

**SENATE
MEETING 278 HELD ON 15th MARCH 2017
UNAPPROVED MINUTES**

| Composition | | Membership | Count | Meeting 12.10.16 | Meeting 07.12.16 | Meeting 15.03.17 | Meeting 15.03.17 | Meeting 17.05.17 | Meeting 12.07.17 | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|
| (a) Ex-Officio Staff | President (Chair) | Professor Sir Paul Curran | 1 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | |
| | Deputy President & Provost | Professor David Bolton | 2 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | |
| | Vice-Presidents | Professor Richard Verrall (Deputy Chair) | 3 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | |
| | | Professor Andrew Jones | 4 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | |
| | | Professor Stanton Newman (p/t) | 5 | Y | Y | A | AD | | | |
| | Director of Student & Academic Services | Ms Susannah Marsden | 6 | Y | A | A | Y | | | |
| | Chairs of the Standing Committees of Senate: | BoS in Arts & Soc Sciences | Professor Theo Farrell | 7 | Y | A | Y | Y | | |
| | | BoS in Business Studies | Professor Marianne Lewis | 8 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | BoS in Eng & Math Sci & Inf | Professor Roger Crouch | 9 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | BoS in Health Sciences | Professor Stanton Newman | 10 | Y | A | A | A | | |
| | | BoS in Law | Professor Carl Stychin | 11 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | BoS in Learning Development | Professor Susannah Quinsee | 12 | Y | A | Y | Y | | |
| | | Academic Governance Cttee | Professor Richard Verrall | 13 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | Research Ethics Committee | Professor Ron Douglas | 14 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | Validation & Inst Partners Cttee | Professor Steve Stanton | 15 | Y | N/A | N/M | N/M | | | |
| Dean of City Graduate School | Professor Ken Grattan | 16 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | | |
| (b) Non Ex-Officio Staff | Elected members of academic staff to equal the number of ex-officio staff posts and to include at least two from each of the Board of Studies areas. | Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 18) | Professor Giulia Iori | 1 | Y | Y | A | A | | |
| | | Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 18) | Professor Laurence Solkin | 2 | Y | Y | Y | A | | |
| | | Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 19) | Professor Mireia Jofre-Bonet | 3 | Y | Y | Y | A | | |
| | | Arts & Soc Sciences (to Jul 17) | Dr Rachel Cohen (Senior Elected) | 4 | Y | Y | S | S | | |
| | | Business (to Jul 18) | Professor Charles Baden-Fuller | 5 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | Business (to Jul 19) | Professor Anthony Neuberger | 6 | A | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | Business (to Jul 17) | Dr Amanda Goodall | 7 | S | Y | A | Y | | |
| | | Health Sciences (to Jul 17) | Ms Julie Attenborough | 8 | Y | Y | A | Y | | |
| | | Health Sciences (to Jul 17) | Dr Chris Flood | 9 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | Health Sciences (to Jul 17) | Professor Chris Hull | 10 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | Maths, Comp Sci & Eng (to Jul 19) | Dr Arti Agrawal | 11 | Y | Y | S | S | | |
| | | Maths, Comp Sci & Eng (to Jul 19) | Dr Anton Cox | 12 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | Maths, Comp Sci & Eng (to Jul 18) | Professor Abdulnaser Sayma | 13 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | Law (to Jul 18) | Professor Susan Blake | 14 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | Law (to Jul 18) | Mr Keith Simpson | 15 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| | | Law (to Jul 18) | Mr Sarwan Singh | 16 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | |
| (b) | One additional elected member from the Visiting Staff (with an alternate) | Mr Peter Woodward (to July 18) | | A | A | A | A | | | |
| (c) Student | A maximum of five students nominated by the Trustee Board one of whom should be the President of the Students Union. At least one from each of the following categories – undergraduate, postgraduate and research. | Mr Yusuf Ahmad, President | 1 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | |
| | | Mr Zain Ismail, VP Education | 2 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | |
| | | Mr Sheikh Hassan, VP Activities & Development | 3 | Y | Y | Y | Y | | | |
| | | Ms Laura Thompson | 4 | A | Y | A | A | | | |
| | | Mr Andy Ridley | 5 | Y | A | A | A | | | |

Key: Y =In Attendance A= Apologies S=On Sabbatical leave N/M=Not a Member EA=Extended Absence AD = Apol/Deputy Sent

| In Attendance | Role |
|------------------------|---|
| Dr John Low | Lay Member of Council |
| Professor Debra Salmon | Deputy Dean, SHS |
| Mr Steve Stanbury | Director, Internal Audit |
| Ms Alison Edridge | Assistant Director, Student & Academic Services |
| Dr William Jordan | College Secretary |
| Ms Gemma Watt | Governance Administrator |

MINUTES SECTION A – OPEN FOR PUBLICATION

Part One – Preliminary Items

Senators met at 2pm on 15th March, immediately prior to a meeting of Senate, to discuss progress on equality and diversity at City and City's Athena SWAN application. Notes on this meeting are annexed to the minutes (Annex A).

1. **Apologies and Preliminary Discussions**

The Chair **noted** apologies from Senators and welcomed to the meeting Dr John Low, lay member of Council, Mr Steve Stanbury, Director of Internal Audit and Professor Debra Salmon, Deputy Dean, School of Health Sciences.

2. **Highlighted Items**

Senate **agreed** to un-star Item 19, Research Students Who Teach, on the request of the Senior Elected Senator and the Students' Union, who asked to receive the complete report prior to engaging in further discussion. The Chair of the City Graduate School reported that a pro forma had been sent to the BoS for completion and once this outstanding action had been completed the report would be finalised and presented to Senate. The pro forma example could be found on page 8 of the Research Students Who Teach report. It was agreed that the full formal report would come to the May meeting of Senate. **[Action]**

3. **Minutes**

The minutes of Meeting 276 held on 7th December 2016 were approved.

4. **Matters Arising**

Item 1 – Students' Union Standing Report

Following the 2016/17 funding bid the matter would be concluded and removed from the matters arising.

Item 2, AOB, Research Fellows in the category of elected staff

The VP(R&E) reported that there were outstanding issues in relation to the classification in HR records that made the identification of Research Fellows impossible at this time. HR records at City used a single descriptor to cover a range of research roles. HR would address this issue, however, as part of the preparation for REF2021. Senate would then be able to return to the issue and assess the suitability of Research Fellows to stand for election and vote in Senate elections.

Items 5, REF 2021 Strategy

The action point related to the advertisement of PhD projects on-line. The VP(R&E) reported that a working group had been preparing templates in SASS. Projects and initiatives were underway but further work was required across all Schools.

Item 8, Assessment Feedback Turnaround Times, LEaD Project.

The Chair of the BoS in Learning Development updated Senate on the Assessment Strategies Project. Commencement of the project had been delayed, but funding had now been received and new posts would be advertised imminently.

Item 29, ARQM Report

Senate had asked for an update to confirm that actions requested at the December 2015 meeting of Senate (but not recorded as an action point until the March 2016 meeting of Senate) had been implemented. The VP(R&E) explained that work on equality and diversity was on-going, and integration of ARQM into business as usual discussions had taken place.

5. Conflicts of Interest

None were **noted**.

6. Terms of Reference and Governance Regulations

Senate **noted** the Terms of Reference and Governance Regulations.

7. Items Specially Brought Forward by the Chair

7.1 At the December Senate SMCSE noted there would be a further Assessment Board Chairs update for their School. The Chair **noted** that the following additional Assessment Board Chairs had been approved by Chair's Action:

- Professor Jamshid Nouri
- Professor Sarah Stallebrass
- Dr Veselin Rakocevic
- Professor Jo Wood
- Dr Anton Cox

7.2 The Chair of Senate reported that Council had approved the Research & Enterprise Strategy at its meeting on 10th March 2017. Senate's views, which had been expressed at the extraordinary Senate meeting on 8th March 2017, had been tabled and discussed at the meeting.

8. Senate Calendar

Senate **noted** the calendar of business.

9. Students' Union Standing Report

Senate **noted** the Students' Union Standing Report which contained updates on programme representation, student satisfaction, progression and employability. In discussion the following points were made:

- The SU leadership election had taken place. The following applicants had been elected to sabbatical posts and would be in attendance at the May Senate; Olesea Matcovschi, President; Malek Arab, Vice President, Education; Zulkaif Riaz, Vice President, Activities and Development.
- 87% of student representatives had been trained and the SU were confident they would reach 100% this academic year. The SU aimed to have at least one representative on each course at City. It would be important to have the support of Schools on this matter.
- The bi-annual 'Keep Calm and Study On' campaign had taken place in January. A range of activities had been arranged to support students during the assessment period. A survey had been created to assess the campaign and to enhance future events.
- The Student Leadership Conference had taken place and feedback had been positive.
- An essay writing competition on the theme of Brexit had been launched.
- The Leadership Project had been launched in January. It offered mentoring and networking opportunities for students.
- Senate thanked the Student Senators for their role in promoting student feedback through the NSS and other surveys.

Part Two – Presentation

10. Student Progression Priorities

10.1 Senate **received** a presentation from the DP&P in relation to student progression. This provides an important indication of how we support our students, as unless there were unusual circumstances, *every* student who join us would be expected to graduate. It is also one of City's four *Vision & Strategy 2026 (V&S26)* Academic Output Key Performance Indicators. Student progression had recently been discussed by ExCo who endorsed the establishment of the proposed Progression Improvement

Programme (PIP) Working Group to oversee the development and implementation of actions to improve student progression rates, with an initial focus on personal tutoring. The Group would report to Education & Student Committee and ExCo would receive regular updates on progress.

The DP&P reported that the presentation should be considered alongside the papers which accompanied the presentation at agenda item 10.2. He explained that the new KPI was for a 90% progression rate from the first to the second year. This would mean movement down from 16 to 10 in every 100 not progressing. Modelling suggested that by achieving this KPI City would also achieve its TEF benchmark. To receive a positive flag City would need to move to 5 in every 100. According to the 2017 *Good University Guide* City was ranked 68, with a completion rate of 85.4%. A 90% completion rate would be needed to rank in the 30s and a 95% rate would be needed to rank in the top 20.

10.2 Senate **noted** the student progression priority actions agreed by ExCo. ExCo had agreed a focus on personal tutoring for 2017/18 as a principal means of supporting students and identifying support needs. Consultation on the Student Participation and Attendance Policy would be initiated in the near future. The DP&P invited comment and further suggestions from Senators. In discussion the following points were made:

- Higher tariffs at City were not linked to higher progression rates for students, nor were students from a widening participation background less likely to progress than other students. There was a correlation, however, between failure to progress and students identified by HEFCE as 'high-risk'.
- It would be important to distinguish clearly between failure to progress as a result of student withdrawal from failure to progress as a result of academic failure. An examination of the outcome of last year's Assessment Boards might offer insight into the causes of high rates of academic failure on some courses. There was still time to address issues identified this academic year.
- Personal tutoring offered many benefits to students, but it was not clear from the analysis in the paper why a stronger focus on personal tutoring would markedly improve progression rates. Further consideration of 'what worked' at other institutions with a student intake comparable to City's would be helpful.
- Some universities had more rigorous systems of personal tutoring as well as better systems for monitoring student performance which helped staff identify students at risk. It would be important to have access to data to identify students and to assess when to intervene.
- Pilots were taking place in The City Law School on the Bar Professional Training Programme, which brought together attendance data, feedback from personal tutoring and summative marks attained by students to form an overall picture of the likelihood of non-progression. If these pilots were successful they could be rolled out to other Schools.
- Although the focus was currently on first year progression, student progression to later years should not be neglected.
- Consideration should be given to resource issues and what structures are in place when developing plans for personal tutoring.
- Professor Carl Stychin reported that he had agreed to Chair the PIP Working Group and its work would commence in late March.
- Reporting from the PIP Working Group would come to future Senate meetings.

Part Three – Items for Approval

11. Governance of Collaborative Provision

Senate received a paper setting out proposals for a new Collaborative Provision Committee to replace Validation and Institutional Partnerships Committee. This would address the outstanding QAA Institutional Review action to strengthen oversight of partnerships, support Council in giving assurance to HEFCE on an area of academic

risk and take account of City's reduced validation portfolio. In discussion the following points were made:

- AGC and Education and Student Committee had previously discussed and endorsed the proposals.
- The Collaborative Provision Committee would be a sub-committee of Senate and therefore the Chair would be an ex-officio member of Senate (as was the Chair of the Validation and Institutional Partnerships Committee).
- The DP&P thanked the Assistant Director, Student and Academic Services and her colleagues for their work in developing the proposals.

Decision

Senate **approved** the proposed changes to the governance of Collaborative Provision and Regulation 6.

12. QAA Institutional Review and Action Plan Update.

The report contained the annual update on the action plan. It was reported that the one outstanding action would be complete if Senate approved the establishment of the Collaborative Provision Committee.

Decision

Senate **approved** the action as complete and **noted** the completed action plan would be published on City's website.

13. Academic Calendar

Senate received the Academic Calendar for 2018/19 and 2019/20 for approval. It was reported that a review of the calendar would take place in relation to the Athena SWAN action point concerning alignment of reading weeks with school half terms. January graduation dates were known to be unpopular with some students and this would be taken into account in planning future graduation dates. A paper would come to a future meeting of Senate. **[Action]**

Decision

Senate **approved** the academic calendar.

14. Recommendation for the Award of Professor Emeritus

Senate received a report providing the nomination for the Award of Professor Emeritus. It was noted that AGC had reviewed the nomination and recommended the report to Senate for approval.

Decision

Senate **approved** the award of Professor Emeritus to Professor Jill Boucher (SASS).

Part Four –Items for Discussion

15. Reports from Sub-Committees and Executive Advisory Committees

15.1 Board of Studies Minutes

Senate **noted** the minutes from Board of Studies meetings. In discussion the following points were made:

- The Chair of LEaD noted recent discussions of the need to ensure consistency in word count guidance and credit and assessment loading.
- Deans asked for clarification of the timeline for teaching fellowship nominations.
- The Chair of the BoS in Arts and Social Sciences noted recent discussions concerning the governance structure for quality assurance. The primary responsibility for oversight of academic quality was currently devolved to Programme Committees rather than departments. The Director of Student & Academic Services had held initial discussion with the Chair of SASS and further discussions would take place. **[Action]**

- The Chair of the BoS for SMSCE reported on the large number of applications in Data Science and Human Computer Interaction Design. High intake might lead to additional teaching loads and the need to recruit more staff.

15.2 Reports from the Graduate School Committee, Education & Student Committee, Academic Governance Committee

Senate **noted** the minutes of meetings of the Committees.

16. NSS Milestones

Senate **considered** the report which outlined City's current performance in the National Student Survey 2016 from the perspective of the relevant performance indicators in the Strategic Plan 2010 to 2016. It was noted that from 2017/18 the reporting would shift in focus to the relevant Academic Output KPI in the V&S26.

The Chairs of the BoS provided updates on the response rates in their Schools and steps taken to address student feedback. It was reported that The National Union of Students (NUS) was running a campaign to boycott the NSS in response to the government initiative to use NSS feedback (as part of the TEF) to determine tuition fee increases. The Executive Committee of City, University of London Students' Union had voted not to boycott the NSS. Although they were opposed to the raising of tuition fees they had chosen to work with City to promote student feedback and to reduce the probability of a low TEF result, given it's the effect it might have on City students.

17. Teaching Excellence Framework Submission 2017

Senate **noted** City's Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) submission which had been approved by ExCo and sent to HEFCE in January 2017. Senators had received the paper in draft in January prior to submission. It was reported that as part of HEFCE's first 'Annual Provider Review' (APR) of City, HEFCE had requested and had been sent a commentary on steps taken to improve progression rates at City. In discussion, the following points were made:

- It was expected that the TEF outcome would be announced in early May.
- The Chair of Senate thanked those who worked on the submission. Many staff contributed to the paper and the style, tone, coverage and balance would be developed accordingly in future years.
- Some institutions had published their submissions on their website, with different stylistic approaches observed. One such institution clearly had not benefitted of input from their SU in the way that City had done.

18. Undergraduate Annual Programme Evaluation – Strategic and Quality Overviews

Senate **noted** the reports on the annual programme evaluation (APE) process. The reports provided assurance regarding quality and the dissemination of good practice to enable oversight of the way in which strategic priorities are being implemented at programme level. It was a richer report and in a different format to previous years. The DP&P reported that this year he had met senior staff in Schools and all undergraduate programme directors to review the APE and to discuss educational performance indicators.

19. Research Students Who Teach Policy: Follow up Discussion

Senate **agreed** to un-star Item 19, Research Students Who Teach, and this item was not further discussed.

20. Doctoral Degree Supervisors Policy: Update

Senate **noted** a report giving a one-year-on review of the operation of the Doctoral Degree Supervisors Policy together with a report on the number of approved exceptions to the policy since May 2015. The Dean of the City Graduate School reported that the table showing the exceptional approval of 'first supervisors' had been updated since circulation to Senate with the '0' figure for SMCSE now included. The addition of this figure completed the table.

Some concerns had been noted at the Graduate School Committee in relation to the requirement that a 'first' supervisor must have a mean ARQM score of three star (or above). But it had also been noted that the number of requests for exceptional approval had been relatively small and the mechanism for exceptions to the policy provided sufficient flexibility. In discussion the following points were made:

- Students should be encouraged to use both supervisors.
- It had been helpful in Cass to appoint early career scholars as supervisors and the policy had encouraged this. Early career scholars might give most time to students, although they may not have an ARQM score yet. It was noted that although this may be the case in Cass this was likely to be discipline specific and other Schools may operate differently.
- Clarification of the roles and requirements for external supervisors and consultants was required and would be further discussed by the City Graduate School and reported to a future meeting of Senate. **[Action]**
- It would be helpful to issue ARQM guidance to departments. There was occasional misunderstanding among academic staff regarding the number of items they should submit. **[Action]**

21. Possible Revisions to Ordinance C1: Composition of Senate

Senate **considered** a paper setting out proposed changes to Ordinance C1 which would form part of the implementation of City's Athena SWAN action plan. CGNC had asked AGC and Senate to take a view on possible changes to Ordinance C1 to report back to CGNC with a way forward. In discussion, the following points were made:

- It was important for Senate to acknowledge that some staff might choose not to define their gender identity. City would need to be mindful of this in any proposed change to the wording of the Ordinance.
- Ex-officio Senators were not currently as diverse as elected Senators. The Athena SWAN action plan, however, should address equality and diversity in senior management positions and so should improve the current gender balance of this group of Senators.
- Elected Senators were currently diverse, in terms of both gender and race, and so there was a strong argument that the current wording of the Ordinance relating to elected Senators did not require amendment. Any change in the wording of the Ordinance would simply be a further symbol of City's commitment to implementing the Athena SWAN action plan, and put in place a floor level for the minimum number of elected Senators who must be female and who must be male.
- Increasing diversity in Senate membership should be encouraged but there was a case for simply monitoring membership year on year and taking action in the future if required. One option might then be to think more creatively about the ex-officio membership and who should represent Boards of Studies at Senate to increase the diversity of this group of Senators.
- It would be helpful for AGC to discuss the matter again before a report was submitted to CGNC for its meeting on 9th May. Senate would receive the minutes from AGC at its next meeting in May.

Decision

Senate **agreed** that AGC would discuss the proposals again at its April meeting and improve the recommendation to CGNC.

22. Improving the Effectiveness of Senate

Senate **considered** initial proposals to improve the effectiveness of Senate. Several strands of work, including the Minerva report on Council effectiveness, proposals from elected Senators for improving the effectiveness of Senate, and Council discussions regarding HEFCE's revised operating model for quality assessment in higher education, would be pulled together into a plan for further consideration.

Additional meetings between the College Secretary, Governance Team, colleagues in Student & Academic Services and the Senior Elected Senator were being planned, where further consideration would be given to how to take forward the agenda and the development of a plan of action. The on-going work would be considered at the meeting of AGC on 12th April and then at the May meeting of Senate.

It was noted by the acting Senior Elected Senator that a meeting of elected Senators would be arranged to discuss how they could contribute to this on-going work. **[Action]**

23. Prevent Briefing

Senate **noted** the report and accompanying action plan which briefed Senate on progress with Prevent. The VP(R&E) explained that there was a focus on safeguarding of City's students and staff, which placed the report within Senate's remit. Further reports would therefore return to Senate for consideration. There was a legal requirement to comply with the Prevent Duty and an annual report would be submitted to HEFCE. In discussion the following points were made:

- A training plan had been agreed with HEFCE which would be rolled out to all staff following a pilot exercise. Additional guidance on Prevent for staff and students would also be provided on City's webpages in due course.
- The Prevent Steering Group had discussed impact of Prevent on freedom of speech. The Equalities Committee would also engage with the policy and contribute to discussions on freedom of speech.
- Student Senators noted the SU's opposition to Prevent, which was in-line with the NUS stance nationally. The SU backed a 'bare minimum' approach to the implementation of Prevent, acknowledging that City had a statutory duty to comply with the policy.
- There were, it was thought, likely to be many members of staff at City who opposed Prevent in principle. One negative consequence of Prevent could be an undermining of the student/academic staff relationship. Another was that Prevent might feed racial intolerance in society.
- Mr Keith Simpson asked that his opposition to Prevent and to any form of implementation of Prevent by City to be noted in the minutes.
- The paper had been marked 'restricted' under City's publication scheme, which meant that it would be made available to staff on a confidential basis, but would not be disclosed to anyone making an FOI request and that staff should not share or discuss the paper with anyone outside City. It was not clear that this paper warranted such a classification and the issue should be further considered outside the meeting. **[Action]**

Part Five – Items for Information

24. Collaborative Provision Register 2016/17

Senate **noted** the report which listed all collaborative arrangements between City, University of London and its partner institutions.

25. Institutional Monitoring Report: Annual Programme List 2016/17

Senate **noted** the programmes running in 2016/17 and programmes that have terminated in 2015/16.

26. Minutes for Information

26.1 Council

26.2 Senate Committees

26.2.1 Academic Governance Committee

26.2.2 Senate Research Ethics Committee

- 26.3 Executive Advisory Committees**
 - 26.3.1** Education & Student Committee
 - 26.3.2** Research & Enterprise Committee
 - 26.3.3** Graduate School Committee

27. Honorary Visiting Professors

Senate **noted** the Honorary Visiting Professors that had been appointed since its last meeting.

Part Six – Concluding Items

28. Freedom of Information Review

Senate **agreed** that the classification of Item 23 would be reviewed outside of the meeting. **[Action]**

Date of Next Meeting

17th May 2017 from 2.00pm to 5.00pm

Professor Sir Paul Curran
President and Chair of Senate
March 2017

Note: **[Action]** = to be recorded in matters arising.

Update on Equality & Diversity and the Athena SWAN action plan

The Senate meeting was preceded by updates on Equality & Diversity and the Athena SWAN action plan provided by the Vice-President (Strategy & Planning).

It was reported that since the last Equal Pay Audit in 2015, the gender pay gap at both total pay and basic pay had decreased by 3.1% and 3.3% respectively. In relation to the PI on proportion of females in senior academic and Professional Service roles it was reported that the proportion of professors who are female had increased to 23% (from 21%). The target was to achieve ~30% female representation by 2020/21. It was also noted that the proportion of Readers who are female had increased to 43% (from 34%) which would support the achievement of this target for professors.

Work was underway for future School applications to Athena SWAN. It was expected that the School of Health Sciences would submit their application in November 2017. The School of Arts and Social Sciences, the City Law School and Cass Business School were aiming for an April 2018 submission. The School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering were aiming for a November 2018 submission.

The VP (S&P) invited Senators to email him questions and advised that he would provide further updates to Senators. The outcome of City's Athena SWAN application would be communicated to all staff once known.