

Senate

Redacted Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday 28th June 2023

1330 to 1630 hrs

Oak 1 and Oak 2, Hillside House

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 (Innovation & 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 Annika Bautz *
Professor Bob Nichol
Professor Paul Townsend *
Mr Patrick Degg
Professor Emma Mayhew
Professor Esat Alpay
Professor Rhys Jones
Professor Rachel Brooks
Professor Jin Xuan
Professor Dan Horton
Professor Amelia Hadfield *
Ms Kerry Matthews
Mr Glenn Moulton (Joint, Interim)
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	FEPS	FHMS
Dr Joshua Andresen	Dr Lewis Baker *	Dr Charo Hodgkins
Professor Karen Bullock	Professor Tom Bridges *	Dr Dynatra Subasinghe
Dr Bora Kim	Professor Philip Jackson *	Mrs Claire Tarrant *
Professor Anna McNamara	Dr Tan Sui	[vacancy]

In Attendance

Mrs Beth Herbert (EH), Secretary
Rachel Hubbard, on behalf of University Council
Jo Yau, Incoming President of the Students' Union
Mrs Rosalind Allen, Governance (for item 2.1)
Mr Dan Tinkler, Advance HE Consultant (for item 2.1)
Ms Lois Moor, FHMS HR Business Partner (for item 3.1)
Mrs Fernanda Haswell-Martin, OAA Executive Programme Manager (for item 3.1)

* indicates member not present

1. Introductory Items

1.1 Welcome / Apologies for Absence

.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the final meeting of Senate for the current academic year. The Chair further welcomed Jo Yau (incoming President of the Students' Union) and Dan Tinkler. The Chair also acknowledged that we have two observers in attendance, Ros Allen, Head of Governance Services (for item 2.1) and Rachel Hubbard, from the University Council.

- .2 Apologies were received from Lewis Baker, Annika Bautz, Tom Bridges, Gill Fairbairn, Amelia Hadfield, Philip Jackson, Osama Khan, Claire Tarrant, Paul Townsend and Naomi Winstone.

1.2 Approval of minutes of meeting on 22nd May 2023

- .1 The minutes of the Senate meeting held on 22nd May 2023 were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

1.3 Vice-Chancellor's Report to Senate

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/45

- .1 In addition to the above paper, which was taken as read, the Vice-Chancellor made the following comments and observations:
- In terms of rankings:
 - Surrey is ranked 13th in the Complete University Guide 2024 (a rise of 5 places since last year); 7 subjects appear in the Top 10 with 3 subjects ranked 1st.
 - THE Impact Rankings 2023 rank Surrey at 46th place (up 9 places from last year) and 9th in the UK (previously 12th). These rankings assess performance against a range of United Nations Sustainable Goals (SDGs). Surrey was submitted to 16 of the 17 SDGs; 6 were ranked in the top 100 and 4 were ranked in the top 50.
 - Surrey is ranked 244th in the QS World University Rankings 2024, a rise of 61 places. This places us in the top 17% of institutions ranked (out of 1,400 listed in the rankings, recognising that QS evaluated 2,900 universities worldwide). More specifically, Surrey ranked 20th in the UK for internationalisation of its staff, 18th in terms of citations, 42nd for international student population, 41st for employability and 42nd for sustainability (these latter two rankings are probably not reflective of our ranking when compared to other rankings such as the Graduate Outcomes Survey).
 - At the last meeting of the Prime Minister's Council for Science and Technology, the Government's consistent message is that it will be committed to increasing the funding for research and development to 3% of GDP.
 - The Government's Science & Technology Framework supports five technologies, all of which align well with Surrey's research strengths, not only within FEPS and FHMS, but also with contributions from FASS through policy.
 - We recently hosted a visit by the Minister of State for Science, Innovation and Technology, George Freeman MP. The visit showcased our strength in collaboration with the regional space sector, bringing Space South Central businesses and academics together. This should be a good launch pad for further collaboration/activities.
 - Surrey was successful in a bid for the Convergent Screen Technologies and performance in Realtime (CoSTAR) National Laboratory, a £[redacted] Arts & Humanities Research Council bid led by Royal Holloway, Surrey and Abertay. Surrey's share of the award is £[redacted]; it provides a unique opportunity for leading the creative industries research and development.
 - Our new Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Research and Innovation, Professor Lisa Collins joins us in the autumn, and is already involved in the Phase 2 R&I review. Members of the Independent Review Panel were impressed by the dedication of colleagues involved in the review, and commended their openness in engaging proactively in the exercise. Going forward, the Phase 2 Steering Committee will work closely with Professor Collins so that the recommendations can be properly considered and implemented, where appropriate.
 - The Vice-Chancellor thanked Dan Tinkler (and Advance HE colleagues) for their work on the Senate Effectiveness Review. Overall, he thought the report was positive and insightful. By and large, the report notes that the quality of members, selection, conduct of meetings and culture were very good but, as always, there are areas where we can do better.
 - With Surrey achieving a 81% response rate, we await the National Student Survey results which will be announced on 10th August.

1.4 Chair's Action/Business

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

2. Item for Discussion

2.1 A review of the appropriateness and effectiveness of Senate

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/46

- .1 The Chair introduced Dan Tinkler (DT) from Advance HE who thanked Beth Herbert and the senior team for their support throughout the review. DT noted that the review commenced in November 2022 and concluded in June 2023. Information to inform the review included observations (of Senate, University Education Committee (UEC) and University Research and Innovation Committee (URIC)), a questionnaire sent to members, a document review and stakeholder individual and group interviews. Emerging themes were presented to the Senate Review Steering Group and a group of Senate members in a workshop format.
- .2 The overall assessment of Senate is that it currently meets its responsibilities (under the control and approval of Council) and is able to provide assurance to Council on academic matters and non-academic support for its students. The culture and practices of Senate and its two major sub-committees (UEC and URIC) are conducive to the scrutiny, challenge and debate necessary for them to perform their academic governance duties. The review highlighted four particular areas of effective practice at Surrey – openness and inclusion; diversity of membership; a positive journey of change; and good governance support. The report includes 26 recommendations (split under four themes – accountability, clarity, constitution and culture) believed to enhance the effectiveness of Senate, its sub-committees and the wider academic governance processes (with five suggested for priority focus).
- .3 The Chair invited comments, and the following observations were made:
- The report was well articulated and most welcomed; it was good to see student representation highlighted.
 - In terms of membership, it was interesting to note the balance of academic versus professional services staff in Senate versus a higher proportion of professional services staff compared to academics in the sub-committees.
 - With self-nomination for academic representation, there is no democratic process; however, there is a good mix of gender, diversity. It is important that members want to represent the academic community rather than their own self interests.
 - Should we consider expanding academic representation with some elected but others self-nominated? Would we want to increase membership? There is no definitive view on the numbers but the balance needs to be considered. One could increase the numbers of academics, or reduce the professional services members by swapping with academics. There is no right or wrong answer; Senate membership at Surrey is small when compared to other institutions.
 - Professional services staff benefit by being part of the community and they can better understand their role in supporting academics.
 - In parts of Europe, membership is split as one third professional services, one-third academics and one-third students.
 - The Students' Union noted the report outcome (i) has general confidence over how Senate operates, (ii) recognises the amount of committees that the SU officers sit on and the workload involved (and suggests ways of supporting them via briefings and agenda guidance), and (iii) recognises the importance of student voice and suggests a dedicated slot on each agenda (the SU are supportive of this). The SU felt that if we were to consider widening student membership on committees, it would be important that it is through elected representation. In terms of possible reimbursement for non-sabbaticals, the SU feel

there could be complications and would want to ensure we avoided conflict or “yes men”. The SU are supportive of providing officers with better briefings and would prefer doing this in house, noting that an “agenda planning” meeting might be helpful. The SU believe that they can contribute to what a “good briefing” could look like.

- With respect to the URIC/Senate relationship, URIC should look to discuss strategic items (e.g. REF) and work that bridges the research and education portfolios (e.g. PGRs who teach, research led teaching).
- The Scheme of Delegation permits delegated authority to Senate and other committees with respect to key decisions. Anything related to the academic endeavour should be seen at Senate. How the paper cover sheet is presented is important; it needs to tell the story of where the journey started, where it went and who has approved/endorsed it. The suggested cover sheet includes sections on risks/assurances, finance/resource implications, student outcomes, EDI and inform of outcome.

.4 The Chair thanked all members for their contributions. He summarised the discussion by noting the strong support for the report, the overall assessment, the positive areas of good practice and stated that the recommendations will help us to shape the future of Senate. The Chair concluded by thanking DT (and the wider Advance HE team) for their time and commitment over the past six months, it was greatly appreciated. He noted that an Effectiveness Review Implementation Plan would be brought to the first Senate meeting of 2023/24.

2.2 Peer Pedagogic Interaction (PPI) Scheme

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/47

.1 The Associate Dean, Education (FHMS) (ADE FHMS) prefaced the discussion by thanking fellow ADEs and other colleagues for contributing to the PPI. It was noted that at the request of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Academic, the ADE FHMS was invited to review the current peer observation scheme (which mainly looks back at teaching practice) and develop a new scheme which is broader and more accessible for all staff involved with teaching and learning (looking ahead to supporting digitally enhanced pedagogies/assessments and thinking how we effectively build a sense of belonging via an online learning community). Extensive consultation with colleagues across the University provided good support for the PPI and helpful feedback.

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

- The reviewee will be able to select what material/teaching is reviewed (ie, lectures, assessments, module pages). However, the reviewer may also wish to view other resources such as MEQ scores and student feedback.
- The PPI will capture good practice which can then be passed along to colleagues.
- As this is a developmental and supportive reflective, the Surrey Institute of Education (SloE) can offer assistance to staff on how to improve.
- The SloE will maintain a list of colleagues who are keen to engage with PPI with staff from outside their discipline.
- This is a welcome pedagogic interaction outside lectures.
- The videos are good.
- The PPI could potentially inform appraisals in looking forward.
- With respect to the form itself, is page 3 more of a “tick box” exercise? Can we brand the form?
- We do well with innovative learning but it is difficult to collate all activity. The idea of the reviewee sharing learning and teaching activities further afield is a good starting point; this could also be done by the reviewer who can draw activities to the attention of the ADE, DLT or Head of School.
- In terms of workload, it was noted that peer review is a requirement for Vet School accreditation and in some Schools, this is already done on an informal basis.
- We need to ensure we capture teaching staff based in the Library and the SloE.

- The pilot is pan-University. During the first year, it will draw out good practice and allow us to see what issues are raised.

.3 The Chair summarised the discussion by thanking members for their contributions to the discussion and noted the positive support for the PPI scheme. Senate ENDORSED the pilot for the 2023/2024 academic year, requesting that an evaluation review be undertaken and discussed at University Education Committee and Senate meetings in June 2024. This will inform whether PPI becomes mandatory from September 2024.

3. Items for Approval

3.1 OAA: Principles of Workload Allocation

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/48

- .1 The Chair introduced the OAA Executive Programme Manager (OAA EPM), Fernanda Haswell-Martin, and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Executive Dean (FEPS), Bob Nichol; they gave a presentation, "*Optimising Academic Achievement Workstream, Principles of Workload Allocation Proposal*". Members were reminded of key updates, the approach undertaken and workstream progress/activities. Work from the Task & Finish Group 5 (Workload Allocation) recommended providing a policy framework for local decision-making around Workload Allocation (WLM) for academic staff, linking this process to other OAA processes (e.g. Criteria for Academic Performance, the promotions process and the Professional Development Review), and creating FAQs for staff and guidelines for managers. The T&F Group did not review tariffs for specific tasks, nor did it look into technical solutions. In terms of transparency, it was noted that this currently differs across Schools and Departments. In consideration of GDPR and personal circumstances, dashboards are being prepared for individuals and at pan-University level (although the ambition is for School/Department level if possible). In terms of governance, it is proposed that the EB Academic Leaders Group monitor workload data pan-University.
- .2 The Chair noted that we need to ensure different allocations do not favour one staff member over another; the workload profile will show what people have done/are doing. The Chair then invited comments, and the following observations were made:
- How can we handle parity across Schools/Departments or Faculties? On the teaching side, we have standardised hours for tasks, but we don't have tariffs for research, scholarship, impact etc. Workload allocation is not about 40/40/20 – conversations will help us to allocate workload against the three domains (Research, Innovation and Impact (RII); Education and Student Experience (ESE); Citizenship, Values and Service (CVS)).
 - The principles should help us to move away from a box ticking exercise towards supporting our strategic objectives.
 - Arguably, this could be a test of leadership as Heads know the strengths and weaknesses of their staff at particular times of the year. If Heads become skilled at allocating workload, assess the outcomes for their colleagues against School/Department requirements, then performance should improve.
 - Another tool at School/Department level is to optimise the staff profile. One could potentially replace a teaching focussed staff member with a teaching and research focussed staff member, thus changing the composition of staff.
 - Local decision making is important. For example, we need impact case studies for REF. A Head can decide what staff are best suited to provide a case study and then allocate appropriate time.
 - This is a cultural change for some Heads. Guidelines will help them to allocate, but would training also help? How do we have the relevant conversations with the Heads? The PVCED (FEPS) indicated a willingness to assist.
 - The principles are high level, not granular.

- As there are three domains with three sub-sections within (e.g. RII, ESE and CVS), there are effectively nine areas to consider. Academics undertake a broad range of activities; how can we best capture workload into those areas?
- Service, within the CVS domain, would include roles such as DLTs, Associate Deans etc.

.3 The Chair summarised the discussion by noting that workload allocation is a framework for planning the best use of our talented staff in ways that allows Schools/Departments to achieve their ultimate goals.

.4 Following the conclusion of the discussion, a formal vote followed. Senate APPROVED the proposed Principles of Workload Allocation (27 in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions).

.5 The Chair thanked members for their contributions to the discussion.

3.2 UUK Annual Report for the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers 2022/2023

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/49

.1 The Interim Dean of the Doctoral College (DDC) presented the paper, noting that the Vice-Chancellor signed the Concordat in October 2020 and we are required to submit an Annual Report to Universities UK (acting as Secretariat), signed off by Council. The DDC was grateful to Dr Mark Whelan, Researcher Development Training Officer, for his work in preparing the report. Of particular note, the DDC advised that the Doctoral College team is:

- Working with HR to differentiate ECRs from the overall research community to enable an ECR-only email list;
- Designing a new starter induction aimed specifically at ECRs and research staff (with Library staff);
- Contributing to provide ECR career support, coaching and development opportunities;
- Organising training for our new Surrey Future Fellows.

.2 The Chair invited comments. It was noted that the report contained a large amount of acronyms, and that we should consider leading on outcomes/processes, rather than roles/committees. In light of this comment, minor tweaking of the report was suggested.

.3 Notwithstanding the above comment, Senate ENDORSED and RECOMMENDED to Council the Annual Report for the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers 2022/2023.

3.3 Degree Outcomes Statement 2023

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/50

.1 The Chief Student Officer (CSO) presented the Degree Outcomes Statement, noting that the report was produced in line with the published sector guidance with data analysis based on the 2021/2022 academic year. The report has been previously discussed at the Quality and Enhancement Sub-committee on 11th May 2023 and at the University Education Committee on 6th June 2023.

.2 Senate ENDORSED and RECOMMENDED to Council the Degree Outcomes Statement 2023.

3.4 Amendments to University Regulations for 2023/2024

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/51

.1 The Interim Joint Academic Registrar prefaced the discussion by noting that the paper contains various updates to our academic regulations (A regulations) and our student regulations (B regulations). The proposals have been reviewed by the Quality Enhancement and Standards Subcommittee and one (or both) of the University Education Committee and University Research and Innovation Committee. The proposals are mostly minor or technical amendments.

.2 The paper was taken as read, but the following were highlighted:

- A1 Regulations for Taught Programmes:
 - To clarify that final year undergraduate students can now retake one module of any size during semester 2, thus allowing them to potentially graduate with their cohort (para 166);
 - Extending our current exceptional provision for alternative re-assessment periods, primarily aimed at specific clinical placement modules in FHMS (para 169);
 - To allow taught students (including Foundation Year students who follow A0 Regulations for the Foundation Year) to submit summative assessments on Thursday and Friday, thus increasing flexibility for module leaders and avoids deadline bunching for staff and students (para A1/120 and A0/62).
 - To introduce a more gradual sliding scale of late submission penalties for taught students, increasing the time students have to submit late (para A1/120 and A0/62). This proposal is primarily the result of benchmarking which shows that Surrey's current approach is relatively severe; this change could result in better outcomes for our students.
 - To enable individuals to enrol on stand-alone modules (e.g. CPD) at the undergraduate level (para 70). This had been requested by FHMS.
- A2 Regulations for research degrees
 - To streamline the final examination process for those registered on dual PhD programmes; students will be required to undertake one viva only but the examination team will be appointed in accordance with the Regulations at both institutions (para 10).
- B Regulations
 - Several technical amendments including the removal of the unnecessary "gatekeeper" role in which the CSO or their nominee formally approves a number of processes.
 - Following positive discussion with the Students' Union, changes to the Student Disciplinary Regulations concerning the student's level of engagement with the process.

.3 A formal vote followed. Senate unanimously APPROVED the proposed amendments to University Regulations for 2023/2024 (24 in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions).

3.5 Academic Year 2024/2025 RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/52

.1 The Chief Student Officer advised that the proposal had been endorsed by Executive Board in April 2023 and the University Education Committee on 6th June 2023. In essence, due to New Year's Day 2025, the autumn semester revision period will be reduced to two days. In addition, due to the late Easter period in 2025, one week of teaching will occur post-Easter.

.2 Senate APPROVED the academic calendar 2024/2025.

4. Items to Note

4.1 Education & Student Experience Report to Senate RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/53

.1 The report was NOTED.

4.2 Research & Innovation Report to Senate RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/54

.1 The report was NOTED.

4.3 Senate Sub-Committee Minutes

4.3.1 University Education Committee, 6th June 2023

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/55

.1 The unconfirmed minutes were NOTED.

4.3.2 University Research and Innovation Committee, 6th June 2023

RECEIVED PAPER 22/SEN/56

.1 The unconfirmed minutes were NOTED.

5. Closing Items

5.1 Any Other Business

.1 The Chair thanked members of Senate for their contributions over the past year. On behalf of Senate, the Chair warmly thanked Diana Dakik (outgoing SU President) for her hard work (and that of the Sabbatical Team) over the past year; Megan Simmons (outgoing VP Voice) for her many contributions over the past two years; Osama Khan (PVC, Academic who is leaving us in October to join Aston University as their Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Academic); Tom Bridges (who stands down after completing his second term); and Bora Kim, Lewis Baker and Dynatra Subasinghe (who stand down having completed their first term, but remain eligible to self-nominate for a second term). The Chair also thanked Rachel Hubbard for observing the meeting and Beth Herbert for servicing Senate over the past year.

5.2 Dates of next Senate meeting

23rd October 2023, 1330 to 1630 hrs

10th January 2024, 1330 to 1630 hrs

24th April 2024, 1330 to 1630 hrs

25th June 2024, 1330 to 1630 hrs

**The Minutes of the Statutory Senate held
on 28th June 2023 were confirmed**

.....
**Professor Tim Dunne
Provost and Senior Vice-President
23rd October 2023**

/eh