 1.4: Standing Orders – To indicate that the changes relating to clarifying the mechanism for reviewing and amending the Standing Orders, clarifying the anonymous voting procedure to stipulate that an electronic
ballot would involve all those members in attendance, and clarifying the voting procedure for motions by harmonising it with that for recommendations would be addressed with immediate effect and not deferred for consideration as part of the Senate effectiveness review.

- Minute 2.2.1: Matters Arising on the Minutes (Institute of Systems, Molecular and Integrative Biology Restructure) – To specify what the proposed restructure was, namely, to disestablish the Department of Molecular Physiology and Cell Signalling (MPCS), and to include the following wording: ‘The University had acknowledged in the summer that the correct consultation process had not been followed when the proposal was first presented to Senate’.

- Minute 5: National Student Survey (NSS) 2022 – To add the following wording ‘NSS results would have been significantly negatively impacted by the local industrial dispute’.

- To review the attendance list to ensure it was an accurate reflection. In future, the names of members not present would be included in the Apologies section.

2.2 Matters Arising on the Minutes

2.2.1 Restructure of the Institute of Systems, Molecular and Integrative Biology (ISMIB) and Disestablishment of the Department of Molecular Physiology and Cell Signalling (MPCS) (Minute 2.2 refers)

RECEIVED:

i. An oral update from the Executive Dean of ISMIB on the proposal to disestablish the Department of MPCS.

REPORTED:

ii. A formal consultation had taken place after the June 2022 meeting of Senate which had included meetings held with the Trade Union (TU), three staff group meetings, and individual consultation meetings. The consolidated notes of the meetings had been shared with and agreed by the TU. The next step was to present the consolidated notes to the Faculty Leadership Team (FLT) to discuss the three options: continue, stop, re-evaluate and restart. Once a decision had been reached by the FLT, a paper would be submitted to the Senior Leadership Team following which Senate would be informed of the outcome. This was an ongoing process and, if there were any material changes, the item would be brought back to Senate.

2.2.2 Senate Papers

NOTED:

i. A concern regarding the receipt of Senate papers. Papers should be circulated to Senate members at least seven days in advance to allow the opportunity for members to read information. The timely receipt of papers was also important for equality, diversity and inclusion related matters. In addition, there had been several reports of new members being unable to access the papers via SharePoint.
ii. These issues would be addressed by the Governance team.

2.3 Report on Action Taken by the Chair on Behalf of Senate

i. Since the last business meeting of Senate, the Vice-Chancellor had taken action on its behalf as follows:
   - To approve a request that the Faculty Postgraduate Office should be repositioned as a fifth Directorate within the Faculty structure. This would be led by an APVC for Postgraduate Affairs and would be supported by a Head of Postgraduate Strategy and Partnerships.
   - To approve revisions to Appendix A to the Student Complaints Policy and Procedures which included clarification of when complaints would go to the Major Disruption Panel.

AGREED:

ii. The actions taken by the Chair on behalf of Senate should be endorsed.

3. Vice-Chancellor's Report

RECEIVED:

i. An oral report from the Vice-Chancellor.

REPORTED:

ii. A Strategic Review would commence at a Senior Leadership Team Away Day scheduled for 30 January 2023. Members would be able to contribute to this process through Senate meetings and other fora.

iii. Graduation ceremonies had taken place in December 2022, including a special event to confer honorary degrees that had been deferred due to COVID-19. Honorary graduates were an important part of the University’s community and it was expected that the process would revert to the previous model, with honorary degrees being awarded during degree ceremonies.

iv. The University had appointed Judge Wendy Beetlestone as Chancellor. Judge Beetlestone was the University’s 11th Chancellor and its first female and first Black Chancellor. Judge Beetlestone was an alumna of the University and had received an Honorary Degree in 2019. In addition, her outstanding professional achievements included being nominated by US President Barack Obama in 2014 to serve as a District Court Judge. Judge Beetlestone would attend the graduation ceremonies later in 2023.

v. The Government’s Autumn budget statement had confirmed the maintenance of the commitment to spend £20bn on research and development funding.

vi. At Government level, there were two issues that would likely affect international students: proposals to change post-study work visas to a six month period and discussions regarding dependants. An announcement was expected in the coming days.
vii. The University had launched its Climate Plan which set out its ambitions to reach Net Zero by 2035. Information was available on the University website and colleagues were encouraged to engage with the plans. Delivery would be challenging, but there were many different ways in which colleagues could participate.

viii. Over the coming weeks, the University would face industrial action. ‘Action short of a strike’ would run until April 2023 and UCU had called for a further 18 days of action in February and March 2023. The University was prepared to mitigate the impact that any strike action would have on students. This was a collective UK-wide action and the University was reliant on national negotiations to resolve disputes. Discussions between UCU and the bodies representing universities in these matters (UCEA in relation to pay, and UUK in relation to pensions), were continuing at a national level, and the University was hopeful that a resolution could be reached. During this time, it was important that the different views and positions of colleagues were respected.

ix. Congratulations should be extended to the winners of this year’s Learning and Teaching Fellowships. Dr Warren Donnellan, Dr Raheela Awais and Dr David Newsham had been recognised for their outstanding contributions to the innovation and development of educational practice.

x. Further congratulations were extended to: Professor Nigel Cunliffe who had been awarded an OBE for services to infectious disease and vaccine research in the 2023 New Year Honours list; to Executive Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Louise Kenny who had received her CBE after being recognised in the 2022 list; and to ophthalmologist Professor Simon Harding who had received his MBE and had also been recognised in the 2022 honours.

xi. In future, Vice-Chancellor updates would be submitted to Senate as a brief paper and there would be an opportunity for members to raise questions relating to the content during the meeting.

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT/DISCUSSION/NOTE

4. Research Publications and Copyright Policy

[The Director of Libraries, Museums and Galleries, Dr Matt Greenhall, attended for this item.]

RECEIVED:

i. A copy of the Research Publications and Copyright Policy.

REPORTED:

ii. The implementation of such a policy had previously received endorsement by Senate.

iii. The policy would ensure that University of Liverpool researchers would retain the rights to make the accepted manuscripts of their journal articles and conference proceedings openly accessible. The policy sought to achieve three goals:

- To confirm and assert staff members’ own copyright for scholarly work
• To comply with open access mandates and allow the sharing of work, granting the University non-exclusive, irrevocable global access
• To maximise research choice and allow a straightforward and simple way to maximise the impact of research and scholarly outputs.

iv. Once the policy had received approval, it would be implemented from March 2023. A communications campaign would run alongside the implementation which would highlight how to enact the policy.

NOTED:

v. There was a wider sector movement around rights retention and the University was working with ‘Northern 8’ (N8) institutions along with other Universities (e.g. Cambridge, Edinburgh).

vi. Giving researchers rights to their own work via the policy was in line with the University’s commitment to making research open and available quickly. It also contributed to building the University’s reputation.

vii. Clarification was received in relation to the following:

• A Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), or later, would allow authors to freely copy and redistribute material in any medium or format and to remix, transform and build upon the material for any purpose. CC BY 4.0 copyright transfer would apply to the whole paper that authors were named on
• The policy would come into effect on 1 March 2023 and would relate to papers and conference proceedings submitted to journals from that date. No retrospective action was required by academics relating to materials already uploaded into Elements prior to this date
• Springer Nature had accepted the principle of rights retention during ongoing national negotiations.

AGREED:

viii. The Research Publications and Copyright Policy should be approved.

5. Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) Submission

RECEIVED:

i. A copy of the University’s TEF Submission.

REPORTED:

ii. The University’s TEF Provider Submission had been submitted to the OfS ahead of the deadline of 24 January 2023.

iii. For the OfS, the TEF aimed to encourage Higher Education providers to improve and deliver excellence in the areas that students cared about the most: teaching, learning and student outcomes. It achieved this by assessing and rating universities and colleges for excellence above a set of minimum requirements for quality and standards.
iv. The University's submission had benefited from input from colleagues from across the institution and had been overseen by an internal TEF Working Group. Overall, it was felt that the submission provided a positive narrative of the University’s work in supporting its students.

v. Since the TEF submission had been received by Senate, some further minor changes had been made.

vi. Submissions would be assessed in the period February to June 2023 with the result expected in July/August. Following a period of internal review (allowing for challenge to the result if necessary) all submissions and results would then be published in September. The rating received would be one of Gold, Silver, Bronze or Requires Improvement and would last for four years.

vii. In addition to the University TEF submission, the Guild had developed a further submission based on feedback from students. Unlike the University TEF submission, the Guild submission (which was led by the Guild President) was not mandatory. It provided a good narrative on achievements and how the Guild and the University could continue to work in partnership.

AGREENED:

viii. Formal thanks should be extended to all colleagues who contributed to the TEF submission and to the Guild for their contribution.

ix. The final copy of the TEF submissions from the University and Guild would be shared with members of Senate. The results along with the submission would be published externally once the assessment process was complete, but there were no restrictions on sharing the documents internally at this stage.

6. Student Success Boards: An Update on Objectives and Priorities

[The Director of Student Experience, Dr Paul Redmond, and the Director of Careers and Employability, Iwan Williams, attended for this item.]

RECEIVED:

i. A presentation from the Chairs of the University’s three Success Boards.

REPORTED:

ii. The Student Success Framework had been launched in 2020 and was designed to ensure that students had every opportunity to achieve their own version of success by promoting the right opportunities to help them thrive. There were three strands to the Framework; academic success, personal success, and future success, which resulted in the formation of three Success Boards.

iii. The Academic Success Board had agreed to focus on four cohorts for the three years of their University education which would allow for real-time interventions to be carried out. These cohorts were as follows:

- Care Experienced Students
- International Students
- Participation of Local Areas 4 (POLAR 4), Quintile 1
• Black Students.

iv. The Personal Success Board had agreed to focus on wellbeing, being active, and developing personal resilience. The Board was also supporting 'Feelgood February' which included a series of events at the University throughout the month of February 2023.

v. The Future Success Board had agreed to focus on embedded employability and reducing the gaps in graduate outcomes between student groups. The aims of the Future Success Board and Careers and Employability aligned closely and they would work together to maximise the influence of the Future Success Board and to ensure students had the best chance of achieving success by:

• Developing an employability narrative and creating energy and purpose to work toward strategic goals
• Offering more opportunities across the institution e.g. employer projects, peer-to-peer, internships, campus jobs, challenges, societies, volunteering etc.

vi. Student success could only be achieved through better co-ordination of assets and resources:

• Pedagogy and curriculum design and delivery
• Academic advising and peer mentoring
• Learning and teaching support
• Central support services e.g. the KnowHow academic skills programme.

vii. Progress had been made where there were existing teams in place to carry out work (e.g. Careers and Employability; Global Opportunities), but the Success Boards faced a number of challenges:

• The Student Success Framework was not yet fully embedded into the day-to-day work and language of the University
• The Success Boards would need to find a different way of working that allowed them to make more data-driven decisions about where to intervene and to evaluate interventions. The Boards had discussed moving away from a committee model to a workshop model to enable this.

**NOTED:**

viii. The University was ahead of the sector in its approach to student success and how it was defined. Good progress was being made in closing gaps, but there were areas where progress had not been made quickly enough, e.g. the University did not recruit enough Black students.

ix. The University had a target for 25% of students to travel globally as part of their studies by 2025. In order to achieve this, the University could:

• Reduce barriers for students accessing global travel opportunities
• Ensure the right support and advice was available for students
• Create a wider portfolio of global partners (including alumni who owned businesses globally) in order to create a stronger offer.
x. The Boards were aware of the challenges faced by students during the cost of living crisis. There were opportunities that could be created by the University to enhance employment opportunities during study including campus jobs and opportunities that were embedded in modules to provide access to employers. However, more work needed to be carried out.

xi. The Boards were using both qualitative and quantitative data in their evaluations.

xii. Colleagues were welcome to visit the Careers and Employability Studio.

xiii. The Director of Careers and Employability would work with the Senate representative from Architecture to explore if any value could be added to their current international opportunities processes.

7. Programme Review Statement

RECEIVED:

i. A copy of the Programme Review Statement.

REPORTED:

ii. Acting on the sector’s behalf, Universities UK (UUK) had committed members to publish a Programme Review Statement as part of its commitment to OfS and the DfE to improve the transparency of processes and oversight that universities undertake to secure their awards.

iii. The development of the Programme Review Statement was currently undertaken on a voluntary basis.

iv. Data dashboards would be updated to include the revised OfS Condition of Registration: B3 - Priority Areas for Assessment.

AGREED:

v. The Programme Review Statement should be approved, subject to a minor amendment being made to the periodic review section to also include reference to further information being requested by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee at Faculty and University level if appropriate actions are not progressed.

8. Update on Attendance Policy

[The Director of Student Experience and Enhancement, Dr Paul Redmond, attended for this item.]

RECEIVED:

i. A paper providing an update on the University’s new Student Attendance Policy, with a proposal to delay the roll out of the policy.

REPORTED:

ii. Following recommendations from the Student Attendance Project Steering Group and feedback from Faculties, it was proposed that the introduction of the
University’s new Student Attendance Policy should be delayed to the start of Semester 1, 2023/24.

iii. During Semester 1 2022/23, new functionality to record both student attendance at mandatory timetabled activities and requests for authorised absences outside scheduled vacation periods had successfully been adopted in the majority of academic areas in each Faculty. Faculties now had access to near real-time attendance data via a suite of reports designed to support enhanced attendance monitoring, reporting and the delivery of timely interventions.

iv. By delaying the introduction of the new Student Attendance Policy, Faculty education leadership teams would have time to review attendance data for their programmes, and reaffirm the importance of attendance, including investigating and taking action on any underlying issues or factors which may be contributing to poor attendance.

NOTED:

v. Some areas of the University had undertaken a trial of the new Student Attendance Policy and the following concerns were raised:
   - Attendance records did not reflect the reality of the classroom: there was anecdotal evidence to suggest that there had been instances of students using WhatsApp groups to share codes which was being explored further
   - The tone of the automated emails was considered punitive, which did not support the pastoral care elements of the policy
   - The system was not adequately resourced and it was incumbent on existing staff to make changes.

vi. The University was also implementing a new CRM system and colleagues were currently working on specifications for the first stage of the project. A new CRM system would support colleagues in following up with students on poor attendance and would allow for more nuance in communications with students. The timescales for delivering the new CRM system would align with the proposed changes to the Student Attendance Policy roll out.

vii. Ideas which could impact positively on student attendance included:
   - Working with advisers to deliver ‘good academic advising’. Advisers were often the first people who would know what individual and nuanced student needs were and would be able to engage with these students
   - Additional resource could be considered for mental health services at the University. There were instances of students who faced long waiting times for support plans which had been exacerbated by the mental health epidemic
   - Some areas of the University had used data at the start of lectures to show students the correlation between attendance and performance.

AGREED:

viii. The roll out of the University’s new Student Attendance Policy should be delayed to the start of Semester 1, 2023/24.
9. **Accounts of the University for the Year Ended 31 July 2022**

RECEIVED and NOTED:

i. A copy of the accounts of the University for the year ended 31 July 2022.

**BUSINESS FROM FACULTIES**

No business received from the Faculties

**REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES**

10. **Education Committee**

RECEIVED:

i. A report on the meeting of the Education Committee held on 17 January 2023, covering the following items:

- Draft TEF Submission *(dealt with as a substantive item by Senate – see minute 5 above)*
- Employability Priorities for the Year
- Regulatory Changes (Changes to the National Student Survey for the 2023 Survey and Office for Students: Student Outcomes (Condition B3): Priority Areas for Assessment)
- Update on Progress Against National Student Survey Action Plans
- Liverpool Online Portfolio Development
- Student Success Framework Update *(dealt with as a substantive item by Senate – see minute 6 above)*.

NOTED:

ii. Since the Education Committee had met, there had been an update in relation to Graduate Outcomes data. The latest data would need to be verified, but it indicated that 80.9% of University of Liverpool graduates were in highly skilled employment. This was a 7.1% increase on the previous year.

11. **PGR Committee**

RECEIVED:

i. A report on the meeting of the PGR Committee held on 16 January 2023, covering the following items:

- Regulatory Changes – Office for Students: Complying with Conditions of Registration
- PGR Leadership and Governance Update
- Actions Taken by the Chair Since the Previous Meeting of the PGR Committee
- School of Electrical Engineering, Electronics and Computer Science Internal Periodic Review Report and Action Plan
- School of the Arts Internal Periodic Review Progress Report
- PGR System Update
- RISE Consultation.
NOTED:
  ii. The University would be running the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) over a four week period during this semester.

12. Research and Impact Committee

RECEIVED:
  i. A report on the meeting of the Research and Impact Committee held on 19 January 2023, covering the following items:
     - Research Publications and Copyright Policy (Rights Retention Policy) *(dealt with as a substantive item by Senate – see minute 4 above)*
     - RISE Phase 3 Consultation
     - University’s Research Development Concordat Action Plan.

NOTED:
  ii. In light of the importance and significance of RISE, a proposal was made to hold an extraordinary meeting of Senate to discuss RISE in detail.
  iii. Some colleagues had not received an individual invitation via email to interact with RISE consultation meetings and it was important that the consultation events were communicated widely.
  iv. Work was ongoing in relation to the ‘narrative statement’ strand of RISE.

AGREED:
  v. Rather than scheduling an extraordinary meeting, it should be possible to address the issues through the significant number of opportunities to engage with the consultation that had been scheduled, and by ensuring that the focus of the March Senate meeting would be on this item.

13. Collaborative Provision Committee

RECEIVED and NOTED:
  i. A report on the meeting of the Collaborative Provision Committee held on 13 December 2022, covering the following items:
     - XJTLU Updates
     - Global Opportunities Updates
     - Brickfields Asia College – Singapore: Site Visit Report
     - Recruitment Agreement Approval Process Proposal.

14. Date of Next Meeting

NOTED:
  i. The next meeting of Senate would be held at 2pm on Wednesday 29 March 2023.