

Minutes (unrestricted)

Meeting title: Senate

Date: Wednesday 11 November 2015

Time: 2.15 pm

Location: The Senate Room, George Thomas Building, Highfield campus

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (*in the Chair*), Deputy Vice-Chancellor Wheeler, Pro Vice-Chancellor M Spearing, Professor J W Anderson, Ms C Atkins (*Academic Registrar*), Professor Y Baatz, Dr D Baralle, Dr S Brien, Dr K Bull, Professor I T Cameron, Dr T Chown, Professor S Colley, Professor Dame Jessica Corner, Dr H Cullington, Dr A Darlington, Mr F Delves*, Dr B Dimitrov, Professor R W Eason, Dr N Evans, Professor J Falkingham, Ms N Fazel-Hamedani, Mr B Franklin*, Professor M French, Professor J Frey, Dr M Ghandchi, Dr N Gibbins, Dr J Glenn, Professor M Gobbi, Dr H M Haitchi, Dr N Hammond-Browning, Professor S Hawkins, Dr R J Hempel, Dr A Hickman, Professor N Hounsell, Dr C W Jackson, Mr J Jones, Ms J Kelly, Professor D P McGhee, Mr K Mahendiran*, Professor R Mills, Dr D Nicole, Mr D Oakley, Ms L Onaran, Mr M Parry, Ms N Passmore, Dr V Perisic, Dr J Pilgrim, Dr F Poletti, Dr E Plum, Dr K Poore, Mr B Price, Professor P Reid, Dr E S Reid, Professor D J Richards, Mr D Richardson*, Professor T Roose, Dr S Ryall, Ms J Savidge, Ms I Stark, Ms N Stecker-Doxat, Dr E Swindle, Dr R Tare, Dr M Tebruegge, Ms S Verma*, Professor J A Vickers, Dr A Viens, Dr P J White, Professor P Whittaker and Professor I D Williams

By invitation Ms L Baldock, Legal (Corporate) Services for Item 12;
Mr G Costigan, Director, Vice-Chancellor's Office, and Ms B Halliday, Director, Legal (Corporate) Services for Item 13; and
Ms K Kerridge-Poonia for Item 20

In attendance Ms C J Gamble

* Members of Senate not present for the discussion of items on the restricted agenda.

Welcome

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular the new members of Senate who were attending their first meeting.

1 Obituaries

The Vice-Chancellor announced with regret the death of:

Mr Sunghan Kim, a MPhil/PhD student in Engineering Sciences: 25 July 2015.

He asked members of Senate to stand for a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

2 Statement of Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters

Received A report, dated 4 November 2015, drawn up on behalf of the Academic Registrar, itemizing and explaining a series of amendments to be made to the Statement of Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters, all of which were highlighted in the accompanying Statement, presented by the Academic Registrar for approval.

Resolved That the amendments to the Statement of Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters, 2015-2016, set out under point 1 i) to iii) and highlighted in Appendix 1 be approved.

Noted The comment in the covering report under 1 iii) that the content of the Statement would need to be reconsidered during the year in the light of the proposals presented under Agendum 11.

3 **Standing Orders**

Received A brief covering report, drawn up on behalf of the Academic Registrar, which outlined minor amendments to the Standing Orders of Senate, together with a copy of the draft, revised Standing Orders for 2015/16, presented for approval.

The Academic Registrar explained that the amendments highlighted in the document took account of the changes that had been introduced during the latter part of 2014/15. She drew attention to an error in paragraph 7: in the second sentence the first 'and' should not be deleted.

Resolved That the revised copy of the Standing Orders for 2015/16 be approved, subject to the correction of the error highlighted by the Academic Registrar.

Noted The statement about further amendments being presented later in the year.

4 **Senate membership**

Received A copy of the membership of Senate for the academic year 2015/16.

The Vice-Chancellor invited members of Senate to let the working secretary know after the meeting if there were any errors in the names and titles of the members listed in the document.

Noted The current membership of Senate.

5 **Minutes (unrestricted) of meeting held on 17 June 2015**

The members approved the unrestricted minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2015 for signing by the Vice-Chancellor.

6 **Matters arising**

Meeting held on 5 November 2014

6.1 **Evolution of Research Governance (Minute 19)**

The Vice-Chancellor explained that there was one matter arising from the November 2014 meeting of Senate which should have been reported last year.

When the proposal to set up a Research Integrity and Governance Committee had been presented to Council in November 2014, after Senate had endorsed the recommendation that it should be a committee of Council, it had been agreed that it should be constituted as an executive group rather than a committee. It had further been agreed that the University Ethics Committee would report to this executive group. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) would report directly to Council on matters that needed discussion or a decision by the governing body.

Meeting held on 17 June 2015

6.2 **Quality Assurance Agency's (QAA) Higher Education Review: summary of follow-up actions (Minute 64)**

The Academic Registrar reported that in July 2015 the Vice-Chancellor had approved the action plan which had been published on the University's web pages by the Quality Assurance Agency's deadline. The work being undertaken to complete the actions listed in the plan was being monitored.

There had been further communication with the QAA at the end of August about the recommendation to publish additional course costs at programme level for prospective and current students by September 2015 because the technical implementation of the work would take until the end of October. A timeline for completing the task had been sent to the QAA which had not requested any additional information.

The QAA had also requested a good practise case study on the University's work with student engagement which the University had drafted and submitted.

6.3 **Amendments to Ordinances** (Minute 69)

The Academic Registrar reported that the amendments to the Ordinances 2.1, 2.2, 2.9 and 2.12.6 to revise the names of the Faculties of Business and Law and Social and Human Sciences had been approved by Council at its meeting on 8 July 2015.

6.4 **Senate Nominating Committee: recommendations regarding the Senate members on Council** (Minute 71)

The Academic Registrar stated that following Senate's approval of the recommendations from its Nominating Committee, one of the three appointees - Dr Gravell - was not continuing in Senate membership this year and thus there was a vacancy on the governing body in Class 3 (Members appointed by the Senate). A further vacancy would arise when Professor Dame Jessica Corner left the University in December 2015. Senate would need to appoint two of its members as soon as possible to serve on Council. The usual arrangements would be made to set up the Senate Nominating Committee as soon as possible.

6.5 **Honorary degrees and Fellows of the University** (Minute 77)

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the timetable for putting forward nominations had been delayed this year and would run according to the following schedule. (The invitation to Senators to submit nominations had been circulated in September, giving a deadline for receipt of 23 October 2015.) The Honorary Degree Advisory Group would meet on 27 November 2015; and Senate would be consulted (electronically) about the nominations before they were presented to Council in January 2016.

7 **Vice-Chancellor's report and summary of University Senior Management Team and University Academic Executive discussions**

Received A report, drawn up on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, dated 5 November 2015, on current strategic and operational issues, recent news and events, and international visits, presented by the Vice-Chancellor.

[Note: There were two errors in the report circulated: in section 60, Will Jennings was a Professor of Political Science and Public Policy; and in section 67, the name of the Faculty should read, 'Faculty of Social, Human and Mathematical Sciences'.]

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to various sections in the report, including:

- The strategic priorities and the proposed elements of quality, sustainability, internationalisation and collegiality. The Vice-Chancellor stated that he wished to emphasize the importance of the latter point and wanted to encourage everyone to share their views about the institution with him.
- A report on the outcome of the work undertaken as part of the Business Model Review would be presented to Senate at its meeting in February 2016.
- The University had recruited a record number of students in 2015/16 which had been driven by a significant increase in Home/EU undergraduates following the lifting of the cap on student numbers.
- The Government's Green Paper, 'Fulfilling our potential: teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice' had been published. [The document is available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/474227/BIS-15-623-fulfilling-our-potential-teaching-excellence-social-mobility-and-student-choice.pdf.]

The publication of the Nurse Review of the UK Research Councils was expected later in November. [The review – ‘Ensuring a successful UK research endeavor’ – was published on 19 November 2015. It is available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nurse-review-of-research-councils-recommendations>.]

- The Vice-Chancellor highlighted the appointments which had been made recently, in particular the Chief Operating Officer’s post which would be taken up by an alumnus of the University, Mr Ian Dunn; and the position of Chief Information Officer to which Professor Simon Cox had been seconded for an initial period of six months from 1 August 2015.
- The Enactus Southampton team had been crowned world champion for the first time this year at the Enactus World Cup which had been held in South Africa. The team had beaten 35 national champion teams from around the world.
- The Equality Challenge Unit’s Athena Swan Charter group had announced on 1 October 2015 that the Faculty of Medicine had achieved the Athena Swan Silver Award.
- The Vice-Chancellor thanked the Chancellor, Dame Helen Alexander, for her help in securing two important visitors to the University who gave talks in the distinguished lecture series: Sir Michael Rake and Sir Philip Dilley.

Noted The information contained in the Vice-Chancellor’s report and the summary of the discussions at meetings of the University Senior Management Team and the University Academic Executive.

8 **President of the Students’ Union’s report**

Received A report, prepared by the President, Mr Franklin, and Vice-President (Education), Ms Verma, of the Students’ Union, on recent activities organized and issues discussed by the Union.

Ms Verma presented an update on two items in the report: additional postgraduate representation and the elections in respect of the Students’ Association at the University of Southampton Malaysia Campus (USMC). A President, Secretary, Treasurer, Officers and representatives had been elected. She and the President were in regular contact with the new President at USMC to discuss any matters that might arise about the running of the Association or to answer questions in the area of academic representation.

Mr Franklin drew attention to the main points in the report’s last section on facilities, space and the student experience and the steps that had been taken in response to the increase in demand on services as a result of the higher than expected number of students recruited this year. He had worked with Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill to explain to students how the issues raised would be addressed, setting it all in the context of the development of University’s estate and infrastructure.

In response to a question about the plans for the campus at Dalian Polytechnic University, the Vice-Chancellor commented that the arrangements there were categorized as collaborative provision thus the development of the campus was not the University’s responsibility unlike USMC which was run by the University.

Attention was drawn to the Staff Social Club and the increase in the number of students who were using it as study space. The Vice-Chancellor acknowledged the point and reiterated his earlier comments about recruiting to plan.

Noted The report from the President and Vice-President (Education) of the Students’ Union.

9 **Senate question time**

Received A report, dated 2 November 2015, on queries and comments received for Senate question time, prepared on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor.

[Note: There was an error in the report: the reference to Agendum 6 in section 2 should read Agendum 7.]

(Written responses to the questions listed in the report are attached as an Appendix to the unrestricted minutes.)

In discussion, a number of observations and comments were offered:

International student diversity

The Vice-Chancellor commented that, when recruiting internationally, the University should seek to achieve a balance in the numbers of students drawn from different countries, rather than focusing on recruitment from one particular area. If that was not possible in the short term, and the majority of students recruited to a particular programme arrived from one country, then consideration needed to be given to how best to support the cohort. The strategy should be examined to see what could be done to improve recruitment levels from a wider range of countries.

Timetabling and de-semesterisation

The Vice-Chancellor added that the majority of institutions worked to a semesterised cycle. However, it could be the subject of a discussion at Senate after the Education and Student Experience Executive Group had considered it first, as suggested by Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill in his written response.

Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) and other teaching matters

The Vice-Chancellor stated that a response to the Green Paper ('Fulfilling our Potential: teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice') would be submitted by the University.

Regarding the bullet-point list of questions under the heading of other teaching matters, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the differences that existed among Faculties would become clearer when the senior executive groups were amalgamated as one, as proposed in the report presented under Agendum 11. The questions could be tackled collectively by the senior management, taking account of the individual areas of success and the particular challenges in each discipline.

Responding to a question on diminishing levels of funding for research and the action the University might take to ensure that it continued to attract grants, the Vice-Chancellor said that where opportunities existed in the UK and abroad to diversify streams of funding they should be taken. Developing collaborative ventures, like the one established with Lloyd's Register, was another potential area where activities could be concentrated as traditional research funding levels dropped.

Noted The questions and responses discussed during Senate question time.

10 **Change in title, introduction of new Vice-President roles, and associated amendments to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances**

Received A report entitled 'Change of title, introduction of new Vice-President roles, and associated amendments to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances', dated 28 October 2015, prepared on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor explained the background to the paper, and the reasons for proposing changes to his title and the introduction of a new role of Vice-President. The portfolios of the current Pro Vice-Chancellors were considerable and, although the current PVCs were doing an excellent job in managing their workloads and providing leadership, it had been recognized that there was a need to put the University's key portfolios on a better footing. The proposals were designed to rectify the current position by creating Vice-President posts which would be full-time, and on an open-ended basis. This would also remove the likelihood that the institution lost the skills and capabilities of a PVC as he/she reached the end of his/her fixed term of office.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that in the first instance there would be three Vice-Presidents to cover the Education, Research and Enterprise, and International portfolios. The PVC role would continue but with a narrower focus on specific, key institutional projects, such as the next Research Excellence Framework exercise or whatever periodic assessment might replace the Quality Assurance Agency's Higher Education Review. The roles would provide opportunities for senior staff to develop their leadership skills, working with the Vice-Presidents. However, the intention was not to increase unnecessarily the number of senior executive roles; two of the posts – the Deputy Vice-Chancellor's and the Provost's – would no longer exist in the structure. By removing the Provost role, the Deans would be more closely linked to the Vice-Chancellor.

Furthermore, the aim was to establish a cohesive, senior team within a simplified structure that would bring together the academic and Professional Services leadership. The role of Registrar would be subsumed under the responsibilities of the Chief Operating Officer who was the head of a unified administration.

The proposals would require the amendment of the relevant sections of the Charter and Statutes, and the Ordinances, all of which had to be done in accordance with the process set out in the Charter (Articles 15 to 18).

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor thanked the Vice-Chancellor for his introduction, and invited comments and questions from the floor:

- Concern was expressed about a possible corollary of creating permanent posts which was that the senior executive might end up being removed from the everyday activities of teaching and research and an understanding of all that that entailed. Strengthening the involvement of the heads of academic units in the governance structures would be a step to militate against that development.

The Vice-Chancellor responded that he saw the involvement of the Faculties in University governance as a key element in the new framework hence the proposal that the Deans report directly to him, and the creation of one executive decision-making body on which the Deans would sit to replace the University Senior Management Team, the University Academic Executive and the University Professional Services Leadership Team. He supported greater engagement in institutional governance arrangements at the departmental level but it was not feasible to include the Heads of academic units on the executive body because of the numbers involved.

It was not intended that the Vice-Presidents should have to step away altogether from research. The opportunity should remain for them to continue to pursue their academic interests, albeit on a limited basis.

- It was questioned whether the Vice-Chancellor would be in a position to deal with all of the matters that the Deans might wish to raise with him. He might be inundated.

The Vice-Chancellor offered the view that, irrespective of the volume of queries that might arise, as the head of the institution, he was well-placed to address and resolve any issues. The new framework would allow the Faculties to develop their role and level of accountability. A stronger senior executive should be coupled more closely with the academic endeavour of the University.

- On the point about strengthening the connection with the Faculties, it was queried how that would be done at the levels below the Deans and the professoriate, for example, the research fellows. The Vice-Chancellor stated that it was a question of sustainability, aligning student numbers and staffing levels to achieve stability and ensuring that those who pursue, for example, a research pathway would be appropriately supported in their career choice.
- Would positive action be taken in respect of the recruitment of the Vice-Presidents, particularly in the view of the fact that the University had joined the 30% Club? Equality and diversity continued to be matters that needed to be addressed. The Vice-Chancellor observed that the intention would be to look internally for candidates and then to move to external advertisement only if it was necessary. He anticipated that positive action would be taken to arrive at a better balance of gender and ethnic diversity in the selection pool.
- How many Vice-Presidents did the Vice-Chancellor plan to recruit? What roles would they take on? The Vice-Chancellor reiterated his earlier statements about selecting three Vice-Presidents initially in the areas of Education, Research and Enterprise, and Internationalization. There might be a need over the longer term for a Vice-President Academic Operations. The intention was to keep the structure as efficient as possible.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor concluded the discussions and invited members of Senate to support the recommendations set out in the paper. Referring to resolution (v), presented in the paper, on the timetable for approving the necessary constitutional changes at an extraordinary meeting of Senate, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor invited Senators to consider an electronic consultation instead. The members of Senate were content to endorse this proposal. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor stated that the revisions would be circulated no later than the first week of December and Senators would be asked to comment within a week of the circulation. The timetable would be adjusted to include the first reading of the amendments at a special meeting of Council which would be held at least one month before the scheduled meeting of the governing body on 20 January 2016 at which a second reading of the changes would be completed; thereafter the documents would be despatched to the Privy Council for approval.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the proposal that the title of 'Vice-Chancellor' be revised to 'President and Vice-Chancellor' be endorsed.
 - (ii) That the proposal that a new title of 'Vice-President' be introduced as a permanent position, with an appointment process run through internal and external advertisement be endorsed.
 - (iii) That the proposal that the roles of Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Provost and Registrar be removed and that flexibility be maintained in the constitutional documents to appoint an appropriate number of Vice-Presidents and Pro Vice-Chancellors to meet the institution's strategic needs be endorsed.
 - (iv) That the proposal that the appointment process for recruiting a Pro Vice-Chancellor to replace Professor Judith Petts be run through internal and external advertisement be endorsed; and that the successful candidate be moved to a Vice-President's role as soon as approval of the required amendments to the constitutional documents had been granted by the Privy Council.
 - (v) That the proposal to conduct the consultation on the revisions with Senate electronically be endorsed; and that the timetable for the internal approval process in accordance with Articles 15 to 18 of the Charter be noted.

11 The Prevent duty and the responsibilities of the University

- Received** A presentation given by Provost and Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing on the 'Prevent duty', section 26 of the Counterterrorism and Security Act 2015. [The presentation is available on the SUSSED Senate group site under Agendum 12.]

Professor Spearing outlined:

- The definition of the term 'Prevent duty' and what its introduction as part of the recent counter-terrorism legislation would entail for higher education institutions, and how arrangements would be monitored.
- The steps the University would have to take to comply with the duty to have '... due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism.'
- The proposed details for monitoring compliance with the legislation which would be undertaken initially by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE).
- The approval process, reporting lines, the role of the Responsible Officer (Chief Operating Officer), and the work under way to draw up a risk assessment and action plan.
- The work that would have to be completed in respect of developing staff training, reviewing current policies to incorporate the Prevent duty, and working with the Students' Union and its societies to ensure that students understood the requirements of the legislation and how they had been introduced at the University.

In discussion, a number of points were raised, including:

- How would the Prevent duty be balanced against the duty on higher education institutions to ensure freedom of speech and to protect academic freedom? Ms Baldock referred to the guidance which stated that institutions would be expected to have in place policies and procedures for students and staff who were working on sensitive or extremism-related research in order to protect academic freedom.
- Professor Spearing stated that the University had a long history of holding events on campus which allowed a wide-range of speakers to express their views. The introduction of the Prevent duty should not change that. Ms Halliday reiterated that the counterterrorism legislation protected the freedom of speech; the guidance regarding the Prevent duty stated that when it was anticipated that external speakers might espouse 'extremist views' they should not go unchallenged. It was expected that proper risk assessment processes would be in place.

- In response to a question about working with other institutions or representative bodies in the sector to develop appropriate practices, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the sector had acted collectively to contribute views and comments on the initial draft of the legislation. What had been introduced was a much clearer version than earlier drafts.
- If students were researching terrorist organizations, would the University ensure that they had access to primary sources? Professor Falkingham pointed out that that would be the responsibility of the programme tutor to consider in the first instance. This was a new area for undergraduate teaching, and the implications needed to be examined further. It was possible that the processes in place for research projects with scrutiny via the Faculty Ethics Committee and/or the Research Integrity and Governance group could be used.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Professor Spearing for the presentation.

Noted The presentation on the 'Prevent duty' and the points raised in discussion.

12 **Revised Code of Practice for Ensuring Freedom of Speech within the Law**

Received A report entitled 'Revised Code of Practice to Ensure Freedom of Speech within the Law', prepared on behalf of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, which summarized the work undertaken to complete a review of the current Code of Practice, taking into account the requirements of the Counterterrorism and Security Act 2015, in particular the duty placed on institutions – the Prevent duty – to have due regard to the need to prevent people being drawn into terrorism, together with a copy of the revised Code of Practice.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor highlighted the main points in the report which were set out in the summary section. What was proposed in the revised Code was essentially a development of what was already contained in the document and was not a radical departure from the current framework. He reminded Senators that the initial report from the working group had been presented at Senate's meeting held on 17 June 2015. He wished to thank Ms Halliday and Mr Costigan for their involvement in the drafting of the document.

The key changes were: more information about the purpose of the Code and the relevant legal requirements were contained in the document; there was a cross-referencing to other University policies that set out standards expected of staff and students; three types of event were defined; the requirements that the 'Responsible Officer' placed on an event which was 'designated' under the Code were less prescriptive and there was greater scope for the Responsible Officer to use his/her discretion; and there was a clarification of who was responsible for the cost of any additional external security measures that might be needed to allow an event to proceed.

In discussion, the members of Senate raised a number of points, including:

- In response to a question about the processes in place, described in the new Code, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor stated that at the point at which a room booking was made the trigger mechanism would alert the organizer that an event should be designated and a 'Principal Officer' should be appointed. He/she would work with the Responsible Officer to determine whether particular measures needed to be taken.
- The title of the document appeared now not to convey the extended ambit of the Code. Would it be possible to reconsider the title? The Deputy Vice-Chancellor stated that that would have to be considered outside the meeting.
- The Faculties needed to be aware of the new requirements in respect of events which were held in buildings where they controlled the room bookings. The Students' Union had been involved with the work of the group which had formulated the revisions and had briefed its societies of the changes.
- What were the consequences for an individual if an error of judgement was made regarding an event? Who would be responsible? The Deputy Vice-Chancellor commented that a view would have to be taken based on the particular circumstances of a case. However, following the Code was a requirement placed on staff which was similar to adhering to health and safety requirements, and was backed up by the disciplinary procedures. Ms Halliday emphasized that the Code was unchanged in regard to the University's commitment to uphold academic freedom of enquiry, and to promote freedom of speech.

- Resolved** (i) That the revised Code of Practice to Ensure Freedom of Speech Within the Law be approved for presentation to Council.
- (ii) That the appropriateness of the title of Code be considered by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor in consultation with the Director of the Legal (Corporate) Services before the document was presented to Council.
- Noted** (iii) The completion of the review of the Code undertaken by the working group.

13 **Academic Reward and Recognition: update on appraisal training compliance**

Received A report on the academic appraisal training , dated 4 November 2015, drawn up on behalf of Provost and Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing.

It was suggested that information on how the new reward system worked should be included in the appraisal training.

Noted The content of the report, the plan to present a further report in 2016 to Senate on the training and completion of appraisals for ERE staff, Levels 4 to 7, and the suggestion made about providing additional information in the training.

14 **Academic Quality and Standards Committee**

14.1 **Report of the meeting held on 13 July 2015**

Received A report of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 July 2015, together with two appendices: '2013/14 Destinations of Leavers of Higher Education (DLHE) Data'; and 'Additional Analysis following reports on 2014/15 Entrant Profile, and 2013/14 UG and PGT Progression and Qualification'.

In the absence of Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill, the Chair of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee, the Academic Registrar drew attention to:

Fitness to Practise (Item 2); the Year in Employment and work under way on the quality assurance implications of the year (Item 3); the DLHE data and the entrant profile, progression and qualification information (Items 9 and 10).

14.2 **Report of the meeting held on 21 October 2015**

Received A report containing extracts from the unconfirmed minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 October 2015, together with an appendix, 'National Student Survey (NSS), 2015 results: summary report'.

The Academic Registrar highlighted:

The timetable for regulatory changes (Item 1); Translation of marks: principles (Item 4); and the National Student Survey, 2015 results (Item 5).

Noted The discussions, and decisions, recorded in the reports from the meetings of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee held on 13 July 2015 and 21 October 2015.

15 **Doctoral College Board: Report from the Director of the Doctoral College**

Professor Vickers presented an oral report on the recently established Doctoral College. The Doctoral College had been set up to act as a unifying and coordinating body to develop and manage doctoral research provision across the University and partner organizations. It aimed to support and nurture the development of the wider doctoral community. Professor Vickers stated that he was aware that there was work to be done to publicise the Doctoral College and its activities across the University and this was in hand. He singled out a number of matters that the Doctoral College was currently considering:

- replacing the current MPhil/PhD registration, with an upgrade stage part way through candidature, to registration at doctoral level from the outset. The Code of Practice for Research Candidature and Supervision and the Higher Degree Regulations would have to be revised and

presented for approval in due course. The aim was to introduce the new arrangements for the academic session 2016/17.

- working with the Students' Union on representation on the Doctoral College Board and its subcommittees; and
- organizing a festival of doctoral research which would take place in Semester II, 2016.

Noted The oral report presented by Professor Vickers.

16 Vice-Chancellor's actions as Chair of Senate

Received A report, compiled on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, which listed the actions taken by his predecessor, Professor Nutbeam, acting as the Chair of Senate, since Senate's meeting on 17 June 2015 until the end of his tenure on 30 September 2015.

Noted The Chair's action take on behalf of Senate during the period 18 June 2015 to 30 September 2015.

17 Enhancing diversity in academic promotions: Annual report

Received A report entitled, 'Enhancing Equality and Diversity: update report and recommendations for 2015/16', drawn up on behalf of Professor Dame Jessica Corner, together with a covering note, prepared by the Head of Equality and Diversity, Ms Kerridge-Poonia.

In presenting the report, Professor Dame Jessica Corner explained that, in a departure from the usual annual update on the gender profile of staff applying for promotions, this report, which would be presented to Council in November 2015, gave an overview of the overall progress made by the institution in respect of equality and diversity. It was a more comprehensive report, of which the promotions data for academic staff on ERE levels 6 and 7 was a part.

Professor Dame Jessica Corner drew attention to a number of areas:

- The section 'Southampton and the sector' in which two tables were presented, one on the number and percentage of female academics at professorial level in the sector and the data for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups, and one which gave the figures for the mean percentage pay for all employees in the sector and at the University. The information in Table 1 suggested that the University was making headway. In terms of promotion, the success rate at level 6 for female academics was on a par with the rate for male academics (Appendix 2, 73% and 72%, respectively). However, at level 7, the difference in the percentage of successful applications widened (63% and 66%). Regarding the mean percentage pay gap, Professor Dame Jessica Corner underlined the statement in the report that at the University the issue was one of the employment pipeline rather than equal pay for equal work (paragraph 2.15). The so-called glass ceiling affected women in all disciplines, although it manifested itself differently across the arts and sciences.

In respect of the position of BME groups, further, investigative work should be undertaken to understand the background and details in order to take the appropriate action.

- The University had made substantial progress in respect of Athena SWAN awards. Currently nine academic groups held awards, including two silver awards for Chemistry and, more recently, one for the Faculty of Medicine. There were three departmental award-holders planning for Silver awards in the near future and preparations were under way to submit an institutional application for a Silver award in April 2016.
- Professor Dame Jessica Corner reiterated the announcement that the Chair of Council, on behalf of the University, had made a commitment to the aims of the 30% Club, an organization which supported and encouraged 30 per cent representation on Boards, other committees and in senior roles.
- The report contained a recommendation to Council that a University Equality and Diversity Committee be established. Professor Dame Jessica Corner was pleased to announce that the Vice-Chancellor had agreed to chair the group when it was set up.

- Professor Nyovani Madise would take on Professor Dame Jessica Corner's lead role in respect of equality and diversity when Dame Jessica left the University in December 2015.

In discussion, the members of Senate raised a number of points which included:

- The unconscious bias training had been extremely well-received. Professor Vickers strongly supported the recommendation in the report that resources should be identified for the training in 2016/17. Ms Kerridge-Poonia commented that it would be discussed as part of the budget setting process. The Vice-Chancellor commented that the new committee would help identify and prioritize initiatives and the resources required.
- How would protected characteristics, as defined by the legislation, be monitored? Professor Dame Jessica Corner responded that currently they were requested at the point at which an individual joined the institution. However, to enable monitoring throughout a period of an individual's employment, additional points of data gathering needed to be introduced. The promotions process was one point. It was known that some individuals did not feel sufficiently confident to disclose personal details for fear that that information might be used to the detriment of their career success. The statistical information that was available, for example, on disability was patchy.
- Professor Cameron wished to acknowledge the work that was being done by the Head of Equality and Diversity and her team across the University, and those members of staff working in the Faculties.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Professor Dame Jessica Corner and Ms Kerridge-Poonia for the report.

Noted The progress made in respect of equality and diversity and the recommendations in the report for the next steps to be taken which would be presented to Council at its meeting on 26 November 2015.

18 Selection of Senate Nominating Committee members for 2015/16

The Vice-Chancellor invited Senators to put themselves forward to form a Nominating Committee for the year to deal with the vacancies – the current one and one which would arise at the end of the calendar year – in Senate membership on Council.

The members of Senate currently on Council were:

Professor Dame Jessica Corner who had been appointed until 31 July 2017 but would leave the University at the end of December 2015;
Dr Bashir Lwaleed who had been appointed until 2018; and
Professor James Vickers, appointed until 31 July 2018.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that an invitation would be circulated to members as soon as possible by the working secretary.

Professor Frey, who had joined the Nominating Committee last year, encouraged members to put themselves forward to be considered for Council membership. Professor Dame Jessica Corner reiterated the comment, adding that being part of the governing body was a role she would thoroughly recommend. She drew attention to her earlier presentation on equality and diversity and the commitment of the University to the 30% Club. The number of women on Council currently fell short of the stated aim of one-third.

Noted The undertaking of the working secretary to circulate an invitation to Senators as soon as possible.

19 Valediction

On behalf of Senate, the Vice-Chancellor led a valediction to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Wheeler who was standing down in December 2015. He thanked Professor Wheeler for all that he had done during his period of office in the senior executive roles he had taken on and the immense contribution he had made to the development of the institution over the years. The Vice-Chancellor said that he had been extremely grateful for the advice and guidance Professor Wheeler had offered to him since arriving at the University earlier in the year.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Professor Dame Jessica Corner for her leadership of the Faculty of Health Sciences since 2010 and her contribution to the academic standing of the University. Dame Jessica was leaving the University in December 2015 to take up a new role at the University of Nottingham as Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Knowledge Exchange.

The Vice-Chancellor also thanked Professor Petts, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), in her absence, for all that she had achieved in her roles as Dean of the then Faculty of Social and Human Sciences and as a Pro Vice-Chancellor. He thanked her for her outstanding contribution to the University. Professor Petts would take up the Vice-Chancellorship of the University of Plymouth in February 2016.

[Post-meeting note: The Vice-Chancellor thanked Professor Hawkins, whose term of office as Dean of the Faculty of Natural and Environmental Sciences would end in December 2015, for his excellent leadership of the Faculty since 2010 and for his many and wide-ranging contributions to the University.]

20 **Date of next meeting**

The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that Senate was scheduled to meet on 24 February 2016 and 22 June 2016.

+++++

Ref CS3/3

Senate question time

1 International Student Diversity

We have several programmes with 100% Chinese. Are there lessons from elsewhere about how to broaden our recruitment?

This is a case of supply and demand; it's difficult to create as much demand from other countries to balance the nationalities. Every UK university has the same problem. We are not alone! The UK as a whole has some work to do if the UK universities are to benefit from attracting back those countries we have lost through policy changes i.e. India

In Southampton, this is primarily an issue at PGT, and we need to raise the profile further in other PGT markets through the in country offices and partnerships. UK PGT students are falling but we may be able to increase EU PGT applications, and we are now visiting more European countries.

The issue is focused on specific courses and academic units (the Business School, WSA and, to a lesser extent, ECS). We need to focus on how to make those courses more attractive to a broader student base.

Whilst all UK universities have the same problem, we need to look at what others are doing to tackle it.

[Response from Charlene Allen, Director, International Recruitment, International]

2 Business School

What is the Vice Chancellor's view on our Business School?

In many other universities, a business school is seen as the biggest cash cow. This is not quite the case at the University of Southampton as we have other stronger schools. Nevertheless, our Business School still creates a significant income, much higher than many other business schools in the region. Looking at the landscape of business schools in the UK and in the world, we still need to develop a prestigious business school to attract more students, enterprises and governments to achieve a sustainable income, knowledge production and dissemination.

Shall we receive more investment from the University in terms of research and infrastructure (a new executive-style building)?

A Business School should be a jewel in the crown of a comprehensive University like Southampton. As the questioner states, the Business School currently generates significant income, but more needs to be done to develop the Business School further.

The University has already invested in the Business School, in developing Building 28 and the top of Building 2 for the use of the School. The South Gower Learning and Teaching Centre has been designed with the needs of an expanding Business School in mind. Assuming it gets the go ahead from Council, it will provide significant additional teaching capacity from 2018.

More important than a building is having the right courses in place which students want, and the right people to deliver them. We need ambitious and enthusiastic staff in the Business School, with a strong leadership team to drive it forward. We have appointed headhunters to conduct an international search for a new Head of the Business School, to lead its future development.

[Comments from Adam Wheeler]

3 Timetabling and de-semesterisation

I should like there to be a discussion at Senate, on two related issues: timetabling and de-semesterisation. (I'm not sure if this will be the right time to start this discussion or if it should really start elsewhere other than at Senate.)

Timetabling

While I fully appreciate the almost impossible task timetabling has had this year and the remarkable job they have done, I have now seen (first hand) from both sides (teaching and consuming) the problems of not knowing the timetable until so close to the start (or even after the start) of term.

More of our students will now have commitments such as child care, parental care, jobs, etc (especially as we expand our Master's courses) and these have and can be managed but only if the course commitments are known well enough in advance. Similarly choices are made by students and then are found subsequently and late on to be unavailable due to timetable clashes, which then result in another series of changes. For staff, invitation to meetings, conferences, have to be accepted with the significant caveat that they won't know their teaching commitments until the beginning of the next teaching year, and this can be embarrassing. Some other universities have similar problems but many must have found solutions as timetables are known many months, if not a year, in advance.

Timetabling is a real challenge and I am grateful for all colleagues who have worked hard to create the timetable this year, and all staff who have had to rearrange other commitments to fit around teaching schedules. There are a number of issues which make timetabling difficult. A paper on timetabling is coming to Senate later this academic year, and it would be better to have the discussion in Senate when that Paper comes.

[Comments from Pro Vice-Chancellor Alex Neill.]

De-semesterisation

The changes to 'A' levels and the removal of so much of the modular approach to teaching at this level should, I believe, prompt us to look again at the semester versus year model. The return to a non-semester full teaching year has many educational and administrative advantages allowing for better arrangement of the learning outcomes, better use of formative assessment and more strategic and integrated summative assessment as well as a much more efficient use of teaching weeks and administrative time in the examination processes.

If we were to bring a discussion to Senate, we would want first to have had a thorough exploration of the issues at the Education and Student Experience Executive Group. The questioner might wish to raise this with their Associate Dean (Education), who can then bring it to the Group.

4 **Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) and other teaching matters**

How will the University be preparing for the TEF?

The government published its Green Paper on TEF on Friday 6th November. This has clarified some (but certainly not all) questions about TEF. For year 1 (2016), those institutions who have passed a recent Higher Education Review will progress to Level 1 of the TEF. In year 2 (2017), we will be able to apply for higher levels of the TEF, in a process yet to be determined but will be a mixture of a self-evaluation and metrics. The Government's proposals are out for consultation with a response of mid-January, and there will be a technical consultation next year.

How does the new VC plan to "join up" the administrative support and the academic/educational need? For example:

- Avoiding the issue of vital welcome documents not arriving to the new first-years, and (as we understand it) academics not being able to influence the process.
- Enabling teaching staff to be able to simply and easily access reliable data on which students are on their modules, along with accessing class lists that can be downloaded in a useable format (instead of having to scrape information from a wide range of often contradictory sources – e.g. blackboard, sussed, efolio)

It is of course important that we deliver the highest quality student experience, and that we ensure all of those responsible for that (across both faculties and professional services) are joined up. The Pro Vice-Chancellor for Education is responsible for driving forward improvements in this area.

How will the new VC ensure consistency between Faculties? For example, currently across the UoS there are:

- Differences in ability to access students in Clearing;
- Different fees for similar MSc programmes;
- Differences in the application of promotion criteria;
- Differences in what constitutes a “full” teaching load and differences in workload expectations;
- Differences in expected quality and quantity of outputs;
- Differences in whether or not staff can take sabbaticals;
- Differences in availability of funding for attending conferences; and
- Differences in access to equipment and facilities.

Under the proposals before Senate at this meeting, I will take on responsibility for line managing the Deans, and thereby take a close interest in the work of Faculties. There are of course areas where we seek a consistent approach across the University, and other areas where it is appropriate for Faculties to develop solutions which are suitable for them. Ultimately, the Dean is responsible for delivering the Faculty Business Agreement, but should have some flexibility in how he or she does it.

[Comments from the Vice-Chancellor.]

5 Positive action policies

My question for the VC – who, I am delighted to learn, has taken on the important role of equality and diversity champion – is:

Given the fact that we still have gender and other inequality here in that we have mainly white, mainly men, at the top of the staffing structure and a gender pay gap, and whilst we have a diverse student body even this is not as diverse as it might be, why has the University chosen not to adopt positive action policies?

Please note I am not asking about illegal forms of positive discrimination but for a commitment to positive action which is allowed.

(I have just redone my E&D online training and was reminded that our policy is not to adopt positive action. Maybe it is about time we did?)

The question mentions positive action and positive discrimination, and it's worth reminding Senate about the difference.

Positive discrimination is the process of giving preferential treatment to groups within society that have been prejudiced against in the past. As the questioner points out, this is illegal.

Positive action is when an employer takes steps to help or encourage certain groups of people with different needs, or who are disadvantaged in some way, to access work or training. That is legal.

The University has engaged in positive action. For example the Springboard Programme has been running 4 years. It was originally targeted at Level 5 and 6 female academic staff, to help address the issue of the glass ceiling at levels 6 and 7 amongst academics. For the last 18 months it has been extended to include female staff of all grades and from across the university, academic and professional services.

Other examples of positive action include providing interview training before promotion interviews.

There is always more that can be done. In the Equality and Diversity Annual Report, which is later on the Senate agenda, we set out some ideas of further areas of work.

I should also say that with the departure of Jessica Corner, I will be taking on the role of Equality and Diversity champion myself, so I will be taking a keen interest in driving this agenda forward over the coming period.

Additional Background

The law allows us to go further than we currently do, and the questioner may be referring to that. The law states:

Positive action in recruitment and promotion can be used where an employer reasonably thinks that people with a protected characteristic are under-represented in the workforce, or suffer a disadvantage connected to that protected characteristic. In practice it allows an employer faced with making a choice between two or more candidates who are of equal merit to take into consideration whether one is from a group that is disproportionately under-represented or otherwise disadvantaged within the workforce.

This is a very tricky area, and one which is optional for organisations to use, a lot of thought would need to be given to this if the University were to adopt this as a way forward. In the meantime we have the approach as set out above.

[Comments from Kamaljit Kerridge-Poonia, Head, Equality and Diversity.]

6 Late questions

Since the introduction of the £9k fees have the university seen any change in student satisfaction rates and drop out rates?

No material changes. There has been a slight increase in student satisfaction but it does not appear to be related to higher fees.

[Information from Pete Clarke, Strategy, Planning and Analytics.]

Are there any plans/funding for the medical school to increase the number of students recruited into the BM courses?

The Department of Health/Health Education England set the number of medical student that can be recruited by each School of Medicine in England, including at Southampton. At the moment we are not aware of any plans to increase the number of medical students.

[Information from Adrian Reyes-Hughes, Faculty Operating Officer, Faculty of Medicine.]

+++++