SENATE

Unreserved minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2020 by video-conference

Present:

Vice-Chancellor (Chair), Professor C Jeffery
Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor S Tendler
Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching, Learning & Students), Professor J Robinson
Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), Professor M Ruth
Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Partnerships & Engagement), Professor K Trehan
Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching, Learning & Students), Professor T Lightfoot
Dean (Arts & Humanities), Professor A Field
Dean (Social Sciences), Professor S Bell
Dean (Sciences), Professor B Fulton
Special Adviser, Professor D Smith

Dr P Altay (GSA President)
Professor I D’Amico
Dr R Aitken
Professor K Atkin
Professor N Audsley
Ms J Baston (GSA)
Professor L Black
Professor D Brown
Professor D Bruce
Dr T Cantrell
Professor N Caspersen
Dr S de Jong
Professor M Freeman
Dr P Garnett
Professor R Gehrels
Professor K Gibson
Professor M Goddard
Dr J de Groot
Professor J Hudson
Professor C Hunter

Professor P Johnson
Dr S King
Dr O Lisagor
Ms F Maiden (U/G faculty rep for Sciences)
Professor U Macleod
Professor N Milner
Professor J Moir
Dr M Perry
Professor D Petrie
Dr M Roodhouse
Professor H Smith
Professor J Swaffield
Professor A Tyrell
Dr D Trenkic
Professor R Vann
Professor P Wakeling
Ms H Weatherly
Professor M White
In attendance:  
Academic Registrar, Dr W Campbell  
Head of Governance and Assurance, Dr A Dawkins  
Senior Governance and Assurance Officer, Dr P Evans (Assistant Secretary)  
Senior Governance and Assurance Officer, Dr A Wakely  
Governance Administrator, Ms B Carter Ellis  
Vice-Chancellor’s Executive Officer, Ms R Christou  
Director of York-Maastricht Partnership, Mr I Wiggins  
Director of Internationalisation, Ms R MacSween  
Director of Student Life and Wellbeing, Ms P Tunbridge  
Business Intelligence Analyst, Ms K Payne  

Apologies for absence were received from the Registrar and Secretary (Secretary), the Special Adviser (Strategy), Professor M Burton, Mr P O’Donnell (SU President), Mr M Johnstone (SU Academic Officer) and Dr S Weigert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-20/101</td>
<td>On behalf of Senate, the Vice-Chancellor thanked those members who were attending their last meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes (S.19-20/42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20/102</td>
<td>The minutes of the meeting held on 5 May 2020 were approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor’s Report (S.19-20/43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20/103</td>
<td>Senate considered a report from the Vice-Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20/104</td>
<td>The Vice-Chancellor reported that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. given the impact of the Covid 19 (C19) pandemic, it was testament to the adaptability and assiduousness of staff and students that the University had successfully reached the transitional point between the current and next academic years, with students due to graduate at a virtual ceremony in August and considerable progress made to re-establish research activity (M19-20/123-125 below refer);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. progress was being made to resume activity on campus, including re-activation of lab-based research and re-opening of the campus Nursery, with the Library to be re-opened shortly; following careful risk assessment in the context of social distancing measures and safeguarding of vulnerable staff and students, plans were also being made to re-open academic departments to a maximum of 25% staff capacity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. in planning for the resumption of both academic and recreational activity on campus from September 2020, a range of mitigation measures would be put in place, including working with the local NHS to support an effective ‘test, trace and control’ process, which was important in terms of providing reassurance to staff, students and the local community;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iv. academic departments had responded imaginatively in their plans to deliver a mixed mode of teaching with online and face-to-face elements, with further consideration to be given on a case-by-case basis to possible extension of certain fixed-term teaching contracts to ensure sufficient teaching capacity was in place;

v. the whole sector continued to face considerable challenges with respect to international student recruitment, a situation exacerbated by the ongoing spread of the virus in some territories and a reputational perception that the UK government had not handled the crisis as swiftly or effectively as others;

vi. colleagues in departments and Marketing, Recruitment and Admissions were working extremely hard to convert applications, including the option of a second January intake for a small number of PGT programmes with high international demand;

vii. the recently announced government support package for HE had generated some misleading press reports about the extent of the coverage it would provide; the full details would not be known until October/November 2020 but most of the financial support would be in the form of loans rather than cash;

viii. as a consequence of this ongoing financial uncertainty, the previously announced cost-containment measures would be continued; as regards the Voluntary Options Programme launched by the HR Directorate, it was noted that to date 90 applications had been made for voluntary severance/early retirement, with 26 applications for reduction in working hours and 10 applications for unpaid leave of absence;

ix. arising from the outcome of the first strategy consultation earlier in 2019/20, the Deans were leading a number of projects relating to organisational change, including in respect of teaching structures, organisational structures and the future size/composition of the student body; these matters were currently being discussed by the University Executive Board (UEB) and other senior leaders to refine the emerging proposals for approval and then phased implementation over the next three years;

x. the Head of Equality and Diversity and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Partnerships & Engagement) were developing a framework of action to address issues of racism, inequality and disadvantage, with a full report on this work to be presented to the next Senate meeting;

xi. it was with great sadness that the University had been informed of the unexpected death of Dr Jessica Wardman (Management), who had been a popular and committed member of Senate; on behalf of the University condolences had been extended to Dr Wardman’s family, friends, colleagues and students;

xii. congratulations were offered to a number of colleagues recently appointed to senior leadership positions, while thanks were expressed to others who were stepping down from such roles; particular thanks were extended to Professor John Robinson who had effectively and diligently served two terms of office as the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Teaching, Learning & Students (TLS), a role in which his prodigious
The appetite for work and deep institutional loyalty had greatly benefited the wider University, including during the current C19 crisis; it was noted that Professor Robinson would be returning to the Department of Electronic Engineering where he would assume a full teaching load in support of his departmental colleagues.

**19-20/105**

In response to a query in respect of the likely residential and collegiate student experience from September, the Academic Registrar reported that:

i. the Student Life and Opportunities Contingency Group (SLOCG) was leading a number of different work-streams on this matter whilst closely monitoring government requirements and guidelines as these evolved in response to the pandemic (e.g. as regards social distancing measures and arrangements for both outdoor and indoor events);

ii. the SLOCG was working collaboratively with the Colleges, student organisations, professional services and academic departments to consider relevant issues such as quarantining students on campus, staggering arrivals, extending welcome arrangements into Autumn Term and contingency planning for a possible second wave of C19 infections.

**19-20/106**

In response to a query on the maintenance of academic quality, institutional resilience and equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) in the context of the reported cost containment measures, the Vice-Chancellor and the Pro-Vice-Chancellors for Research and Teaching, Learning & Students reported that:

i. resumption of the strategy development process was intended to address such issues by clarifying the University’s long-term ambitions and identifying the associated workforce/workload implications as regards sustaining outstanding teaching and research;

ii. particular consideration was being given to the needs of early career researchers to ensure they were not disproportionately affected by the impact of C19 at such a crucial early stage in their professional lives;

iii. imagination and adaptability were key to delivering the best experience possible to students under the current difficult circumstances, with encouraging evidence that staff were actively engaging in relevant training programmes, webinars etc; mutual support and sharing best practice were also vitally important;

iv. in order to manage the inevitable workload tension between transferring teaching online while simultaneously maintaining research output, work was ongoing with Heads of Departments, team leaders and principal investigators to analyse on a case-by-case basis how workload might need to be re-distributed between colleagues who were at different stages in their careers;

v. as regards the academic promotions process, information requirements in respect of extenuating circumstances had immediately been modified to reflect the impact of the crisis and it was hoped that it would be possible to run the usual round during the
next academic year (subject to the student recruitment out-turn which would be known in September 2020).

19-20/107 **Resolved:**
To approve the recommendation that Professor Kiran Trehan (Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Partnerships & Engagement) and Professor Jo Swaffield (Head of the Department of Economics) be appointed as academic members of the University Council for three years, with effect from 1 October and 1 August 2020 respectively.

University Strategy 2030

19-20/108 Senate considered a report outlining the next steps in the development of the University Strategy 2030.

19-20/109 The Vice-Chancellor reported that:

i. following his initial consultation with the whole University community, a *Vision for York 2030* had been developed to provide the guiding framework for the next stage of strategy development, which had then been temporarily suspended in March 2020 due to the C19 crisis;

ii. recent resumption of this work had led to the establishment of five working groups (Research, Internationalisation, Sustainability, the Student Experience and the Civic University) led by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the three new Pro-Vice-Chancellors;

iii. the working groups would, in the light of C19 as a new contextual factor, develop broad strategic goals for refinement and then wider consultation in September 2020, including via an additional Senate meeting (date to be confirmed); the final strategic goals would then be presented to the University Council for approval in October 2020.

19-20/110 The Pro-Vice-Chancellors for Research and Partnerships & Engagement reported that:

i. the themes under consideration by the working groups would be underpinned by a set of values and principles which ran through and connected each;

ii. values such as curiosity, integrity and rigour would be applied to both basic and applied research to transform society and to inspire York graduates as future leaders;

iii. the aim would be to instil in members of the University community and the world beyond a sense of the power of dialogue and free expression as the cornerstones of a vibrant civil society;

iv. a strong emphasis would also be placed on scaling up the University’s knowledge base with boldness and ambition in order the highlight and magnify its positive impact on society;

v. efforts would be made to develop challenging and distinctive ambitions that reflected the University original founding principles;

vi. a genuinely active approach to consultation also required serious consideration of the sort of language used to engage different communities, and Senate members with relevant experience or ideas
in this area, especially as regards connection to local/regional partners, were invited to contact the Pro-Vice-Chancellors; vii. in order to utilise University research as a way of shaping and influencing the EDI agenda in broader society it would be necessary to move beyond policy development to delivering innovative actions and activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19-20/111</th>
<th>Senate observed that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>it would be important in the consultation to capture the views of groups that could be harder to reach (e.g. mature and part-time students, distance learners, staff on fixed-term contracts etc); it was noted that a range of different media and forums would be employed to garner views from such groups, as advised and supported by the University’s internal communication team; it was generally agreed that in order to be effective any strategic plan required a strong sense of ownership by as many members of the University community as possible, while acknowledging that there was still space for disagreement and ongoing debate as part of commitment to free and open dialogue;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>the consultation process should clearly signal to participants that their views were genuinely valued and could make a difference to the final version of the agreed strategy; the same applied to the constructive role that Senate could play in the process and consideration might be given to how that could be enacted in practical terms at its additional meeting in September;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>although the strategy needed to map to and reflect wider societal issues, it was nevertheless possible to present exemplars of ways in which society might be improved through the principles and ambitions it espoused;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>as lack of resourcing had sometimes been a barrier to fulfilment of EDI action plans in the past, it was important to acknowledge the associated resource implications and build these into budgets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City College Thessaloniki *(S.19-20/45)*

| 19-20/112 | Senate considered a second report on a proposed partnership with the City College Thessaloniki (the College). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19-20/113</th>
<th>The Deputy Vice-Chancellor reported that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>the partnership had been approved by UEB and, subject to approval by Senate of the academic elements, would be presented to the University Council for final agreement on 29 July 2020;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>the proposed relationship remained within the parameters previously presented to Senate (M19-20/71-75 refer), with the exception of students at the College not being registered students of the University (in accordance with legal advice on avoidance of exposure to non-academic complaints);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>the College would be designated as an international campus of the University and a range of its degree programmes would be validated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by the University, with the first students to start on such York-
validated programmes in September 2021;
iv. in terms of validation and withdrawal agreements, the University
would have control over all newly developed programmes, with
considerable assurance having been provided in respect of existing
programmes by the validation and quality assurance reports from the
previous UK partner institution (University of Sheffield);
v. if approved the new relationship would be formally reported to the
Office for Students (OfS) as a ‘reportable event’ under the terms of its
regulatory regime.

19-20/114 Senate observed that:
i. although its precise terms and condition were not yet known, the
future UK-EU trade deal arising from Brexit might have some impact
on aspects of the partnership (e.g. in relation to the Horizon and
Erasmus schemes); if the eventual trade deal covered academic
interactions in a manner similar to that with other non-EU countries, it
was likely to be based on institutional-level agreements, such as the
one being proposed and also the existing partnership with Maastricht
University;
ii. it would be important to have clarity in respect of the resources and
support available to students at the College (as required by external
QAA reviews of such overseas validation arrangements); it was noted
in this context that a site visit by senior colleagues in January had
included inspection of all academic facilities and open discussions with
College students (without staff present), all of which had provided
considerable assurance as regards student support provision at the
College and associated levels of student satisfaction and engagement;
iii. it would be useful for those departments initially to be involved in
validation activity (Management, Computer Science, Psychology and
Language & Linguistic Science) to receive further information as soon
as possible in respect of the likely timescales for such activity.

19-20/115 Resolved:
To approve the proposed academic relationship with the City College
Thessaloniki and to recommend formation of the new partnership to the
University Council.

Undergraduate/Postgraduate Taught Degree Outcomes 2018/19 (S.19-
20/46)

19-20/116 Senate considered the annual statistical reports on undergraduate and
taught postgraduate outcomes.

19-20/117 Ms Karen Payne (Business Intelligence Unit) reported that:
i. for the graduating undergraduate cohort in question there had been
an increase of 1.9% in the proportion of ‘good’ (i.e. first class and
upper second) degrees awarded (cf. 01.1% increase in the Russell
Group);
ii. the increase had been caused by a 2.3% rise in the proportion of first-class degrees awarded, with a slight decrease in the percentage of upper seconds;

iii. there remained considerable variation (29.6%) in the proportion of such degrees awarded by different departments;

iv. there had been a 3.2% increase in the proportion of PGT students ‘qualifying with award at intended level’ (cf. 1.7% increase in the Russell Group);

v. the proportion of such positive outcomes across different departments ranged from 70.8% to 96.8%;

vi. overall PGT students leaving with no award had decreased by 2.9%;

vii. additional data was available to departments in respect of the relationship between entry tariff and degree outcomes, which could provide an interesting view of the characteristics of specific cohorts.

19-20/118 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (TLS) reported that:

i. work was in train to draft a Degree Outcomes Statement in accordance with QAA guidance, and this would be submitted to Senate for consideration in due course;

ii. given the ongoing wide variation in departmental outcomes, departments were encouraged to reflect on their own data in the context of their marking and assessment criteria;

iii. despite the disruption caused by C19, the degree outcomes currently being processed for the 2019/20 graduating cohort represented a robust set of results that would not show significant variance from previous years.

19-20/119 Senate observed that:

i. given the public interest in media reporting of so-called ‘grade inflation’ it was important to continue the analytical work exploring the relationship between entry tariffs and outcomes as manifested across different departments and to contextualise this with other interlinked input factors;

ii. the Degree Outcomes Statement currently being drafted and informed by BIU data analysis would provide the basis for further discussion by Senate of the highly complex relationship between entry tariff, academic standards and degree outcomes;

iii. although the data for some departments might be affected by the inclusion of four-year integrated Masters programmes with their different entry requirements, it was possible for departments to extract such students from the data for analytical purposes.

Teaching, Learning and Assessment in 2020/21 (S.19-20/47)

19-20/120 Senate considered a report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (TLS) on the further guidance issued to academic departments in respect of teaching, learning and assessment in the coming academic year.
| 19-20/121 | The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (TLS) reported that:  
| i. | the guidance had been developed by the Academic Contingency Group and signed off by the Chairs of Teaching Committee and Senate;  
| ii. | the report included a summary schedule of deadlines and expectations in respect of teaching modifications for 2020/21;  
| iii. | the agreed arrangements had been trailed with departments for feedback prior to approval/launch and also informed by the most recent OfS guidance and consultation with students;  
| iv. | the overarching aim of the guidance was to ensure a rich and rewarding on-campus educational experience for students in the coming academic year. |

| 19-20/122 | Senate observed that:  
| i. | in due course it would be useful for departments to receive further guidance in respect of arrangements in Spring Term 2021, especially as regards the possible resumption of lectures; it was noted that an update on such matters would be available in October 2020 in the context of further consideration of space management issues on a socially-distance campus;  
| ii. | timetabling arrangements might be affected by continued spread of the C19 virus and the government’s approach to local as opposed to nation-wide interventions (i.e. contingency planning needed to factor in the possibility of further localised lockdowns). |

| Research Matters (S.19-20/48) | 19-20/123 | Senate considered a report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) in respect of research matters related to C19. |

| 19-20/124 | The Pro-Vice-Chancellor reported that:  
| i. | the Research Contingency Group had been focused on the re-opening of labs and other campus facilities such as the Library and Nursery, which would be closely monitored to ensure staff and student safety;  
| ii. | six-month funding extensions had been agreed by UEB for final-year PhD students as well as a number of actions in respect of the charging of continuation fees for students who had completed their normal period of enrolment;  
| iii. | pump priming would continue for ‘live’ projects but no new funding would be allocated from University sources in the current financial year, with limited funding available in 2020/21 (sum yet to be determined);  
| iv. | it had been agreed to maintain the Research Development Fund (RDF) as an essential source of strategic support and that its model, budget and operation be reviewed to take account of C19 constraints;  
| v. | external launch of the new Fellowships programme had been temporarily postponed but it would be maintained as an essential element of the University’s support for early career researchers;  
| vi. | as well as re-opening of science labs, work was also underway to support the resumption of research in the Social Sciences and Arts and |
Humanities faculties, especially in areas where this required fieldwork and human participants;
vii. plans were being devised to re-open academic departments to 25% staffing capacity so that colleagues could access materials in their offices essential to both teaching and research.

**19-20/125** Senate observed that:
i. in terms of pump priming it would be important to prioritise the needs of early career researchers for whom achievement of preliminary results was crucial;
ii. the Academic and Research Contingency Groups should continue to collaborate in order to maintain the relationship between teaching and research and to ensure joined-up policy development (e.g. as regards protecting research time for early career academics); it was noted in this context that all contingency groups reported into an overarching co-ordination group chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor which was meeting on a weekly basis to ensure there were no gaps in the University’s response to the current crisis.

**Student Welfare, Health and Wellbeing Support (S.19-20/49)**

**19-20/126** Senate considered an update report from the Academic Registrar in respect of the welfare, health and wellbeing support available to students.

**19-20/127** The Academic Registrar reported that:
i. the University’s response to student wellbeing during the C19 crisis had been recognised in a series of case studies published on the OfS website;
ii. the first four rounds of applications to the Emergency Student Support Fund had seen 714 successful applications and a total disbursement of £346k;
iii. efforts remained ongoing to closely monitor relevant government guidance as it evolved and changed during the course of the crisis.

**Community Activity (S.19-20/50)**

**19-20/128** Senate considered an update report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Partnerships & Engagement) regarding community activity related to C19.

**19-20/129** The Pro-Vice-Chancellor reported that:
i. supporting the city and regional/community partners through the C19 recovery process had provided an opportunity to develop new partnerships and would also inform the University’s future Civic Engagement Strategy;
ii. one exemplar of such engagement was the collaboration between the Department of Social Policy and Social Work and the city to explore the experiences of parents with learning difficulties in their local communities (funded by the National Institute for Health Research);
iii. the Management School had also been working with the city, Local Enterprise Partnerships and York alumni to provide support for small businesses;
iv. other more recently initiated projects included the Estates Directorate working with the city on sustainable travel and opening up some campus spaces for use by HM Courts and Tribunals Service (with potential knock-on benefits for students of the Law School); staff in other Professional Services Directorates were also contributing actively to building improved relations with city partners;
v. the University would be collaborating with York St John University to develop a series of activities relating to women in STEM;
vi. various projects were in train that specifically related to the arts and humanities and the role of cultural organisations in the city (museums, galleries, film etc); this included work with schools and community groups and would be showcased on the University website.

### Election of Members to Senate (S.19-20/51)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19-20/130</th>
<th>Senate considered an updated and enhanced regulation covering both the election of academic staff to Senate and professional support service staff to Council (Regulation 9).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 19-20/131 | The Head of Governance and Assurance reported that:

  i. the previous regulation was unsatisfactory as it contained a number of anachronisms and did not cover the full election cycle or the election of support staff to the University Council (which had been run in accordance with past custom and practice);

  ii. as current Statute 12.1.i made separate provision for three members of Senate to be elected from among fixed-term academic staff, it was proposed to remove this distinction between fixed-term and permanent staff and thereby to increase the number of elected Senate members from 15 to 18 (six per faculty) from the one composite group of all staff on academic contracts;

  iii. as advised by HR and in accordance with past practice, GTAs were not eligible to stand/vote as they were employed on casual engagements with the University and their primary status was as PGR students (who were otherwise represented on Senate);

  iv. pending Senate agreement, the new regulation would also be submitted to the University Council for approval of the support staff electoral process. |
| 19-20/132 | Senate observed that:

  i. when running the election under the terms of the new regulation it would be helpful to explicitly state that all staff on academic contracts (as defined in §9.4) were eligible;

  ii. following Senate approval the reference to fifteen elected members in §9.2.3 would need to be updated. |
| 19-20/133 | **Resolved:**  
i. to approve the proposed new Regulation 9 and associated amendment to Ordinance 5 and discontinuation of Statute 12.1.i;  
ii. to recommend approval of the new Regulation and associated amendment to Ordinance 5 and discontinuation of Statute 12.1.i to the University Council. |
| --- | --- |

### Regulating 7: Student Discipline (S.19-20-II/7 from Category II agenda)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19-20/134</th>
<th>Senate considered an updated version of Regulation 7 (Student Discipline), noting that the matter had been raised on request from the Category II agenda.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 19-20/135 | The Academic Registrar and the Director of Student Life and Wellbeing reported that:  
i. student discipline was a fundamental aspect of providing a safe community environment on campus;  
ii. prompted by a number of misconduct cases the Student Conduct and Respect Team had been established as part of the wider Student Life and Wellbeing Team;  
iii. the team had been strengthened by the appointment of a Conduct and Respect Adviser and a full-time Sexual Violence Liaison Officer, who had supported over 100 students to date;  
iv. twice weekly ‘Students of Concern’ meetings had been established to review individual cases on a confidential basis;  
v. a revised Support to Study and Attend procedure was aimed at enabling students to engage with their course and successfully complete their studies;  
vii. another key element of these developments in student support had been the complete overhaul of the current Regulation 7 (Student Discipline) following wide consultation with all stakeholders;  
viii. review of the Regulation had taken into account learning points from York and other institutions as well as legal advice from the specialist law firm Shakespeare Martineau; the proposed changes were also in line with the OIA Good Practice Framework on Student Discipline and sector-wide guidance from UUK;  
ix. given the unfortunate rise in more serious cases in recent years, the proposed new Regulation contained considerably more procedural definition and guidance for all parties involved in such cases;  
x. the handling of all serious cases centrally by the Conduct and Respect Team sought to ensure consistency of approach while also having suitably trained people in place to respond to reported cases (all members of the Team and other relevant staff having received training in appropriate procedures). |
in investigation skills during 2019/20 from the law firm *Pinsent Masons* and other specialist external training providers);  

xi. the requirement for the University to be informed when a student was charged with a criminal offence would allow the University to support the student and take appropriate cautionary measures to protect the rest of the University community;  

xii. the proposed new Regulation set out clear lines of responsibility for each stage of the disciplinary process.

19-20/136 Senate observed that:  

i. it was important that the University retained the right to consider unacceptable conduct that had taken place outside University premises (as set out in §7.2.5);  

ii. it was generally acknowledged that the current Regulation 7 was inconsistent with best practice, wider University structures/policies and recent developments in the student disciplinary landscape;  

iii. in format and length the new Regulation seemed out of line with other University regulations, which could have implications for maintaining its currency (e.g. as role titles changed). It was suggested that it might be more appropriate to restrict the Regulation to top-level principles, with the supporting procedural detail provided elsewhere in guidance notes. However, given that there was not a prescribed model for University regulations, the key colleagues consulted considered that holding all key information regarding student discipline in a single document outweighed any prescription on the context of the Regulation;  

iv. the inclusion of academic misconduct in the Regulation seemed to conflict with other policies in that area, including as regards the role to be played by Heads of Department;  

v. although the need for a professional approach to case investigation and handling was recognised, the proposed Regulation seemed to be reducing the level of academic involvement in its proposed procedures;  

vi. the inclusion of reputational damage to the University as a form of misconduct might have an unwarranted influence on decision-making in cases that had been subject to high levels of media interest;  

vii. further clarity was required in the Regulation as regards responsibility for the decision-making in respect of assigning levels of severity (Level 1 or Level 2) to each case;  

viii. in addition to the one passing reference in §7.5.2(e), it might be appropriate to include further detail about the misuse of University computers;  

ix. further guidance might be useful on the sorts of factors that could be taken into account when applying sanctions such as exclusion;  

x. greater clarity was required around the independence of the appeals process, especially as regards the role to be played by senior colleagues such as the Academic Registrar and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (TLS); the roles played by such colleagues also needed to include appropriate delegation arrangements in order to prevent possible delays in
decision-making at key points in the process (e.g. around interim suspensions to maintain campus safety);

xi. the Regulation as currently drafted did not seem to reference timing issues as regards when a student could make an allegation (e.g. whether retrospective allegations were permissible).

| 19-20/137 | The Academic Registrar, Director of Student Life and Wellbeing and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (TLS) reported that:

   i. it was not uncommon for regulations at other HEIs to contain the level of detail proposed in the new Regulation 7, the drafting of which had been subject to professional legal advice throughout;
   
   ii. the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (TLS) and the Chair of the Standing Committee on Assessment had supported the inclusion of academic misconduct in the Regulation;
   
   iii. consultation feedback had confirmed that students found the wording of the current Regulation unclear and the student organisations had been closely involved in the re-drafting process to ensure greater clarity (especially around the sorts of sanctions that could be imposed);
   
   iv. academic misconduct was already included in the current Regulation 7, and as such no change was being proposed in this area (although it was noted that a review of the related academic misconduct policy and procedures was scheduled to take place in the coming year);
   
   v. Heads of Department had expressed the view during the consultation that they were often uncomfortable with the role they were expected to play in serious cases that were not academic misconduct, and so the new Regulation had sought to address this (while still retaining senior academic leaders on appeal panels);
   
   vi. if not already sufficiently clear, the relevant section of the proposed Regulation would be reviewed to ensure appropriate separation between those involved in considering cases and those hearing subsequent appeals;
   
   vii. the proposed new Regulation sought to close some gaps in the current Regulation regarding the authority to exclude or terminate a student’s registration;
   
   viii. the considerable amount of work undertaken on other aspects of behavioural misconduct (M19-20/134 above refers) had informed the drafting of a much stronger and clearer policy;
   
   ix. the consultation process had included staff actively involved with academic misconduct policies and procedures (e.g. Chair of the SCA, Assistant Registrar/Student Progress etc), although it was acknowledged that these also required separate review in the next year.

| 19-20/138 | The Vice-Chancellor observed that:

   i. a number of valid points had been made about the length of the proposed Regulation and whether it was possible to move some elements into separate guidance notes/appendices, although it would be important to adhere to guidance from the Office of the
Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE) as regards providing clear and self-contained policies to students;  

ii. the minor points regarding process raised by some Senate members should not be difficult to address;  

iii. further work was planned to review the separate academic misconduct policy to ensure its coherence with the new student discipline regulation; the proposed new Regulation could therefore be seen as an interim bridging arrangement ahead of that review process during 2020/21 (which would involve relevant academic colleagues).

| 19-20/139 | **Resolved:**  
To approve the proposed new Regulation 7 (Student Discipline) for implementation from 2020/21, subject to the Vice-Chancellor’s comments in M19-20/138 above. |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------|

**Annual Statement on Research Integrity (S.19-20/52)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19-20/140</th>
<th>Senate considered the annual Statement on Research Integrity, noting that it was required under UUK’s Concordat to Support Research Integrity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 19-20/141 | The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) reported that:  

i. the Statement provided a summary of actions and activities in support of research integrity and a high-level statement on any formal investigations of research misconduct during the last year;  

ii. it had been approved by Research Committee at its last meeting and would be submitted to the University Council for institutional sign-off before publication on the University website;  

iii. specific reference had been made to the efforts to maintain research activity during the C19 pandemic, including provision of guidance on conducting research from home;  

iv. two new members of staff had joined the Research Strategy and Policy Office to support ethical review, including servicing of the new Academic Ethics and Compliance Committee;  

v. a number of training initiatives additional to the University’s core provision were described in the Statement (e.g. a Research Integrity Forum on the topic of controversial research);  

vi. during 2019/20 there had been one formal allegation of research misconduct relating to research staff, in which an initial investigation had found there was no case to be answered; there had been three formal investigations relating to research students, as a result of which the Academic Misconduct Policy for PGRs had been partly re-drafted to clarify a number of matters relating to academic judgement, mitigating circumstances and plagiarism. |

| 19-20/142 | **Resolved:**  
To approve the annual Statement on Research Integrity for onwards submission to the University Council. |
Committee Reports [unreserved] (S.19-20/53)

19-20/143 Senate noted the synopsis reports from the following sub-committee meetings:

i. Teaching Committee: 14 May and 18 June 2020
ii. Research Committee: 29 April and 17 June 2020
iii. Planning Committee: 15 April and 3 June 2020
iv. Student Life Committee: 11 June 2020
v. Special Cases Committee: 22 June 2020

As regards the Teaching Committee report, the Student Faculty Representative (Sciences) reported that student representatives had been disappointed by the Committee’s decision to endorse a recommendation from the SCA regarding retention of a modified policy on the provision/use of calculators in closed examinations. It was noted that student representatives were likely to raise the matter again for further discussion during 2020/21.

With regard to the University’s participation in the pilot exercise of the subject-level Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (TLS) reported the feedback from participating departments that it had proved a useful exercise, although the outcome in terms of modification of the TEF process at a national level had been disappointing. It was noted in this context that currently there were mixed signals from the government regarding the likely future of the TEF.

Nominations for Committee Membership (S.19-20-II-4)

19-20/144 Senate approved the following appointments to committees:

Hull York Medical School Joint Senate Committee
Professor Neil Lunt (SPSW) [re-appointment for one further year]
Special Cases Committee
Dr Emma Hayiou-Thomas (Psychology) [re-appointment]
Dr Sam Hellmuth (Language & Linguistic Science) [re-appointment]
Research Committee
Professor David Barnett (TFTI/A&H) [re-appointment for one further year]
Professor Piran White (Environment/Sci) [re-appointment for one further year]
[All appointments for a period of three years from 1 August 2020 until 31 July 2023 unless otherwise stated]

Senate also noted that forthcoming vacancies remained on the following committees:

- University Court (two members of the Senate, appointments co-terminous with Senate membership);
- Honorary Associations Committee (one member from Arts and Humanities);
- Special Cases Committee (one member from Arts and Humanities and one Senate member [any faculty]).
Senate **decided** to delegate authority to the Vice-Chancellor to make appointments by Chair’s Action to these remaining vacancies.

### Periodic Review Report (S.19-20-II-5)

**19-20/145** Senate **noted** a periodic review report in respect of the Centre for Women’s Studies.

### Annual Statement from the OIA (S.19-20-II-6)

**19-20/146** Senate **noted** the Annual Statement from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education.

### Ordinances & Regulations for 2020/21 (S.19-20-II-7)

**19-20/147** Senate **approved** minor textual changes to Regulations 1 (**Higher Doctorates**), 2 (**Research Degrees**) and 6 (**General Academic Regulations**) for the 2020/21 edition.

### Policy on Research Degrees (S.19-20-II-8)

**19-20/148** Senate **approved** changes to the Policy on Research Degrees for 2020/21.

### Dates of Meetings in 2020/21

**19-20/149** The dates of meetings in 2020/21 were **noted** as follows (all 14:15):
- Tuesday 20 October 2020
- Tuesday 2 February 2021
- Tuesday 11 May 2021
- Tuesday 6 July 2021