LANCASTER UNIVERSITY

Minutes of a meeting of the Senate
held on 2 March 2016

PRESENT: Vice-Chancellor (in the Chair); Professor P. Ashwin; Professor A. M. Atherton; Professor P. Atkinson; Ms J. Bennett; Dr P. Bishop; Professor S. Bushell; Professor K. Cain; Professor A. G. Chetwynd; Dr A. Collins; Mr J. Davies (for Mr T. Buckley); Professor S. P. Decent; Professor M. Ehrgott; Mrs R. Fligelstone; Professor C. Gere (for Mr F. Dawes); Professor A. Gillespie; Ms O. Gomez-Cash (for Dr W. Tych); Professor S. Guy; Dr R. Haley (for Professor R. Jones); Mr B. Harper; Professor B. Hollingsworth; Professor M. Hughes; Professor N. Johnson; Professor K. C. Jones; Dr R. Lauder; Professor A. Lazarev; Professor C. Leitch; Professor C. May-Chahal; Ms M. McDonough; Dr C. Melville; Mr P. Montague; Professor J. F. O’Hanlon; Professor C. Paoloni; Professor M. Piacentini; Dr R. Rigby; Professor E. Semino; Professor S. Skogly; Dr B. Smith; Professor M. M. Smyth; Mr J. Thornberry; Mr M. Topps; Dr J. Unger; Professor T. Vurdubakis; Ms J. Walmsley (for Ms C. Povah); Dr S. Walter; Mr S. Wright; Dr S. Young.

IN ATTENDANCE: Miss F. M. Aiken; Mr P. Boustead; Mr J. S. W. Dickinson; Ms C. Geddes; Mr I. Lyne; Mr P. Maggs; Ms N. C. Owen; Mrs S. Randall-Paley; Mr M. Swindlehurst; Ms T. Walters; Mrs L. M. Wareing.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Professor S. Bradley; Professor P. R. Fielden; Dr A. Gilchrist; Dr M. Ginger; Mr R. S. Gould; Mr W. Hedley; Professor S. R. A. Huttly; Professor J. Whittle; Professor M. B. Wright.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE TO THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

From Dr Steve Wright, Learning Technologist, Faculty of Health and Medicine representative member for staff (who are not teaching or research staff):

What can be done to make the process by which staff retire a more human, respectful and engaging process that would recognise their contribution and also invite ongoing engagement with the University as a valued “academic (or professional) alumnus”?
Could practical steps be considered for example to enable opting in to a “retired” email address/account with redirect from their employee account rather than shutting down an account and giving the impression that a member of staff is simply not replying?

On behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, the Chief Administrative Officer reminded Senators that changes to the process of retirement had been introduced in January 2015 to address the issue of membership without accountability, as well as to comply with certain software and licencing requirements. Simultaneously a light-touch process to allow continuation of service for retiring staff had been introduced. This process allowed Heads of Department to request continuation of services such as e-mail addresses and, to date, no problems had been reported. However, staff concern about the seemingly abrupt nature of the termination of formal association was recognised, and the Chief Administrative Officer reported that the University was considering the introduction of a staff alumni association to provide an ongoing relationship. Discussions were at an early stage, and details would be circulated in due course.

Dr Wright thanked the Chief Administrative Officer for the reply and assurance. He concurred that formal retirement processes were necessary, but welcomed the discussion about further developments to support retiring staff.

MINUTES

S.2016/01 Minutes of the Meeting Held on 4 November 2015

Documents: SEC/2016/2/0190; SEC/2015/2/1288

Resolution: the Senate approved the minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2015, with the minor amendment of the removal of the subordinate clause “that while specific aspects of it would return to that body for further refinement” from minute S.2015/62.

The Vice-Chancellor further reported, as a matter arising, that the proposed changes to the Statutes and Ordinances, considered at the last meeting (minute S.2015/65) had been approved by Council and changes to Statute submitted to the Privy Council. Amendments had been accepted with one exception. Statute 16a, which set out provisions in relation to the Students’ Union, was to have moved from Statute to Ordinance, however, following Privy Council consideration, it had been agreed, with no objection from Lancaster, that it remain in the Statutes.
SECTION 1: ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

S.2016/02  Report of the Vice-Chancellor

Ref: 1.2

PROPOSAL (Vice-Chancellor): the Senate was invited to receive for information an oral report from the Vice-Chancellor on items of interest.

The Vice-Chancellor reported on the following items.

(A) NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The Vice-Chancellor detailed a number of national activities and Lancaster’s response to each.

Higher Education Green Paper

This set out the government’s direction of travel for the higher education sector towards ever increasing marketisation. The paper set out means to drive competition between different models of delivery, placed a greater emphasis on metrics and set out the separation of teaching and research in governance terms with the creation of two new national bodies, the Office for Students and ResearchUK. Lancaster had submitted a response in which it objected to this separation due both to its inherent inappropriateness, as well as the lack of recognition of the wider activities of universities in the community and economy. The new Teaching Excellence Framework, or TEF, was a key element of the Green Paper and currently the University was awaiting the technical consultation which would give greater detail on the operation of the framework.

Nurse Review of the Research Councils

A review of the Research Councils, undertaken by Sir Paul Nurse, had recommended the creation of a single research body, ResearchUK, to oversee the work of the Research Councils. This recommendation had been accepted by the government, as announced through the Comprehensive Spending Review, but further details on implementation were not yet available.
Stern Review of the REF

Related to the above, Lord Stern was currently undertaking a review of the REF. A short consultation period was underway in which Lancaster would be submitting a response in which it championed the continuing primacy of peer review in the REF process.

Comprehensive Spending Review

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his Comprehensive Spending Review, announced a 17% cut to the BIS budget by 2020. However, conversion of maintenance grants to loans subsumed the majority of this, so the direct impact on Lancaster would be limited.

LANCASTER ACTIVITIES

The Vice-Chancellor detailed a number of local activities of interest to the Senate.

Higher Education Review

The University has successfully completed its QAA Higher Education Review. The Vice-Chancellor recorded his thanks to all involved.

Queen’s Anniversary Prize

The University had been awarded the Queen’s Anniversary Prize for a fourth time in recognition of the work on corpus linguistics in the Department of Linguistics and English Language. This represented high profile recognition of the University’s work for which congratulations to those involved were formally recorded.

Storm Desmond

The University had undergone a very significant event in December 2015 when Storm Desmond had flooded large parts of Lancaster and left the region, including the University, for an extended period without electricity. This represented a severe test to the University’s resilience and the Vice-Chancellor recorded his thanks to all involved both in the event itself and in the post-event period of recovery.
(C) **CHANGING LANDSCAPE**

In response to a question, the Vice-Chancellor acknowledged that the higher education landscape was changing and that the outcome of the European referendum could change it again significantly depending on the outcome. It was noted that the University was doing some preliminary planning regarding potential impact, and it was agreed that this would be considered at a subsequent Senate. It was also noted that the higher education sector was firmly in favour of remaining within the European Union.

**RESOLUTION:** the Senate agreed to note the report.

---

**S.2016/03**  
**Summary of UMAG Business Relevant to Senate**

**Ref:** 1.3; **document:** SEC/2016/2/0195

**RESOLUTION:** the Senate agreed to note the report.

**S.2016/04**  
**Forward Schedule of Senate Business**

**Ref:** 1.4; **document:** SEC/2016/2/0222

**RESOLUTION:** the Senate noted the schedule of currently expected Senate business for 2015/16.

---

**SECTION 2: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION REQUIRING DECISION**

**S.2016/05**  
**Review of the Role of the 'Head of Department': Report of Findings and Recommendations**

**Ref:** 2.5; **document:** SEC/2016/2/0218

**PROPOSAL** (Dean, Faculty of Health and Medicine and Chair of the Working Group): the Senate was invited to note and approve the report.

The Dean of the Faculty of Health and Medicine introduced the outcomes of the review of the role of Head of Department, which he had chaired, and its key recommendations agreed by the working group following consultation. These were summarised as:

- extension of term to four years;
- introduction of a common process for appointment;
- enhancement on support;
• a personal financial contribution;
• additional training;
• more explicit details in relation to promotion criteria.

Further work was being planned for Heads’ access to shared university services.

In discussion the following points were noted.

• The report had focused on appointment and pay procedures, which was welcome, but more could be done to further articulate the responsibilities and means of accountability of Heads.

• A common job description was good, but how this description was applied in practice was variable across the University; means were needed to ensure consistency.

• It was confirmed that Headships were determined by seniority of staff and not specific title – Senior Teaching Fellows, for example, were fully eligible.

• Financial incentives were positive, but ensuring that Heads’ research profiles/pipelines were not disadvantaged was equally important in some departments.

It was noted that the approach was designed to be flexible so as to allow each department to adapt it to meet particular requirements.

RESOLUTION: the Senate approved the report.

S.2016/06 Review and Updating of the Academic Promotions Criteria for 2016/17

Ref: 2.6; documents: SEC/2016/2/0216

PROPOSAL (Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development): the Senate was invited to receive, discuss, and approve the criteria as set out.

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development introduced a paper setting out new academic promotions criteria, noting that it built on the paper previously considered by the Senate in 2014. The new criteria were designed both to help to achieve the University’s strategic aims as well as to meet the new sector context. By balancing recognition for research, teaching and leadership excellence, academic staff would be able to temper their career development to those aspects which best reflected their skill-set. The new criteria, if approved, would be adopted by Academic Promotions Committee and would, over time, establish new precedents with promotion processes.
In discussion the following points were noted.

- The definition of how leadership was recognised needed to be flexible enough to capture the varied nature of leadership contribution.

- There was endorsement of the intended balancing of leadership, research and teaching, but reservation among some Senators about the title ‘Professor’ being used for those who did not demonstrate strength in research.

- It was suggested that titles could be adapted to reflect the route through which they were achieved, however, it was considered that this could misconstrued as creating second tier standing, and this was not the intention.

- It was noted that the new criteria required clearer understanding of what was meant by ‘Research Fellow’ and ‘Teaching Fellow’ and it was agreed that HR would undertake this work.

- National-level championing of teaching made the changes to promotion criteria particularly timely.

Senate approved the new criteria. However, the reservations of some members were noted, and it was agreed that Senate would receive an annual report on how the criteria were being implemented and whether it was leading to dilution of titles.

**Resolution:** the Senate approved the criteria as set out for immediate implementation with an annual report coming to Senate.

**Action:** PB

---

**Enhancing Research**

Ref: 2.7; document: SEC/2016/2/0191

**Proposals** (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)): the Senate was invited to:

(i) receive the paper setting out processes designed to positively enhance research at Lancaster;

(ii) note the annual approach described in section A;

(iii) approve the new Periodic Research Enhancement and Development process described in section B.
The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) introduced a paper on enhancing research, a previous version of which had been to Senate in September 2015 (minute S.2015/53 refers). He noted that the paper contained two processes. The first was an annual process designed to reflect current practice within departments and to provide both institutional assurance that research support was being actioned and to provide data to support planning and strategic development. The second was a periodic research and development process designed to put research on a level footing with teaching in terms of providing information to enhance local practice and to provide both qualitative and quantitative information to inform planning and strategic development. He noted that combining periodic engagement of both teaching and research had been considered, and where possible such an approach would be taken. Decisions regarding this would be taken by the two Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Education and Research) in consultation with the Faculty Deans.

In discussion the following points were noted.

- The strongly held ambition from members of Senate that the annual departmental report process (section A.5 of the paper) would be light touch was noted. Senators were assured that the process will be designed to be light touch, including that data would be drawn from existing sources.

- It was questioned how useable some research management data is currently and it was suggested that for the processes in the paper to be meaningful there would need to be clear processes to ensure transparency and equity.

- It was noted that research management information was sometimes not currently sufficiently robust to support strategic planning; this process, it was anticipated, should improve the reliability of this material.

- It was confirmed that for early career staff there must be recognition of the time necessary to develop pipelines of research and that an important aspect of the processes described in the paper was to ensure that there were suitable development opportunities in place and that these were being used.

- When assessing the quality of research outputs in preparation for a future REF, suitably robust peer-review methodology was needed, including external assessment as appropriate.

- The potential impact of the paper on members of staff needed to be recognised and addressed within the implementation of the new process.
• As an organisation, it was necessary to be able to reflect on research strategically, including development of multidisciplinary activities. In order to do this effectively, it was necessary to have a robust understanding of research activity and to plan how to maximise this activity.

• The process needed to ensure the enhancement of a research culture and not an audit culture.

• The process must not be solely driven by a desire to maximise future REF results; it must also take a longer term view of research strategy.

• Periodic review would be sufficiently flexible to allow each discipline to ensure that areas of focus were appropriate.

Reflecting on the points made, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor offered the following summary. It appeared that Senate did not currently engage in data-evidenced research-related discussions sufficiently. Considering this pragmatically, taking a quantifiable annual approach, as set out in the paper, would provide the means to do this and, longer term, would spread the burden of work required for the next REF. Such work would not only help to shape future REF submissions, but, more importantly, would allow the University to regularly review its research strategy and implementation to ensure that work and planning was being focused to maximise effectiveness.

Acknowledging this summary as accurate and in recognition that more work would be undertaken in collaboration with Heads of Departments in relation to the practical implementation of the processes as set out in the document, Senate approved the new periodic research development and enhancement process.

RESOLUTION: the Senate noted the annual approach as set out in the paper and approved the new periodic research development and enhancement process.

ACTION: SPD

S.2016/08 Proposal to Review Postgraduate Research Provision

Ref: 2.24; document: SEC/2016/2/0265

PROPOSAL (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)): the Senate was invited to approval the proposal to review postgraduate research provision.
The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) introduced a proposal to review postgraduate research provision. He noted that this stemmed from the outcomes of the Higher Education Review (see S.2016/09 below). The review would consider all aspects of PGR provision, but would focus particularly on induction and training, and financial models. In discussion it was noted that while students were represented in the working group there were no PGR students and agreed that PGR representation would be sought.

**Resolution:** the Senate approved the review of postgraduate research provision as set out.

**Action:** SPD/SRAH

---


*Ref: 2.8; document: SEC/2016/2/0214*

**Proposal** (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)): the Senate was invited to note the report and approve the Action Plan.

Senate noted the outcome of the Higher Education Review. It was reported that the University was required to produce and publish an action plan by April 2016. It was noted that for audit purposes the action plan would be kept as a discrete document, however, many of the actions would be incorporated into other ongoing work within the University.

**Resolution:** the Senate noted the report and approved the Action Plan.

**Action:** SRAH

---

**S.2016/10 Exit Awards for Students Registered on Collaborative Dual Degree Programmes Delivered by the COMSATS Institute of Information Technology (CIIT) in Lahore, Pakistan**

*Ref: 2.9; document: SEC/2016/2/0220*

**Proposal** (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International) and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)): the Senate was invited to approve the award of CertHE and DipHE exit qualifications to students registered on collaborative Dual Degree Programmes delivered by the COMSATS Institute of Information Technology (CIIT) in Lahore Pakistan.
It was reported that the dual degree in COMSATS would not be recognised in Pakistan, owing to a decision by the Higher Education Council in that country. Students would still receive a Lancaster University degree which would carry the same status as one granted in the UK, but, due to internal laws in Pakistan, this degree would not be recognised, for example, for purposes of in-country professional accreditation. For this reason it was recognised that while some students would want to continue, others would want to step off the programme. In order to support this process Senate was asked to approve the recognition of a Certificate of Higher Education (CertHE) for those who had completed the equivalent of year-one of the programme and a Diploma in Higher Education (DipHE) for those who had completed the equivalent of year two. These awards already existed within Lancaster’s collaborative provision, and Senate was asked to extend them to include Lancaster students at COMSATS. It was recognised that this provided COMSATS students with access to exit awards not available to students from the main campus, but it was reported that the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) was currently reviewing this arrangement and would be bringing a proposal to Senate in due course. On this basis, Senate approved the use of the awards as set out.

RESOLUTION: the Senate approved the award of CertHE and DipHE exit qualifications to students registered on collaborative Dual Degree Programmes delivered by the COMSATS Institute of Information Technology (CIIT) in Lahore Pakistan.

ACTION: SB

S.2016/11 Honorary Degrees 2016

Ref: 2.10; document: SEC/2016/2/0213 (Restricted and Confidential)

SECTION 3: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION NOT REQUIRING DECISION

S.2016/12 Research Income and Research Income Diversification Performance Indicators

Ref: 3.11; document: SEC/2016/2/0215

PROPOSAL (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)): the Senate was invited to note the set of research performance and diversification indicators recently endorsed by UMAG.
The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) presented research performance and diversification indicators which would be used to inform management decision-making.

RESOLUTION: the Senate noted the report.

**S.2016/13 National Student Survey Update Report**

*Ref: 3.12; document: SEC/2016/2/0219*

**PROPOSAL** (Provost for Student Experience, Colleges and the Library): the Senate was invited to note and comment on the update report.

The Provost for Student Experience, Colleges and the Library presented an updated report on the 2015 National Student Survey outcomes noting that it provided overviews from the four faculties. She noted that the University was considering a similar style survey for second year students. It was further noted that the 2016 NSS was underway, due to close at the end of April. Members were asked to encourage eligible students to participate.

RESOLUTION: the Senate noted the report.

**S.2016/14 Transparent Allocation Model: Working Group Report**

*Ref: 3.13; document: PAS/16/014*

**PROPOSAL** (Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences): the Senate was invited to note and comment on the final report.

The Dean of FASS provided the final report of the working group considering a transparent allocation model. This, he noted, concluded the work previously considered by the Senate. Additional work, he reported, was being undertaken through the University Planning and Resources Group to develop benchmarks and tests against comparative institutions.

RESOLUTION: the Senate noted the report.
SECTION 4: ITEMS FOR DECISION UNLIKELY TO REQUIRE DISCUSSION

S.2016/15  Departmental Change of Name: Department of Management Learning and Leadership

Ref: 4.14; document: SEC/2016/2/0193

PROPOSAL (Dean, Management School): the Senate was invited to approve the name change from the Department of Management Learning and Leadership to the Department of Leadership and Management with effect from 1 April 2016.

RESOLUTION: the Senate approved the change of name with effect from 1 April 2016.

S.2016/16  College Constitution: Bowland College

Ref: 4.15; document: SEC/2016/2/0038

PROPOSALS (Principal, Bowland College): the Senate was invited to:

(i) approve the revised college constitution for Bowland College, which has been brought into line with the Constitution template that Senate approved in July 2015;

(ii) note and approve the addition of clause 1.2.8 ‘provide opportunities for senior and junior members of the College to engage socially and academically’ to the Constitution template.

RESOLUTION: the Senate approved the Bowland College constitution.

S.2016/17  Dates of Terms, Examinations and Degree Congregations 2015-2025

Ref: 4.16; document: SEC/2016/2/0204

PROPOSALS (University Secretary): the Senate was invited to:

(i) approve the dates of terms, examinations and degree congregations for the academic years 2015-16 to 2024-25 inclusive, as set out;

(ii) note that in the academic years 2018-19 and 2024-2025, due to the fact that the date of Easter is so late, it is necessary to have the first week of the Summer Term immediately after the last week of the Lent Term, and then continue the Summer Term after the Easter vacation.
RESOLUTION: the Senate approved the dates of terms, examinations and degree congregations for the academic years 2015-16 to 2024-25 inclusive, as set out.

SECTION 5: ITEMS FOR REPORT

S.2016/18 Undergraduate Assessment Regulations: Repeat of the First Year

Ref: 5.17; document: SEC/2016/2/0198

PROPOSAL (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)): the Senate was invited to note for information the amendment to the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations with regard to the provision for a repeat of the first year.

RESOLUTION: the Senate noted the amendment as set out.

S.2016/19 Academic Standards and Quality Committee: Annual Report 2014/15

Ref: 5.18; document: SEC/2016/3/0023

PROPOSAL (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)): the Senate was invited to receive for information the annual report of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee for 2014/15.

RESOLUTION: the Senate received the report.

S.2016/20 Equality and Diversity Committee: Annual Report 2014/15

Ref: 5.19; document: SEC/2016/2/0203

PROPOSAL (Chair, Equality and Diversity Committee): the Senate was invited to receive for information the annual report of the Equality and Diversity Committee for 2014/15.

RESOLUTION: the Senate received the report.

S.2016/21 Institutional Summary Report on Periodic Quality Reviews 2014/15

Ref: 5.20; document: SEC/2016/2/0196

PROPOSAL (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)): the Senate was invited to note the report.

RESOLUTION: the Senate noted the report.
S.2016/22  Chair’s Action

Ref: 5.21; document: SEC/2016/2/0202

PROPOSAL (University Secretary): the Senate was invited to note the decisions taken by the Chair, on its behalf, regarding the following:

(i) Membership of the Education Committee;
(ii) Honorary Fellowships.

RESOLUTION: the Senate noted the decisions.

S.2016/23  Written Reports of Meetings

Ref: 5.22

RESOLUTION: the Senate received the following written reports of meetings and, where appropriate, confirmed the actions taken:

(i) Academic Standards and Quality Committee, meetings of 24 September 2015 (SEC/2016/2/0039) and 26 November 2016 (SEC/2016/2/0201)
(ii) Collaborative Provision Oversight Committee, meetings of 9 November 2015 (SEC/2016/2/0225) and 18 January 2016 (SEC/2016/2/0197)
(iii) Colleges and Student Experience Committee, meeting of 11 November 2015 (SEC/2016/2/0228)
(iv) Council, meetings of 25 September 2015 (SEC/2016/2/0224) and 20 November 2015 (SEC/2016/2/0223)
(v) Equality and Diversity Committee, meeting of 21 October 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1417)
(vi) Public Arts Strategy Committee, meeting of 17 September 2015 (SEC/2016/2/0230)
(vii) Ruskin Library Board, meeting of 17 April 2015 (SEC/2016/2/0229)
(viii) College Syndicate reports:
   (a) County College Syndicate, meeting of 21 October 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1312)
   (b) Fylde College Syndicate, meeting of 3 November 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1370)
   (c) Grizedale College Syndicate, meeting of 23 October 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1272)
   (d) Pendle College Syndicate, meeting of 17 June 2015 (SEC/2015/2/1257)
S.2016/24  **New and Revised Courses**

*Ref: 5.23; document: SEC/2016/3/0085*

**RESOLUTION:** the Senate noted the reports on new and revised programmes, and programmes to be laid down, all approved in accordance with the schedule of delegations.

S.2016/25  **Departures**

Senate noted the departures of both the University Secretary and the Academic Registrar and recorded its thanks for their contributions.