

Governance Restricted Minutes

Senate

23/01 A meeting of the Senate was held via Teams on Wednesday 1 March 202

Development in AERDD. She then joined AERDD as a member of staff involved with developing countries, often travelling overseas, but also running and contributing to courses at the University. In 2001 she joined the Department of Construction Management & Engineering. She retired in 2010.

Derek Morton - Derek started as a chef at Whiteknights Hall, then became the head chef and eventually was the catering manager. Derek worked at the University for 40 years.

Professor Philip Stratton-Lake - Philip joined the Philosophy Department in 1998 from Keele. As a senior and longstanding colleague, he held every conceivable role in the Department over many years. These included Senior Tutor 1999-2005; Admissions Tutor 1998-2005; Head of Department 2006-2009; MA/MRes Co-ordinator 2009-2011 and more recently; Head of the School of Humanities 2011-2016; and Research Division Lead 2016-2022.

Emeritus Professor Ian Mills OBE FRS, whose work led to a redefinition of the

Individual Expectations Framework was an institutional approach to setting individual expectations for academic staff. Recognising that academic excellence was a collective endeavour, the Framework aimed to support the setting of expectations that support people's academic ambitions and performance and those of their teams, Departments and Schools, fostering in this way a sense of community and collective responsibility. The Framework was aligned to the Excellence and Community elements of the University Strategy.

The proposed approach was a nested framework that spanned from University level to individual level, and a set of principles that all expectation-setting should follow. This approach would enable every member of staff on an academic contract to have a clear agreement with their reviewer on what was expected of them in a defined multi-year period in terms of teaching, research and other activities (in terms of quality and productivity), for this to be done on an equitable basis, and to be supported appropriately (e.g. training, workload allocation, mentoring) to meet those expectations and plan for their career development.

The Framework was approved by Senate in June 2022. As reported then, in order to address the challenges linked to operationalising the framework, a pilot took place between June and November 2022. The pilot aimed at answering four key questions:

- 1) Whether the proposed indicators are appropriate and whether the data supports the implementation of the framework.
- 2) Whether the process for setting expectations can be effectively and efficiently run and whether the process can be integrated into wider staff management practices
- 3) Whether the process provide clarity of expectations to staff
- 4) How the processes developed through the pilot can be scaled up, and what are the systems requirements to do this.

The pilots sought to test implementation of the framework through setting expectations via the PDR processes, where individual expectations and linked quantitative indicators supporting for an individual would be agreed. Indicators for teaching were revised to take account of the feedback from Senate and UBTLE in summer 2022. For the pilot, indicators for teaching were aligned to two teaching priorities: providing high quality teaching and student support, and development of prac 10.4 (t)-6.8 (i)(w)2.5 (o)11.5u (i)(w)2.5 (o)-9. toer(l)2.4 e(v)-2.2 (e)10.4 n ttina idt (pm)4.8(e)10.4 .t mdu2vee(v)(w)202vti wistneithertioo eac(i)2.5 anicatorswverpmsnet (s)-2.edeasvelëao to

a revised contextual statement incorporating disciplinary benchmarks for indicators piloted, together with other discipline-informed measures. Benchmarks were informed by data ranges and averages over a 3-year period for the unit, as well as external benchmarks where available. Statements were also mindful of school priorities and KPIs. The piloting schools provided revised statements to colleagues to inform discussions.

expectations. Such a statement would bring together in one place the expectations and requirements from probation, promotions and professorial review processes.

The Senate noted that the following proposals represented a change from the Framework as approved by Senate in June 2022, and were aimed at improving the framework, support plans for implementation, address feedback from University committees:

- 1) **Institutional and disciplinary expectations:** The outcomes of the pilot highlighted the benefits of increasing clarity in terms of expectations at different career stages. It was proposed that this clarity should be provided through:
An institutional statement of expectations for teaching, research, leadership and citizenship at different career stages, bring together and ensuring alignment with expectations set out in existing processes (probation, promotion and professorial review). The statement would be developed in discussion and consultation with relevant committees and academic staff. It would be approved through the appropriate governance route, including Senate.
Disciplinary statements, setting out disciplinary expectations at School and Department level for teaching, research, leadership and citizenship, at different career

pilot, there was a better understanding of systems requirements and options for development. In addition,

- How can you separate out the expectations place on staff from workload allocation. There were difficulties in getting hold of reliable and impartial data. How could the framework be operationalised by Heads of School without the ability to understand the workload context?

The pilots had identified that without appropriate digital systems this could not be automated at scale. The pilots had discussed whether the framework should be paused until such an automated system were in place but this was likely to take several years, or whether to use existing systems. The framework would be able to include other data as systems come online, e.g. CRIS, but this will be a gradual process

- Heads of School wished to engage on managing workloads and expectations and had a lot of insight, how could they be involved further?

Heads of School would be engaged with on implementation – there would be a plan to work with individual Schools to ensure that it was fit for purpose.

- All colleagues wanted a workload allocation that was fair and equitable. Many were convinced that their current workload allocation was excessive. If not careful, the system could prove that everyone was working too hard already and that further teaching should not be allocated out.

The Individual Expectations Framework was not a workload allocation model and did not support the allocation of work. Clearly some Schools already used existing workload models

- There was some discomfort around Teaching and Learning measures based on student evaluation. There were other measures that could be considered in thinking about teaching quality.

It was important to include input from students but the measures did not have to be limited to this – all of the indicators would be kept under review. The starting point for the work on the Framework was that it should not impose significant workload or additional data collection, and that it was designed to be a starting point for discussion.

a (g)] 11400111 (75 (d2667pg as 26 (67p(2n51d1(62.5))16 (e5h10e5 (u4)-20n4 (w)363 (6v1015.9)re

- How much effort, work, time, money would be put into implementing this? Was it worth it? What was the lost opportunity cost?

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Senate whether, given the late submission of the paper, it wished to discuss the topic further at the upcoming reserve Senate in early May before reaching any decision on the proposed amendments.

23/04 Review of ROSS (Item 5)

It was noted that during 2021/22, UCRI undertook a review of the Research Outputs Support System (ROSS) which had been in operation since 2017. The ROSS system provided research divisions with a mechanism to be tailored locally, aimed at:

- Research Divisions implemented the ROSS system in a variety of ways. The review of ROSS was intended to understand:

- The o to(i)anau7 (t)-6.11.1a0a8sua7(c)n10s4M5ei13s5(s)-2.1(w)2.2.1(a)10 5 (n)10.4 (.8

exercises

- The use of ROSS in supporting work in progress and monograph development
- The use of any data generated through ROSS (ROSS dashboards/reports)

New Year's Honours

Professor Paul Glaister was appointed CBE in the New Year's Honours for services to education.

UCU Industrial Action

The UCU's demands were for a new valuation of the USS scheme and for the restoration of benefits, which were reformed following the 2020 valuation. Considering that the 2023 valuation of the USS was already underway, and that the VC had publicly stated his support for the restoration of benefits as far as this is possible within the context of the 2023 valuation, the University and UCU appeared to be in dispute but not in disagreement – a situation for which a resolution should be found.

The Universities and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA), on behalf of universities, had put forward pay offers in respect of the 2023/24 round of negotiations, with uplift ranging from 8% for the lowest paid to 5% for those on higher incomes.

Race Equality Charter Bronze Award

The University had recently been awarded the Bronze award. It was praised for its candid approach to identifying race equality issues and contained details on decolonisation of the curriculum, efforts to improve BAME staff progression and the work of our BAME and Allies Staff Network.

Athena Swan

Technical Services had received a Silver award.

LGBT+: New Fund

In LGBT History month, the University community had organised a range of activities and colleagues had shared their perspectives as to why this month was so important. A new fund had been announced to support small scale projects with funding requests of up to £1,000 for projects led by staff and students that aid understanding and practical help for LGBT+ communities.

The University had paused its membership of Stonewall's Workplace Diversity Scheme this year due to concerns about the reporting process the charity used to judge institutions on equality progress.

International Women's History Month

Looking ahead to International Women's History Month, colleagues had organised an interesting programme of activities this year with a focus on women and health.

Excellence

Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)

The final draft of the 2023 UoR TEF Submission had been submitted. This year's TEF Exercise included an optional independent Student Submission. RUSU had taken ownership of the Student Submission and colleagues worked in partnership with RUSU to ensure the two

submissions aligned.

UKRI competitive funding decisions 2021/22.

The Senate noted updates from UBTLSE on:

- Examiners
- Degree Outcomes Statement 2022
- Monitoring of undergraduate, taught postgraduate and postgraduate research programmes
- Amendments to Taught Postgraduate classification rules
- Amendments to Integrated Master's progression rules

and updates on:

- Changes to policies
- Annual Statement from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator 2021
- Teaching, Learning and Student Experience Risk Register
- Portfolio Review Pathway
- Online Examinations 2023
- Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework
- University Annual Quality Assurance Review Report 2021/22
- Abrahart v Bristol Ruling
- Suicide Prevention and Postvention
- Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct
- Industrial Action Contingency Group
- Graduate outcomes 2019/20 Cohort – sector-level comparison
- National Student Survey 2023
- League Table Summaries
- Blended Learning
- Cost of Living
- Sector bodies and national initiatives
- Teaching and Learning Funds, Awards and Fellowships

The Senate were asked to:

- a. note the contents of this report.
- b. approve and commend to Council the Annual Learning and Teaching Report for Spring 2022 (see Minute 23/05).
- c. approve the appointment of Internal and External Examiners for 2022/23.
- d. approve and commend to Council the revised Degree Outcomes Statement 2022.
- e. consider and commend to Council the statement on the *Monitoring of undergraduate, taught postgraduate and postgraduate research programmes*.
- f. approve amendments to the Taught Postgraduate Classification Rules (2024/25 onwards).
- g. approve amendments to the Integrated Master's Progression Rules (with immediate effect).

The Senate approved the transmission of the ALTR to the Council. It also approved the transmission of the Degrees Outcome Statement 2022 and the Statement on Monitoring of Undergraduate, Taught Postgraduate, and Postgraduate Research Programmes, to the Council.

23/09 Report of the University Board for Research and Innovation (Item 10)

The Senate noted that the University Board for Research and Innovation had not yet met this term. The Senate were asked to note that UBRI had approved at its meeting on 16 November 2022 the following changes to Research Divisions to align with the University's future REF submission strategy:

- Merging the Classics and History Research Divisions
- Merging the Politics & International Relations and Philosophy Research Divisions
- Merging the Art and Typography & Graphic Design Research Divisions

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

- Review of REF outputs analyses in UoAs
- Research England Expanding Excellence in England (E3) call 2024-2028
- Public Engagement with the Research Action Plan
-

Items for note

23/11