

St George's, University of London

Senate

Minutes (unreserved) of the meeting held on 14th June 2016

Professor Jenny Higham (Chair)

Dr Iain Beith

Professor Dot Bennett

Dr Jo Brown

Professor Nigel Brown

Rob Churm

Dr Val Collington

Professor Mark Fisher

Dr Julia Gale

Steven Gilbert

Dr John Hammond

Dr Vanessa Ho

Nick Lock

Dr David Lovell

Dr Francesc Miralles

Dr Linda Perkins-Porras

Dr Anne-Marie Reid

Karen Roberts

Professor David Strachan

Kat Telford

In attendance:

Derek Baldwinson (minutes)

Nicola Arnold

Andrew Dyer

Dr Julie Leeming (for items 4 and 5)

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Dr Anthony Albert, Professor Franklyn Howe, Dr Marcus Jackson, Dr Iain MacPhee, Dr Nadia Mantovani, Dr Barbara Phillips, Dr Suman Rice, Professor Michael Ussher and Professor Peter Whincup.

2. Minutes of the previous Senate meeting

Received and approved:

The unreserved minutes of the Senate meeting held on 7th March 2016.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/A

3. Matters arising from the joint SPARC-Senate meeting

- 3.1.** Information Governance Toolkit (arising from minute 14) – it was reported that SGUL had met the Health and Social Care Information Centre's Information Governance Toolkit requirements with an overall satisfaction score of 66% based on compliance

with the IGT requirements currently in place. SGUL would be submitting its next self-assessment in January 2017 and it was hoped that the satisfaction score would rise.

4. Success as a Knowledge Economy: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice

Received:

An extract from the BIS white paper setting out the Government's proposals to reform the higher education and research system.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/B

Reported:

4.1. The White Paper proposals do not differ significantly from the proposals contained in Green Paper that preceded it. The Green Paper was considered by Senate in November 2015. The Government proposals are intended to:

- a) Make it easier for new providers to enter the HE market, to achieve degree awarding powers and acquire university title.
- b) Establish the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) as vehicle for recognising and rewarding excellence in teaching.
- c) Create a new regulator, the Office for Students, as a non-departmental body. OFS, which will replace HEFCE, will represent the interests of students.
- d) Promote access to higher education and equality across the lifestyle for students from disadvantaged backgrounds.
- e) Create UK Research and Innovation as the funding body for research and innovation. UKRI will take on functions of the research councils although the names of the research councils will be retained.

4.2. The implementation of many of the Government's proposals will require primary legislation and a Higher Education and Research Bill has been drafted to provide the legislative framework to implement those proposals. The timing of legislation was likely to be influenced by the outcome of the EU referendum. However, the White Paper and Bill set out the framework within which Higher Education will develop in the future.

5. Teaching Excellence Framework

Received:

A presentation from Dr Reid on the planned introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/presentation

Reported:

5.1. Institutions opt in to the TEF. In year 1 of the TEF, institutions that have a current satisfactory QAA rating are eligible to raise fees in line with inflation for 2017-18. SGUL meets this criterion.

- 5.2. BIS is consulting on the operation of TEF in Year Two. In year 2, TEF assessments take place and are published in academic year 2016/17. TEF awards made in Year Two will therefore be primarily relevant to the decision-making of the cohort of potential students applying in 2017/18 for courses starting in 2018/19.
- 5.3. Three aspects of quality are assessed under the TEF. These are teaching quality; the learning environment; and student outcomes and learning gain.
- 5.4. Metrics are used to assess quality in the three aspects. The metrics are derived from the NSS; from HESA data on the non-continuation of students; and from the DLHE survey. Data is benchmarked to take into account the characteristics of students and the subjects that they have studied.
- 5.5. Universities can provide additional evidence to support their TEF application. The additional evidence is called the provider submission.
- 5.6. Submissions will be rated as “Meets expectations”, “Excellent” or “Outstanding”. Ratings last for three years. All TEF2 applicants are guaranteed to achieve a “meets expectations” outcome as a minimum and will be eligible to raise fees in line with inflation for 2018-19.
- 5.7. HEFCE is seeking to appoint panel members and assessors to review submissions to the Year 2 TEF. Staff and students apply directly for these roles. Staff with an interest in applying to be TEF panel members and assessors are however asked to discuss their intention with Dr Reid. Dr Reid will put in place a screening process to vet applications.
- 5.8. SGUL was intending to submit an application in TEF2 in line with the deadline for submissions of December 2016. Dr Reid would be the academic lead for the submission. Although the financial advantages of a successful TEF application are difficult to calculate, there are clear strategic and reputational benefits from a TEF2 submission.

Discussed:

- 5.9. There are no direct costs to SGUL in submitting a TEF2 application.
- 5.10. Panel members and assessors receive payment for their work. The time commitment is extensive: 26 days for academic panel members and 17 days for academic assessors. In view of the time commitment, it was important for SGUL to be aware of staff intentions to submit applications.
- 5.11. Dr Reid would shortly meet with her counterpart at Kingston University to discuss the interface with KU as it relates to the joint faculty and the provider submissions of the two universities.

Agreed:

5.12. To endorse the intention to submit a TEF2 application. Senate would review preparations for the TEF2 submission when it meets in November 2016.

6. Revised operating model for quality assessment

Received:

A paper on the revised operating model for quality assessment to be implemented by HEFCE in England in 2017-18.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/D

Reported:

- 6.1. The Revised operating model for quality assessment will replace the programme of cyclical reviews of institutions that had been carried out by the Quality Assurance Agency under contract from the funding councils since the 1990s. The revised model will be implemented in England for the first time in 2017-18 by HEFCE. Responsibility for the quality assessment will transfer to the Office for Students when OFS is set up.
- 6.2. The operating model for quality assessment comprised:
 - a) The Annual Provider Review - Annual Provider Review (APR) is described as a desk-based, light-touch annual monitoring approach which builds on HEFCE's existing data analysis and assurance arrangements.
 - b) A five-yearly HEFCE assurance review (HAR) – at this stage, little detail has been provided about the HAR.
- 6.3. As part of the APR, Council will be asked to provide assurances in a number of quality-related areas covered by the Higher Education Code of Governance. These areas include the quality of the academic experience, student outcomes and standards of awards.
- 6.4. As a one-off activity, the periodic review processes of all institutions will be verified to ensure that are focussed on quality improvement and include sufficient strong, external scrutiny. The verification process will take place during 2017-18 and will be administered by QAA under contract from HEFCE.

7. Research Excellence Framework

Received:

From the Dean of Research an oral report on initial plans for the Research Excellence Framework.

Reported:

- 7.1. SGUL was awaiting the outcomes of the Stern Review of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) before detailed REF plans were finalised. Lord Stern had been tasked to provide options for a simpler, lighter-touch method of research assessment that

used data and metrics more effectively. He was expected to complete his review in summer 2016.

- 7.2. The next REF was likely to take place in 2020 although a REF in 2021 remained a possibility. The position would be clearer when Senate next meets in November 2016.
- 7.3. Regardless of the outcome of the Stern review, the REF was expected to focus on the quality of research outputs, the wider impact of research and the vitality of the research environment. It would continue to be used as the means for distributing quality-related research funding and have a bearing on the reputation for excellence in research of institutions.
- 7.4. Citation information was expected to be a measure of the quality of research outputs. A Research Strategy Officer was now in post and she was reviewing outputs in CRIS and citation information in Scopus from the period from January 2014 onwards to identify potential 3* and 4* articles.
- 7.5. The eligibility rules that were in place for the 2014 REF are likely to be in place for the next REF. It will be possible to include trust staff provided they have a contract of employment with SGUL and they have cited SGUL in any publications.
- 7.6. More Principal Investigators are expected to be included in the forthcoming REF than had been included in 2014. In 2014, 50% had been included and if, SGUL adopted a more inclusive approach, this might rise to 80% of PIs. If that was the case, SGUL would need to submit more impact cases; seven had been submitted in 2014. 15 possible case studies have already been identified and more will be sourced.
- 7.7. The research environment (including the numbers of doctoral degrees awarded; the research infrastructure and facilities; grant income; collaborations; and wider contributions to the discipline) had been a weakness for SGUL in 2014.
- 7.8. Since 2014 SGUL had, with the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, been awarded ten students each year under the MRC Doctoral Training Partnership studentships programme and this would have a positive impact. SGUL had also invested in equipment and researchers were being encouraged to raise their external profiles and pursue collaborative research opportunities.
- 7.9. A decision on the units of assessment in which SGUL would submit had yet to be taken. The feasibility of joint submission with Kingston University in UoA 3 (Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy) would also be considered.

8. Space Strategy

Received:

An oral report from the Chair of the Space Strategy Committee (SSC) on the Space Utilisation Programme.

Reported:

- 8.1. The relocation of PHRI from Hunter Wing to Jenner Wing was complete. Some staff in IMBE had been relocated to free up space for the Faculty who staff would move from Grosvenor Wing to Hunter Wing. Space in Hunter Wing released as a result of the IMBE moves had been handed over to the contractor.
- 8.2. The contractor had been asked to bring forward the hand over date for the corporate teaching rooms in Jenner Wing to 30th August 2016.
- 8.3. A change to the design of the Faculty accommodation in Hunter Wing to maximise the use of the open plan areas was being considered. The cost of the change was circa £75k. The design change might delay the project by four weeks. The changes would be considered by the Programme Board as an exception from the agreed parameters for the project.
- 8.4. The Programme Board was reviewing its communication strategy. As part of the review, signage would be refreshed and updated campus maps developed for returning students.

Discussed:

- 8.5. It would be useful if the project microsite could be updated and publicised to staff. It would also be useful if tours of refurbished areas could be offered when the project was complete.
- 8.6. The Faculty design change might delay the completion of that element of the project to Mid-September. Discussions with the contractor to minimise any delay are ongoing.

9. Athena Swan

Received:

A report on SGUL's Silver Award application.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/E

Reported:

- 9.1. SGUL's Silver Award application had been unsuccessful and the institution had been invited to resubmit no later than April 2017.

9.2. Dr Aileen O'Brien had stood down from her role as academic lead for Athena Swan and a replacement was being sought. Administrative support for the application process and for the academic lead was also being considered.

Discussed:

9.3. Athena Swan was one of several equality-related charter marks that SGUL had applied for or intended to apply for. The Equality and Diversity Committee had discussed that need to take a more strategic and coordinated approach in managing the application processes particularly in relation to the collection, analysis and presentation of data. These discussions had culminated in a proposal to establish a new Associate Dean role. This proposal would be considered by the Staffing Review Committee in June 2016.

10. Strategy Planning and Resource Committee

Received:

A report on educational and research matters considered at SPARC.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/F

Reported:

10.1. SPARC's Terms of Reference indicate that it will make regular reports to Senate. The report, the first of its kind, had been prepared to strengthen the reporting lines from SPARC to Senate. The preparation of a bespoke report was also intended to reduce the frequency with which the same papers were considered at both SPARC and Senate.

Noted:

10.2. SPARC had considered the implications of the removal of bursaries for student nurses. It was clarified that the Government had announced that bursaries would be withdrawn for nursing and midwifery students and for students enrolled on courses in the Allied Health Professions (including physiotherapy and radiography) from September 2017. Bursaries would be replaced with loans for these students.

11. Report from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee

Received:

A report from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/G

Reported:

11.1. The report drew on deliberations at QAEC meetings in March and May 2016. From the report, the following points were noted:

- a) QAEC had recommended that the development of the Education Strategy should be deferred pending the appointment of a Director of the Institute for Medical and Biomedical Education in succession to Professor Brown who would be retiring shortly. Work on the development of a Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy was continuing.
- b) QAEC had reviewed 2014-15 data from a range of student procedures including the appeals and complaints procedures.
- c) In the period covered by the report, 22 students had submitted academic appeals. Of these, three had been upheld.
- d) 14 students had made complaints. Of these, eight complaints had been resolved informally and the remainder had been escalated to the formal stage of the procedure. Two complaints had been upheld and four rejected.
- e) 39 students were considered under the fitness to study or practise procedure. Of the 39 cases, 33 were resolved informally by SPMC and six cases were referred for investigation. Two students were eventually excluded under the procedure.
- f) Students who are dissatisfied with the outcome of any procedure can complain to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. Five students who initiated or were the subject of procedures in 2014-15 chose to complain to the OIA. Four complaints were found by the OIA to be not justified. On the advice of the OIA, SGUL convened a complaints appeal committee to hear the appeal of the fifth student. That complaint was rejected.
- g) QAEC had convened a Plagiarism Development Working Group in 2014 to explore the use of Turn-it-In as a vehicle for the submission of coursework. The Group had identified the need for a learning technologist to support the use of Turn-it-In and the Electronic Management of Assessment. An application to create a new learning technologist post had been submitted to the investment fund as part of the planning round.
- h) QAEC had analysed value-added scores by Ethnic group (BME vs. White) for 2013-14 and 2014-15 for the Biosciences and Health Professions (Radiography and Physiotherapy). The analysis indicated that students from BME groups in subject areas have a value-added less than 1, suggesting that students in these areas are not achieving as many 1st and 2.1 as the sector, when taking into account the entry profile of the students and subject.

Discussed:

- 11.2. Seven allegations of academic misconduct had been received in 2014-15. Of these, five were deemed to prima facie instances of misconduct and each allegation was admitted by the students concerned. Instances of academic misconduct may be underreported if possible breaches are identified and investigated at the course level without reference to the student affairs team in registry.
- 11.3. SGUL had procured a new VLE (Canvas) and the installation and use of Canvas will have implications for the use of Turn-it-in.

Agreed:

- 11.4. In line with the recommendation contained within the report, to terminate the external examiner appointment of an MSc Healthcare Practice external examiner because the external examiner had not submitted a report.

12. Annual Programme Monitoring 2014-2015

Received:

A report from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee on the outcome of annual programme monitoring (session 2014-2015).

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/H

Reported:

- 12.1. The report confirmed to Senate that SGUL's annual monitoring procedures were being implemented as intended. All programmes offered by SGUL, including programmes offered in partnership with other providers, had submitted annual monitoring reports that had subsequently been approved by FQC, TPCC or UMBEC. It was also confirmed that each annual monitoring report included an action plan to improve the academic experience of students.
- 12.2. A separate report from the Research Degrees Committee (RDC) that captured data on new registrations and on submission outcomes for research degrees candidates for the period from 1st October 2014 to 30th September 2015 was also made available to Senate. The Research Degrees Committee report also summarised current and planned quality assurance activities and initiatives.

Agreed:

- 12.3. To receive and note the report.

13. Academic Forum

Received

A report from the meeting of the Academic Forum that had taken place on 17th May 2016.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/I

Reported:

- 13.1. The meeting was attended by 15 members of the academic staff (one of whom was from FHSCE). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposals, previously considered at Senate in March 2016, to alter the way in which meetings were scheduled. The proposals had been broadly endorsed by the Academic Forum.

Discussed:

- 13.2. When Academic Forum considered the proposals, there were mixed views on the merit of adding students to the membership of Academic Forum. On balance, Senate concluded that it was beneficial to include students in all academic meetings. Initially, student membership should be limited to Students' Union sabbatical officers.

Agreed:

- 13.3. To approve the proposed changes to the Academic Forum.
- 13.4. That the implementation of the teaching diary could usefully be discussed by Academic Forum in view of the fact that the teaching had recently been the subject of an equality impact assessment.
- 13.5. To review the impact of the changes to Academic Forum when Senate meets in June 2017.

14. Equality and Diversity Committee

Received

An oral report on the work of the Equality and Diversity Committee from Dr John Hammond, the EDC chair.

Reported:

- 14.1. As noted earlier, the analysis of value-added scores by Ethnic group (BME vs. White) for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 data for the Biosciences and Health Professions (Radiography and Physiotherapy) indicated that there was a BME attainment gap for some courses. Dr John Hammond and Professor Michael Usher (Associate Dean for WP) have convened the Attainment Gap Steering Group to work with Course Teams and others to develop a strategic response to the issues raised by the analysis of value-added scores. The Group will report to QAEC and EDC and, through these committees, to Senate.
- 14.2. That the Prevent duty placed a duty on Higher Education Institutions to have 'due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism'. SGUL submitted an initial assessment of compliance with the Prevent Duty to HEFCE in January and further in-depth reporting will follow in April and December 2016.
- 14.3. Positive meetings had been held with students regarding the Prevent duty. It was apparent from these meetings that there was a great deal of anxiety amongst students in general surrounding Prevent and some student groups were feeling particularly vulnerable. Student anxiety at these levels had not been anticipated and a communications plan was being developed to allay student concerns. The scope to offer on-line non-mandatory Prevent training to staff was also being explored.

15. Student Charter

Approved:

The reissue of the Student Charter for 2016-17.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/I

16. MSc Physician Associate Studies

Agreed:

To receive the report of the validation of the MSc Physician Associate Studies and to approve the recommendations of the validation panel.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/K

17. MSc Sports Cardiology

Agreed:

To receive the report of the validation of the MSc Sports Cardiology and to approve the recommendations of the validation panel.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/L

18. Common Postgraduate Framework

Agreed:

To receive the report of the validation of the Common Postgraduate Framework modules and to approve the recommendations of the validation panel.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/M

19. The General Regulations for Students and Programmes of Study

Approved:

To approve the General Regulations for 2016-2017.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/N

20. Quality Manual

Approved:

Amendments to the Quality Manual for 2016-2017.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/O

21. External Examiner appointments

Approved:

The appointment of Mrs Pak Hung, Senior Lecturer in Midwifery, University of Wolverhampton, as external examiner for the Diploma/BSc Healthcare Practice (midwifery modules) for the period to December 2018.

22. Actions taken by the Chair

Received and noted:

A report on decisions taken on behalf of Senate by the chair since last meeting of Senate.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/P

23. Student Cases

Received and noted:

A report on student cases considered by hearing committees.

Paper Senate/2015-16/3/Q

24. Honorary appointments

Agreed:

To recommend to Council that Nigel Brown is awarded the title of emeritus Professor in Biomedical Sciences in the Institute of Medical and Biomedical Education.

25. Retirement from Senate

Dr Jo Brown would be leaving St George's to take up a post at the Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry at Queen Mary. Dr Brown was thanked for her many outstanding contributions to St George's as inter alia Academic Director of the Student Experience and Head of Clinical Communication.

26. Queen's Birthday Honours

Noted:

Professor Vari Drennan had been made a Member of the Order of the British Empire (MBE) for services to health service research, development and nursing.

Professor Ian Peate, a partner of Kingston and St George's under the Faculty's Gibraltar-based nursing programme, had been awarded an Officer of the Order of the British Empire (OBE) for services to nursing and nurse education.

27. Dates of meetings in 2015-2016

Tuesday 12 July 2016 (joint meeting with SPARC) at 2pm in H2.5 and H2.6

28. Dates of meetings in 2016-2017

All meetings are from 2.00 – 4.00 pm in H2.5

Tuesday 15 November 2016

Tuesday 28 February 2017

Tuesday 6 June 2017

Tuesday 11 July 2017 (Joint meeting with SPARC H2.5 and H2.6)

Q:\Committees\Senate\2016-17\November 2016\Senate mins 14 June 2016.doc

CONFIRMED