

Governance Restricted Minutes

Senate

23/01 A meeting of the Senate was held via Teams on Wednesday 1 March 2023 at 2.15 pm.

Present:

The Vice-Chancellor (Chair)

Professor Maarten Ambaum
Professor Tabarak Ballal
Professor Cindy Becker
Professor Elena Beleska-
Spasova
Professor Kat Bicknell
Professor Helen Bilton
Professor Ingo Bojak
Dr Simon Clarke
Professor Phil Dash
Dr Yota Dimitriadi
Ilan Dwek
Professor Richard Frazier
Professor Claire Furneaux
Professor Becky Green
Dr Chris Jones
Professor Rodney Jones
Dr Marris Joseph
Professor Daniela La Penna
Dr Shu-Ling Lu
Dr Rachel McCloy
Professor Elizabeth McCrum
Dr Mary Morrissey
Professor Adrian Palmer
Dr Karen Poulter
Professor Rebecca Rist
Professor Amy Smith
Professor Katja Strohfeldt
Dr Gabor Thomas

Brian Turner
Professor Andrew Urquhart
Professor Sarah von Billerbeck
Professor Carol Wagstaff
Dr Shixuan Wang
Professor Adrian Williams
Dr Hong Yang
Professor Dominik Zaum
Dr Ruvi Ziegler

Students:

RUSU Inclusion
RUSU Welfare Officer
Nicholas Alifa
Katerina Hadjistravi
Thomas Hudson
Akash Kumar

In attendance:

Penny Egan
Louise Sharman (Secretary)
Andrew Grice
Dr Richard Messer
Tony Oliver (interpreter)
Sally Pellow

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed new members to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor outlined the format of the meeting to Senators encouraging them to raise any additional items for discussion under the Vice-Chancellor's report.

The Vice-Chancellor paid tribute to the following who had died since the last meeting of the Senate:

Verity Smith - Verity joined the University in the late 1980s to follow an MSc in Rural Social

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 international standard units of measurement. Professor Mills was a longstanding member of Reading's Department of Chemistry, specialising in infrared spectroscopy.

Emerita Professor Jane F. Gardner – who was a significant figure in the field of Classics, and in particular the field of Roman law. Jane was appointed Assistant Lecturer in 1964, Lecturer in 1966, Senior Lecturer in 1988 and Professor of Ancient History in 1993, she retired in 1999.

Annette Thornton – Lecturer in Classics who was greatly involved in the Department for Continuing Education.

23/02 The Minutes (22/46 – 22/61) of the meeting held on 2 November 2022 were approved as a correct record.

Items for presentation and discussion

23/03 Individual Expectations Framework (item 4)

At the start of this item Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Zaum offered his apologies to the Senate and to the Secretary for the very late circulation of this item.

The Senate received a paper and presentation from Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor Zaum on the Individual Expectations Framework.

At its meeting on 23 June 2022, Senate had received the Individual Expectations Framework developed as part of the Expectations and Workloads Workstream. 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 UBTLSE 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 practice. They were also aligned to institutional KPIs for teaching (Increased student experience and satisfaction) and linked to relevant questions in the NSS (e.g. module evaluation indicators) to ensure student voice is taken into consideration. Teaching indicators were presented as baselines, to enable line managers to identify potential issues and to enable the start of conversations to understand the reasons for these and to find ways to support individuals to address them. A core set of quantitative indicators for teaching and research were used in the pilot, with related data provided centrally. A summary of the data used was submitted. Participating staff were encouraged to self-report on expectations where central records were not kept, as they would normally do as part of their PDRs.

To support the pilot, participating schools (IoE, SPMPCS – Climate division) developed

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. Schools received data linked to relevant indicators from the central team for all individual staff participating in the pilot. Individuals and line managers received individual data to inform discussions. Schools developed an additional section to the PDR template to support expectations setting and to articulate school priorities.

The pilot showed that it was possible to implement the framework through the PDR process, and that statements containing disciplinary expectations were helpful for staff and for the expectations setting process. It also showed that the core indicators piloted were generally appropriate, and that it would be possible for data currently collected by the University to support the framework's implementation utilising the core set in the pilot. The survey and feedback from Heads of School showed that some staff (particularly those early in their careers) benefited from more clarity on what is expected of them. Importantly, feedback indicated that staff found particularly helpful the alignment with promotion criteria, which provided additional clarity and support for their career development.

The pilot also identified a number of challenges including inaccuracy of some of the data, particularly around 15-day turn-around; ability to adequately represent individual contributions to collective activities such as collaborative grants and collaborative teaching on modules/programmes, and ability to scale up generation data at individual and unit level on an accessible and efficient manner with current systems. The impact of different approaches to staff and line management together with the varying level PDR process as it currently stood and its effectiveness were identified as challenges that would need to be addressed if the expectations setting process was to be undertaken as within the PDR. A further challenge identified was the varying degree to which Schools had sufficiently articulated and effectively communicated medium term priorities for teaching and research, which was seen as necessary in order to provide relevant context to expectations setting as intended in the framework.

The outcomes of the pilot and revised framework were discussed with UCRI, UBTLSE and the Strategic Programme Board as part of a broader business case for the Expectations and Workloads Pathway of the Strategic Foundations Programme. Feedback from these Boards indicated concerns on the use of data and metrics at individual level in relation to teaching. Particular concerns related to module evaluation and 15-day turnaround metrics; modules were likely to be taught by groups of staff; these measures were used to enhance the quality of T&L for students rather than to performance manage staff; and that there were biases in module evaluations. It was agreed that an approach based on metrics to inform expectations setting was appropriate, but that further work on approaches to teaching and learning data was necessary. Furthermore, discussions with PVCs Teaching & Learning concluded that an institutional statement of expectations at different career stages would be helpful to frame individual

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 stage (from lecturer to professor, including research only grade 7 staff) and contract classification (teaching only, research only, teaching and research). These statements would incorporate benchmarks and ranges where appropriate, and would clarify how other contextual data informed expectations setting and progress review.
- 2) **Teaching and learning data:** A revised approach to the use of teaching and learning data to address concerns raised. It was proposed that 3-year data (by year and by term) for selected module evaluation questions were made available at aggregated and module level for School/Departments. It was proposed that similar data was provided for all modules where an individual contributed to teaching, irrespective of the individual's contribution to that module. Whilst this data would not be used to set a particular numerical benchmark, it provided a data-informed context within which the contributions to teaching and student experience of individual colleagues could be explored during PDRs and similar discussions. This would enable staff and managers to take account of biases, response rates, etc. This data existed at School/Department level, and dashboards had been piloted by CQSD, so it did not require additional data collection. Summary data had also be used to inform narratives in the TEF submission. Both sets of data (School, individual) would then be used to inform discussions when setting expectations and support overview of progress. It was also proposed that the indicator linked to 15-day turn around should be removed from the framework.
- 3) **Other indicators:** in developing the framework and proposals for implementation, a principle of utilising data already being collected by the University had been followed. It was intended that data and indicators in the framework would be kept under review. Should changes, updates or improvements emerge from future work within the pathway, from implementation of new systems (e.g. CRIS), or other activities, proposals for changes would be brought for consideration to Senate.
- 4) **Systems:** The University currently does not have systems that could efficiently support the full implementation of the framework. Informed by the learning from the

pilot, there was a better understanding of systems requirements and options for development. In addition, the approval for the implementation of a Current Research Information System had reduced the uncertainty on systems requirements going forwards. Work was ongoing to identify where existing processes could be improved to support implementation, and on the development of interim and permanent solutions for effective production and dissemination of data taking into account systems updates and changes.

- 5) **Implementation:** Following the pilot, it was proposed that the implementation of the framework would be phased, starting with the development of the institutional statement of expectations (by the end of the 2022/23 Academic Year), and of disciplinary statements (by October 2024). A detailed timetable for the provision of summary and individual data would be developed, taking into account current systems development work, but this would be a multi-year process.

The following comments and questions were raised by Senators:

- Receiving a discussion paper on the morning of Senate was not helpful in allowing Senate to perform its role. The Senate Agenda Group meets ahead of the Senate to pre-read papers to establish whether a pre-meeting would be useful to allow elected members to explore particular topics in more detail. This could not be done on this occasion due to the delayed availability of the paper.
- How would discipline level statements of expectations be produced?
In the pilot stage Heads of School/Department, Research Division Leads, and SDTLs worked on producing these along with data that was provided centrally.
- Why was the 15-day turnaround dropped?
This was dropped on the basis of comments from UBTLSE around the accuracy of the data and that the feedback turn-around time was not always under the control of the module convenor. It was not appropriate to include the data at this stage but this would be kept under review.
- There was some disappointment as this work was pitched as a way of providing colleagues with clear guidance of what was expected. Looking at a discipline level this could vary greatly leading to inconsistencies and lack of transparency. There were concerns around how teaching would be measured – using module evaluation as a whole would not reflect individual excellence.
There needed to be balancing act between general expectations and discipline specific expectations. It was easier to collect data on Research but Teaching and Learning was more challenging – that was why an institutional level statement would be developed to express a clear institutional expectation for consistency. The institutional level statement would be brought back to Senate.
- Would an institutional minimum be stated?
No there was a view that minimum expectations would skew the production of data and would have detrimental consequences for incentives for providing feedback.
- Ultimately will the whole framework be transparent and equitable?
The framework would be published. It would be equitable because of benchmarking and data used, but it would need to take into account disciplinary differences, personal circumstances, and career stage.

- 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 existing measures should be used.

- The Framework used the PDR process. Did the pilots pick up any issues with variation around how managers undertake PDRs?

HR would be engaged with on training on the use of the Framework as part of the roll-out of the exercise.

- Had peer review of teaching been considered?

Yes, this had been considered but data was not recorded centrally for this – there was no desire to impose more peer review just to make the data meaningful.

- A number of TI colleagues would require clarification on scholarship. There was some disappointment that when it came to scholarship there was no defined %/figures for line managers. Amongst the amendments proposed it would be helpful to see something that line managers should expect colleagues to be involved in scholarship. At the disciplinary level it was possible to include clear expectations in regard to scholarship but at the institutional level the University did not want to put in specific figures as it could not do this in a consistent, transparent and fairway that would cover all disciplines. If scholarship was important to Schools/Departments then there was nothing to prevent its inclusion.

- Why does the framework not include all staff?

Given the different expectations between academic and professional services colleagues the variations would have been too challenging to encompass in a single framework. A commitment had been given to reflect on the Framework and what could be used for professional services colleagues.

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

The project work would not have been undertaken if it was not believed to have a positive tangible benefit. The Framework would be important in improving the quality of teaching and research, and it would be important for the career development of colleagues. The project had worked hard to embed the Framework into existing processes to minimise the collection of data, and would ensure that this was not another layer of bureaucracy – it was a way of working differently.

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.

The Senate agreed that the Senate Agenda Group should determine whether to use Senate reserve and its pre-meet in May.

23/04 Review of ROSS (Item 5)

The Senate received the Review of Research Outputs Support System (ROSS).

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:

- (i) supporting discussions about outputs before submission for publication
- (ii) undertaking and recording post-publication reviews to support a variety purposes, such as research communications, career development, external prize/award nominations and meeting the needs of the REF exercise.

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

- The variation in quality assessment across Research Divisions and strengths and weaknesses of different approaches
- How monitoring of quality and progress of large scale/long-term outputs was achieved across the University. Similarly, how was practice-based research monitored.
- How current practice informed the selection of outputs for REF 2021 and strengths and weaknesses of using ROSS as a tool to identify the pool of eligible REF Candidates
- How/if ROSS could include 'double weighting' information to inform any future

exercises

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

The review was informed by 3 surveys conducted in November and December 2021, with Invited responses from Heads of Schools, Research Division Leads and UOA Leads. Responses were used to motivate four focus groups taking place in January 2022. The groups comprised mixed academics, Heads of School, and Research Division Leads.

Key findings of the review included:

- Cultural differences in local implementation of ROSS
- Misalignment between Heads of School and Research Division Leaders perceptions regarding ROSS and REF quality and performance management
- Confusion surrounding the developmental aspect of ROSS
- Doubts concerning robustness and effectiveness to support REF preparations, including selection and optimisation of outputs portfolio for submission.
- Issues around the granularity of the process to facilitate sufficient differentiation for REF processes
- The importance of establishing systems that were owned by research divisions

In addition, the outcomes of the REF were published in May 2022. UCRI undertook an institutional review of the REF outcomes and identified a number of priorities for the next REF cycle, including improvement of outputs support and review processes so that they more effectively support the development of high-quality outputs with a view to reduce the proportion of 1* and 2* outputs in the next REF submission.

Based on the review outlined above, and the priorities identified by UCRI as part of the review of REF outcomes, a set of proposals were developed. These proposals were approved by UCRI, have received feedback from UBRI, as well as positive feedback from RDLs.

In the ROSS system, pre-publication support, post-publication review and REF preparations were all part of a single system. The proposals approved establish three different strands of activity, each one with a clear set of objectives:

Output development: the proposals include the establishing of a Pre-publication review of outputs system (PRO), which is developed and led by research divisions to ensure that appropriate feedback and support was provided to researchers during the development (draft stage) of selected outputs.

Ongoing REF selection: this would be delivered through a REF Tool, which would be the University's mechanism for evaluating the quality of published outputs. The tool would be developed and led by UOA Leads to be appointed in 2023/24. Taking into account the outcomes of the review of ROSS, the REF Tool would focus on REF candidate outputs, consideration of metrics to inform assessment where these are relevant to the discipline, ability to gain external review, regular calibration, and training.

Expectations and performance: the implementation of the two tools above could complement and support activity being developed elsewhere, such as the implementation of the Individual Expectations Framework, the review of the PDR process, and probation, promotion and professorial review processes.

23/05 Annual Learning and Teaching Report (ALTR) (Item 6)

The Senate received the Annual Learning and Teaching Report (ALTR).

The ALTR supported Council in fulfilling its responsibilities for planning, monitoring and the control of teaching and learning activity, as specified in Ordinance A2. The ALTR also provided assurance that the University was maintaining the standards of its awards and enhancing the quality of its education in line with expectations of the Office for Students (OfS).

The following key points were noted from the Report:

- (a) There had been significant changes in the regulatory landscape during 2021/22: the Office for Students introduced revised conditions of registration which were more stringent and incorporated metrics-based performance criteria; and a new Teaching Excellence Framework methodology had been implemented and the exercise was under way.
- (b) The University had met all the OfS's high-level baseline requirements for 2021/22. However, in the subsidiary detailed analysis, there was one subject area where some demographic subsets fell below the OfS's prescribed performance thresholds.
- (c) The University had submitted a strong TEF submission, reflecting the University's progress in teaching, learning and the student experience over the last few years and its broadly positive TEF metrics.
- (d) The University's results in NSS 2022 showed a significant improvement on recent years, with an overall satisfaction rate of 80.2% (up from 74.3% in 2021) and with two areas significantly above benchmark (Organisation and management and Student voice). Assessment and feedback remained an area of relative weakness in the NSS, but was no longer flagged as significantly below benchmark; work continued to improve the quality and timeliness of feedback to support students in improving their understanding and performance.
- (e) The proportion of higher classifications in undergraduate degrees (Firsts and 2:1s combined) returned to pre-pandemic levels after a spike, due to pandemic-related mitigations, in 2019/20 and 2020/21. The awarding gap between White and BAME students had, however, increased.

- (f) The Portfolio Review Pathway, which was part of the Strategic Foundation Programme, was bringing about major change in the University's educational provision, including semesterisation of the academic year, rationalisation of the programme portfolio, and a redesign of programmes to update the curricula and improve the student learning experience. The pathway was making good progress towards implementation in September 2024.

The following comments and questions were raised by Senators:

- It was an OfS requirement for the Council to sign-off the ALTR. Pro-Vice-Chancellor Professor McCrum would present this to the Council at their meeting on 13 March 2023.
- In the graphs within the report it was better to compare the University against the benchmark data.
- A considerable amount of work had been put into improving long-standing issues arising from the NSS.
- Work on the Student Voice had input considerably to improving assessment and feedback measures.
- It was not clear what the strategy was in regard to international partnerships. The lack of reporting from the Global Engagement Strategy Board did not help in this respect.
- UBTLSE did assure the quality of provision with the University's partners, but the wider question of a global engagement strategy sat with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor International (see 23/10).

23/06 Report of the Vice-Chancellor (Item 7)

The Senate received the Vice-Chancellor's address to the Senate, noting in particular:

Community

Syria and Turkey

The University community was shocked and saddened by the devastating earthquakes in Syria and Turkey. Colleagues from Student Services had written to the 100 students from Turkey and 20 from Syria directly affected offering them pastoral and other support.

Head of School Appointment

Professor Gail Marshall had been appointed as interim Head of School of Humanities whilst a permanent appointment was considered. She took up this role alongside her position as Head of School for Literature and Languages for the remainder of this academic year.

PVC International recruitment

Recruitment was progressing for the new PVC international with the advert going live earlier this month.

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.

UBRI received a summary of the published outcomes of UKRI competitive research funding decisions in 2021/22. Overall, the University had received 34 awards from 96 applications, the 'success rate' of 35% being above the sector average of 27%. Total value awarded was c. £12.9m, in line with 2020/21, but equating to a slightly lower market share (0.64%).

ECMWF

The public consultation on the new ECMWF building design was held on Wednesday 18 January, on Whiteknights, as a statutory part of the planning application process. Professor Dominik Zaum was leading the engagement with ECWWMF.

Associated with this development, the Reading School of Art would be relocating from TOB1 to the Pepper Lane entrance to Whiteknights.

Sustainability

With the recent announcement that UK tuition fees were frozen for another two years and the small increase in student maintenance loans of 2.8%, against the background of annualised inflation in excess of 10%, the financial situation had become very challenging indeed. From discussion with VCs of other research-intensive universities in the region, it was evident that the combination of the long-term freeze of tuition fees and the high level of inflation was having far-reaching impacts on the financial sustainability of the sector.

The University would need to introduce further savings for this year. The Director of Finance had announced some measures and others will be put in place once the outcome of quarter 2 forecast was known.

[redacted, Sec 43]

Items for report and approval

23/07 Report of the University Executive Board (Item 8)

There was no report from UEB on this occasion as items had been covered in the Vice-Chancellor's report.

23/08 Report of the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience (Item 9)

The Senate received the Report of the meetings of the University Board for Teaching, Learning and Student Experience (UBTLSE) held on 2 November, 6 December 2022, 18 January, and 21 February 2023.

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
- Review of current and future activity in regard to research culture
- Membership of the ASPECT programme
- Natural History Partnership Manager
- Annual Research Equipment and Infrastructure Fund
- Higher Education Innovation Funding to support impact and public engagement
- Use of the University Gold Open Access Fund
- Research awards and applications in FQ1 2022/23
- UKRI competitive funding decisions 2021/22

23/10 Report of the Global Engagement Strategy Board (Item 11)

The Senate noted that there was no report on this occasion and that no formal written report had been received over the last two years. The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the absence of a report was not an absence of activity in this area. A report would be submitted to the next meeting.

Items for note

23/11 Retirement of Professors (Item 12 a)

The Senate approved that under the provisions of Ordinance B7 the title of Emeritus/ta Professor be conferred with effect from the date indicated on:

Professor Tim Dixon (31.12.22)
Professor Keith Morrison (24.1.23)

23/12 Other retirements (Item 12 a)

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

Ian May (4.11.22)
Robert Redknapp (30.11.22)
Dawn Dinsdale (11.12.22)
Janet Fillingham (31.12.22)
Donal McLoughlin (31.12.22)
Laura Davis (31.12.22)
David Jones (31.12.22)
Joy Charnley (31.1.23)
Anna McMenamin (10.2.23)
Paul Inman (25.11.22)
Phil Newton (9.12.22)

23/13 Reports of Examiners for Higher Degrees by thesis (Item 12 b)

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

23/14 Suggested topics for presentation at future meetings

- Professional Services and working with Schools, including current impacts on staffing
- Move to semesterisation and the impact on the calendar for minority and religious communities – it was noted that this had been covered by an Equalities Impact Assessment that could be shared.