Governance Restricted Minutes

member in attendance at the Council (curren

PGR students sat halfway between student and researcher. They are a key interface between teaching and research, but could often fall between the cracks PGR numbers feed into REF environment statements and league tables e.g. THES

#### **Trends**

[redacted Section 43]

[redacted Section 43]

Home PGR admissions were falling sector wide

## Recruitment Strategy (Home)

[redacted Section 43]

[redacted Section 43]

[redacted Section 43]

# Researcher Development

The Dean role also includes Researcher Development typically Research Assistants and Postdoctoral Research Assistants

The University has a commitment via the Researcher Development Concordat, recognised by the award of a HR Excellence in Research award

Research staff are very heterogeneous communications and development opportunities not uniformly received

Seeking to provide a hub and community for research staff across the University (c.300 staff)

A Researcher Development Project Officer has been appointed

A Teams site has been created to disseminate opportunities for funding, training, news.

The Research Staff Committee had been re-established

The GS were working with Schools to build a community of practice

#### Vision

Working with local structures, Schools, Functions to ensure communities of PGRS and Research Staff can thrive

To provide expertise and resource to support locally identified development needs, and variations between disciplines

The GS to be a central hub and point of contact in providing training, support and signposting

This means that the GS will need to evolve. Ten years ago the GS was sector leading but there has been a clear expansion in the remit of GS since 2015. Consideration would be given to a new title and structure

Was low recruitment of Home PGRS down to a lack of interest or funding? Doctoral loans had not really taken off

Natural History Museum Research Open Day Research colleagues had been invited to attend an open day to learn how the University and Natural History Museum were aiming to develop research and training together.

# Sustainability

## Recruitment

The University was in a strong position up to confirmation with 5% increases in applications compared to last year. Because of that strong pre-Clearing performance, in some subject areas minimum grades were raised, and it was decided not to enter some subjects into Clearing. As Clearing progressed, there was strong demand with over 1250 offers made. By mid-morning of the following day forecasts indicated that the University was comfortably above target and the decision was made to withdraw from Clearing at mid-day. In the intervening window between results and enrolment, a number of Universities continued to recruit in Clearing, with more students than ever (a total of 14,000) opting to decline their place at their previously first choice University to take up a place elsewhere. Whilst the University undoubtedly benefited

strike action would take or when this was due to be discussed at UCU s national committee later in the week. It was anticipated that the strike action would focus on an assessment boycott in the past this type of action had variable impact across the University. The Vice-Chancellor reminded the Senate that the door was still open for discussion with UCU.

What were the University's plans for lifelong learning? The Government had recognised the demand for lifelong learning and had been considering various routes for this. A consultation had been undertaken on this topic but there had been no response from Government yet. The University would be keen to create targeted provision in some areas but would not expect every School to develop a lifelong learning strategy. At present the focus was to rationalise and simplify teaching, rather than to start creating other structures. A key obstacle in developing provision was the requirement to meet OfS Condition B3 (see 22/52) around minimum standards.

Had any consideration been given to extending the timescale for the Portfolio Review Programme? There were concerns in some Schools that work would take longer than March if it were to be done properly, there were also concerns around workload pressures—was there any flexibility around the timings?

The timescales set for the Portfolio Review were driven by the 2024/25 recruitment cycle when the changes would be implemented and to meet contractual obligations to students. The views of Senate were taken into account when the changes were

them to develop and implement effective systems, policies and processes to prevent and respond to incid

The Senate received the Report of the meetings of the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience (UBTLSE) held on 4 July 2022, 13 September 2022 and 4 October 2022.

The Senate noted updates from UBTLSE on:

Key decisions and changes to policies Review and Up

provided to those Schools with underperforming results.

### 22/55 Report of the University Board for Research and Innovation (Item 11)

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor highlighted to the Senate that the University was now in the global top 200 universities according to the THE Rankings the University was joint 198 out of 1,799 universities worldwide. Reading s UK ranking rose three places to joint 26 out of 103 institutions the KPI aim for this metric was 25.

The Senate noted that the University Board for Research and Innovation was not due to meet until 16 November 2022. That meeting was due to consider:

Review of the University risk register with reference to research and innovation-related risks.

Receive performance-related data, including research grants and awards outcomes for 2021/22, research-related University Key Performance Indicators, and recent world league table performance.

Reflect on REF 2021 and wider strategic changes, including future REF strategy in terms of the approach to the quality assessment of research outputs, impact strategy and UOA structures.

Receive updates on:

- o UCRI activity on research culture
- o Research England allocation for 2022/23
- o The research-related pathways of the Strategic Foundations Programme
- Concordats to support research integrity and the career development of researchers
- o Minutes/reports from reporting committees
- o Launch of the Research Output Prize for Early Career Researchers

The Senate received an update from the University Committee for Research and Innovation, in particular noting updates on:

Review of 2020 Research Plan - Proposals post-ROSS review. Plans for review of RFF

The Senate approved that that the following be accorded the title of Honorary Fellow for a period of five years with effect from the date indicated:

Dr Judith McCullouch (31.5.22) Elizabeth Dymond (30.6.22) Kim Marshall (31.8.22) Lucy Virtue (30.9.22) Teresa Wilson (30.9.22)

# 22/61 Reports of Examiners for Higher Degrees by thesis (Item 14 d)

The Senate approved recommendations for the award or otherwise of Higher Degrees.