

Senate

Minutes of a meeting held on Tuesday 17th January 2023

1330 to 1600 hrs, 01/02 CII Lower Ground Floor

James Clerk Maxwell Building (home to 5G/6G)

Ex-officio members:

President & Vice-Chancellor

Chair: Provost & Senior Vice-President

Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Academic

Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Research & Innovation

Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Executive Dean (FASS)

Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Executive Dean (FEPS)

Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Executive Dean (FHMS)

Vice-President, External Engagement

Associate Dean, Education (FASS)

Associate Dean, Education (FEPS)

Associate Dean, Education (FHMS)

Associate Dean, Research & Innovation (FASS)

Associate Dean, Research & Innovation (FEPS)

Associate Dean, Research & Innovation (FHMS)

Dean International

Chief Student Officer

Academic Registrar

Director of Surrey Institute of Education

Director of Library & Learning Support Services

Director of Research & Innovation Services

Director of Research Strategy

Director of Innovation Strategy (Incubation & Enterprise)

Dean of the Doctoral College

President of the Students' Union

VP Voice of the Students' Union

Professor Max Lu

Professor Tim Dunne

Professor Osama Khan

[vacant]

Professor Bran Nicol (Interim)

Professor Bob Nichol

Professor Paul Townsend *

Mr Patrick Degg

Professor Emma Mayhew

Professor Esat Alpay

Professor Rhys Jones *

Dr Alfred Thumser (Interim) *

Professor Rachel Brooks *

Professor Jin Xuan

Professor Dan Horton

Professor Amelia Hadfield

Ms Kerry Matthews *

Mr Adam Child

Professor Naomi Winstone

Mr Paul Johnson

Mrs Gill Fairbairn (Interim)

[vacant]

Ms Caroline Fleming

Dr Allan Kilner-Johnson (Interim)

Ms Diana Dakik

Ms Megan Simmons

Nominated members:

FASS

Dr Joshua Andresen

Professor Karen Bullock

Dr Bora Kim

Professor Anna McNamara

FEPS

Dr Lewis Baker

Professor Tom Bridges

Professor Philip Jackson

Dr Tan Sui

FHMS

Dr Charo Hodgkins

Dr Surinder Soond

Dr Dynatra Subasinghe

Mrs Claire Tarrant *

In Attendance

Mrs Beth Herbert (EH), Secretary

Ms Pam Powell, on behalf of University Council

Marie Sheehan, Incoming Interim Academic Registrar

Professor Paul White, Advance HE Consultant

Mr Nick Moore, Head of Academic Performance (for item 2.1)

Mrs Fernanda Haswell-Martin, OAA Executive Programme Manager (for item 3.4)

* indicates member not present

1. Introductory Items

1.1 Welcome / Apologies for Absence

- .1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the second meeting of Senate for the current academic year. The Chair further welcomed new ex-officio members Gill Fairbairn and Allan Kilner-Johnson. The Chair also acknowledged that we have three observers in attendance, Pam Powell (from the University

Council), Marie Sheehan (Incoming Academic Registrar) and Professor Paul White (the Advance HE Consultant who is a co-lead on the Senate Effectiveness Review).

- .2 Apologies were received from Rachel Brooks, Rhys Jones, Kerry Matthews, Claire Tarrant, Alfred Thumser and Paul Townsend.

1.2 Approval of minutes of meeting on 24th October 2022

- .1 The minutes of the Senate meeting held on 24th October 2022 were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

1.3 Vice-Chancellor's Report to Senate

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/17

- .1 In addition to the above paper, which was taken as read, the Vice-Chancellor made the following comments and observations:
- In terms of the political context, there appears to be a relatively stable cabinet now (the Minister for Skills, Apprenticeships and Higher Education is the Rt Hon Robert Halfon). The Chancellor's Autumn statement unveiled a plan for stability and growth including support for the increasing cost of living and energy crisis. The Government also reconfirmed it will increase funding for R&D to £20 billion by 2024/2025, and will continue to guarantee funding to UK applicants for successful awards made to Horizon Europe calls that close on or before 31st March 2023. On the opposite side of the coin, there will be no increase to tuition fees for the next two years.
 - How can we meet the challenge of the current economic crisis? We need to enhance our commercialisation income and aim to increase our philanthropic income.
 - Although student satisfaction has increased, we should not take this upward trend for granted, particularly with strike action pending. Collectively, we need to continue our efforts to enhance the student experience.
 - The TEF provider submission is imminent, and the National Student Survey 2023 launches in February.
 - Preparations are beginning for the next REF. We need to increase our research power as Surrey is one of the smallest in the UK; the Surrey Future Fellow appointments should help.
 - The Campaign is going well; thanks are extended to the Team, supporters and alumni.
 - Professor Annika Bautz has been appointed as Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Executive Dean (FASS) from 6th March 2023.
 - The Surrey Senior Leaders' Programme has been launched. The programme is aimed at senior leaders (professional services and academics) to further support/shape our strategy and strengthen our leadership community.
 - The VC thanked all members and their colleagues for the hard work last semester, noting that examinations were underway and semester two was starting soon.
- .2 The VC invited comments, and the following observations were made:
- The national scene is one of discontent with planned strikes across many sectors. Following the three days of UCU strike action in November, a decision is pending on future strike action (up to 18 days during February and March) and the form it will take (ie, marking boycott). We respect the right of colleagues to strike, and as leaders, we recognise that our priority is to minimise the strike impact on the provision of teaching and student support. Silver and Bronze groups meet regularly to prepare for any potential disruption and to consider forms of mitigation. The Students' Union were planning to enlist the assistance of academic staff with their upcoming election campaign; strike action could have an impact on this and on marking and assessments. We will work with the SU to manage any potential disruption.
 - Noting the under-recruitment for 2022/23 and the accompanying financial impact, it is a challenging year ahead. We need to work closely with colleagues in Marketing, Recruitment

and Admissions to improve future recruitment. Notwithstanding the headwinds of Brexit, the energy crisis and the cost of living, we should consider what we can do for the greater good, and what can we do with students who leave after 1 year? It was noted that reaching out and talking to students is important.

- The Admissions Team had been working hard and turnaround times for PGT applications has improved since the report was written. There has been a huge demand for February 2023 PGT starters and we are now over-subscribed in some programmes.

1.4 Chair's Action/Business

- .1 The Chair formally noted that no Chair's Action had been taken since the last meeting.

2. Item for Approval

2.1 Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) Provider Submission

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/18

- .1 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Academic (PVCA) prefaced the discussion by noting this was the second substantial TEF round. In the first round, Surrey received gold. In the current round, all Office for Students (OfS) registered providers will receive an overall rating as well as two underpinning ratings, one for student outcomes and one for student experience. We stand well against the outcomes dimension and have a very good student experience, particularly over the past two years. The PVCA expressed his personal thanks to all the authors; it was a challenge to reduce the original draft of 65 pages to the required 25 pages as there was so much good material.
- .2 The Head of Academic Performance, Nick Moore, continued by noting the Provider Submission is 25 pages in length. It is evidence based and referenced. The Provider Submission sits alongside a 10 page Students' Submission and TEF indicators (provided by the OfS). The Submission has been through a series of reviews with the authors, Directors of Learning & Teaching, Associate Deans (Education), students and the University Education Committee. Since this version was submitted to Senate, minor editing and changes to the conclusion have been undertaken.
- .3 The Chair invited comments, and the following observations were made:
 - In response to a question whether there was any part of the student experience/outcomes where we could have done better, learning gain was the answer. What is the ideal way of measuring learning gain from the start of studies through to graduation? The OfS has suggested that each institution should agree their own measure. More generally, we need to be more systematic in how we evaluate initiatives and without good student experience and outcomes data, it will be difficult to gain a better award.
 - Although transnational students are not included in the current TEF, they may be in the future. We should consider means to capture international data. As a minimum, if one module contains an international element within it, this will help to roll out internationalisation into the curriculum and aid in globalisation.
- .4 Senate APPROVED the TEF Provider Submission, recognising that minor proofing and checking remained work in progress. The Chair expressed his thanks to the team, noting the huge amount of effort and work involved.

3. Matters for Discussion

3.1 Future of the University Research and Innovation Committee (URIC)

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/19

- .1 The Interim Director of Research & Innovation Services presented the paper, noting that an open discussion was held at the last URIC meeting where members were asked to consider the purpose of

URIC, its associated Terms of Reference and whether the business/reports/items raised at recent URIC meetings reflect the committee's purpose. This paper outlines the questions posed to the committee and the subsequent points raised in the discussion. Specifically;

- Agenda items feel skewed towards policy and approval with less opportunity for discussion.
- There is little discussion on external factors and risk.
- Mechanisms are needed to identify lesser-known items to include on the Agenda, and to empower individuals to bring their items to URIC in the interests of enhancing our work in R&I, and raising awareness of issues of importance/interest to all.

.2 The Chair invited comments, and the following observations were made:

- The principle of streamlining and simplifying policies and procedures is helpful.
- URIC should lead and cascade down to Faculty R&I Committees who, in turn, cascade to Schools. There should also be opportunity for Faculty R&I Committees to feed into discussions at URIC.
- In terms of innovation, how do we get our research "out and about"? What platform or process do we use?
- The University retains overhead costs from research projects to support other costs/charges (including unfunded research). Transparency on how this process works would be welcome.

The discussion then highlighted challenges around research data management:

- Research data management can be complex, e.g. data acquisition, intellectual property, public claims etc. Not many universities have it "right". We have various areas working behind the scenes but this is not transparent to researchers. URIC should have some oversight on how we support good practice in research data management.
- Clearer guidance or a briefing should be provided to all researchers at the start. University level infrastructure to support data management is needed; this should not be retained locally.
- The challenges of good governance needs to be well communicated to the academic community.

.3 The Chair summarised the discussion by thanking members for their contributions and noting that management of research data is high on our priority list and changes should become evident in the coming months. It was reported that we are appointing a Director of Surrey Research Compute, subject to successful negotiation.

[Change to published agenda order]

3.4 Optimising Academic Achievement (OAA) Update

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/22

.1 The Chair introduced the OAA Executive Programme Manager (OAA EPM), Fernanda Haswell-Martin, who gave a presentation, "*Optimising Academic Achievement Workstream, Senate Update January 2023*". The update reminded members of the governance/approval requirements for Senate and Executive Board, and noted that significant progress had been made in the Criteria for Academic Performance (CfAP) Task & Finish Group #1.). Specifically, the Criteria has adopted a 3-domain approach (Domain A: Research, Innovation & Impact; Domain B: Education & Innovation; Domain C: Citizenship, Values & Service) that has been tested and the framework developed through consultation with various stakeholders. Further consultation has been planned for Senate members, Faculty "town halls", UCU members of JNCC, and all staff through SurreyNet. The Promotion Criteria Task & Finish Group #4 will be sharing the improved promotions process that will take effect from 2023 with substantive criteria-led changes for 2024. It was noted that the Project Board will sign off a detailed communications plan in January.

- .2 The OAA EPM continued the presentation by noting that T&F Groups 2, 3, 5 and 6 are on track to complete their design work by February 2023. The Promotion Criteria T&F Group #4 will be sharing the improved promotions submission process in February (phase 1) and will then work to design improved promotions criteria afterwards (phase 2). The workstream progress was summarised and it was noted that the Project Board will sign off a communications plan in January.
- .3 The Chair invited comments, and the following observations were made:
- The progress to date was great to see. What is the role of Executive Board in the workstream? EB will be required to sign off changes/proposals in three areas: the appraisal process, the new workload allocation model, and academic remuneration (including allowances).
 - In terms of consultation, the Academic Leaders Forum is comprised of staff who report directly to the PVC Executive Deans. There is an expectation that Heads of Schools will cascade down to the next level; it is their responsibility to listen and feedback to the T&F Group leads. It was noted that all Faculties are represented on each T&F Group.
 - Is there confusion in using “Innovation” in Domains A and B? In education, innovation refers to teaching and new programmes; in research, innovation means knowledge exchange and tech transfer. These definitions are known within the community.
 - The Academic Lead for EDI is being consulted on OAA. A recent report, *Education: The State of the Discipline. Staff equality in UK higher education* has recently been released (<https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/education-the-state-of-the-discipline-staff-equality>). The report explores existing statistical data relating to staff equality in UK higher education.
 - How will the criteria be put into operation? The 3 domains replace the c.16 role profiles. Each domain notes headline expectations against a set of performance measures. The framework has been developed at a high level. This will be further nuanced at local level and examples will also be provided. When undertaking appraisals, a 1 year timeline applies; when thinking of applying for promotion, you are guided by the column to the left.
 - This holistic framework provides a set of performance measures and sets expectations. This will help maximise individuals’ objectives and strengths; in turn, this will help the academic community to prosper.
 - What can we do for short term researchers who are unable to be promoted? We should look to provide opportunities for promotion. ECRs will “fit” into the Research, Innovation & Impact and Citizenship, Values & Service domains, unlikely for Education & Innovation. It was noted that phase 2 of the Promotion Criteria T&F Group #4 will consider this in the Spring.
 - The Workload Allocation T&F Group #5 recently held its first meeting. Attendees are voices for the University, they have not been selected for their role. To broaden input, we should consider publishing membership for others to contact.
- .4 The Chair concluded the discussion by thanking members for their contributions and confirmed that Senate will continue to have opportunities to contribute, the first being through the drop-in session on 6th February.

3.2 Reducing the Awarding Gap/Resolving the Continuation Issue

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/20

- .1 The Associate Dean, Education (FEPS) prefaced the discussion by noting that the Student Success Group (SSG) has been set up; its central focus is on inclusive education practice, looking at (i) teaching practice, assessment and feedback that supports diverse student groups, (ii) staff/student skills development for effective work, student, communication and resilience in diverse group settings, and (iii) student social and wellbeing support within subject disciplines to enhance student motivation and a sense of belonging and identity. This work benefits all our students but the immediate focus is on reducing the gap in attainment of good degrees between black students versus white students to 6% by 2024/2025 (a target of our Access and Participation Plan (APP)). A

second APP target is eliminating the gap in non-continuation between students from low participation neighbourhood versus all other students.

- .2 Through discussion with SSG colleagues, there are five general areas under consideration for improving continuation – socialisation, engagement/motivation, understanding, teaching quality/academic support/assessments and flexible pathways in study. Within each area, examples of practice, action and policy change have been identified (some of which builds on our 85 Plan). Activities specific to the awarding gap have also been identified as have priority activities and some “unconventional” ideas (e.g. introducing staged/interim qualifications for motivation).
- .3 The Chair invited comments, and the following observations were made:
 - A year one qualification, separate and similar to the Professional Training Year award, was thought to be a good idea.
 - It was useful to see the key reasons why students withdraw from their studies in the appendix.
 - Students tend to be anxious in the first year as they are away from home for the first time.
 - The first year needs to be taken seriously; we know that potential employers take note of all results, but particularly core modules.
 - We tend to approach withdrawal from an “academic” point of view, there must be an academic reason why a student leaves. However, one should not underestimate the power of friendships and socialisation.
 - It would be useful to share the paper with all Directors of Learning and Teaching. The work of SSG should be more visible to student reps and teaching staff.
 - In terms of attainment gap and academic support, it can be difficult to identify less achieving students. Perhaps it is better to find ways to help all students.
- .4 The Chair thanked members for their comments and noted that this is an important priority issue for Surrey.

3.3 2022 Academic Promotions Data Review

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/21

- .1 The Chair presented the paper which provides a summary of promotion applications and success rates which is broken down by gender and ethnicity. In terms of headlines,
 - Almost 70% of applications received were successful.
 - Females were more successful than males in attaining promotion (73% versus 64% respectively).
 - Less women submitted applications for promotion to Professor; we need to support and encourage our female colleagues.
 - The BAME data noted that, in Faculty Promotion Committees (FPC), Asian identified colleagues had a 10% lower success rate than White identified colleagues. It would be good practice for all Promotion Committee members to have sight of demographic data from previous years.

[Return to published agenda order]

4. Items to Note

4.1 OSCAR Annual Report 2021/2022

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/23

- .1 Senate NOTED the annual report.

4.2 Education & Student Experience Report to Senate

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/24

- .1 Senate NOTED the report.

4.3 Research & Innovation Report to Senate

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/25

- .1 Senate NOTED the report.

4.4 Senate Sub-committee Minutes

4.4.1 University Education Committee Minutes, 6th December 2022

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/26

- .1 Senate NOTED the unconfirmed minutes.

4.4.2 University Research and Innovation Committee Minutes, 8th December 2022

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/27

- .1 Senate NOTED the unconfirmed minutes.

5. Closing Items

5.1 Any Other Business

- .1 The Chair reminded Senate that three new academic representatives joined Senate in September 2022 and the remaining nine (of twelve) representatives come to an end of their 2 year term in the summer. This 3/9 split appears somewhat unbalanced, and rather than continue in the same manner, it was proposed that we move to a 6/6 split, thus replacing/renewing six academic representatives each year. This arrangement would necessitate, on an exceptional basis, three existing members to extend for one year (giving them an initial 3 year term). Members were supportive of this proposal which will be advanced post-Easter.
- .2 Earlier in the meeting, the Chair formally thanked Adam Child for his contributions over the past 3 years and wished him every success in his new role as Academic Registrar at Warwick University. The Chair also thanked Bran Nicol for his many valued contributions to Senate and the wider University over the past year as Interim PVC Executive Dean of FASS. It was noted that the University was fortunate that, while Bran is leaving the interim role, he is remaining a Professor at the University.

5.2 Dates of next Senate meetings

27th April 2023, 1330 to 1630 hrs

28th June 2023, 1330 to 1630 hrs

/eh