

SENATE

Minutes of Meeting held on 13 July 2022

Present: Professor Ian Walmsley (Chair); Professors Buluwela, Distaso, Evans, Green, Hanna, Haynes, Jardine, Johnston, Lindstedt, McCoy, Meeran, Thompson, Xu; Drs Costa-Pereira, Craig, Field, Fobelets, Malhotra, Rutschmann; Mr Lo, Mr Lupton, Mr Tebbutt, Mr Ashton (Secretary), Ms Webster (Minute Secretary).

In attendance: Professor Jason Riley for Professor Brandon, Ms Turham for Dr James; Professor Tetley and Ms Hailey Smith for Minute 2645; Mr Malcolm Edwards for Minute 2646

Apologies: Professors Brandon, Craster, Haynes, Kingsbury, Spivey, Weber; Dr James; Ms Bannister; Ms Makuch

2639 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were noted as above.

2640 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 23 March 2022 were confirmed as an accurate record.

2641 Matters Arising

Minute 2635 refers: The Vice Provost (Education) had met with the Assistant Provost Promotions following the last meeting of the Senate. A new Working Group is to be established, chaired by Professor Jonathan Mestel, to consider the issues raised in terms of the revised Module Evaluation Questionnaire and to propose amendments to the Survey.

2642 Chair's Action

There was no Chair's Action to report.

2643 Provost's Business

Received: A verbal report from the Provost.

Reported (1) That a review of Council effectiveness was ongoing and being overseen by the College Secretary.

(2) That this was the last Senate meeting for Professor Emma McCoy who would be leaving the College to take up a new role at the London School of Economics. The Chair thanked Professor McCoy for everything they had done and accomplished and for steering the College through the pandemic in an exceptional manner and leaving the education provision poised for the future. These achievements were demonstrated through two exceptional set of improved National Student Survey results.

(3) That Professor Mary Ryan would be taking up the post of Vice Provost (Research Enterprise). It was noted that while this post had less to do with the business of Senate, but the appointment would see the conjunction of research and education get a new focus.

(4) That this year's Officer Trustees will be coming to their end of their period of office soon. Thanks go to all of them for their hard work and contribution to the College;

Next year's office holders will be:

- **Union President:** Hayley Wong
- **Deputy President (Education):** Jason Zheng
- **Deputy President (Welfare):** Nathalie Podder
- **Deputy President (Clubs & Societies):** Dylan Hughes
- **Deputy President (Finance & Services):** Niamh McAuley

2644 Vice-Provost (Education) Business

Received: A Report from the Vice-Provost (Education) (Paper Senate/2021/22)

Reported (1): That thanks were expressed to the Academic Registrar for his help in pulling this report together.

(2) That in terms of the National Student Survey, it was pleasing that the College had maintained last year's good results and particularly good to achieve this as a research intensive University. However, the College could not be complacent around assessment and feedback and it was planned to launch projects in the next academic year to focus particularly on this area under the refreshed Learning and Teaching Strategy.

(2) That in respect of the 2022-23 admissions pipeline, there were a number of factors which could affect recruitment, including the ongoing impact of Covid which was still affecting some international travel, delays in processing ATAS and visa applications and a Government instruction that institutions can not deliver online education to new, sponsored students while they are overseas. A number of mitigations had been put in place by the Admissions team including communications to department and students and increased resource to support CAS production.

(3) That there were reports nationally of higher than usual levels of failure for students years 1 and 2, and that early Examination Board outcomes at the College indicated that this pattern may repeat here. There had also been an increase in the number of Mitigating Circumstances claims. Senate agreed that a small group should form to oversee this over the summer period and the review the possible action to be taken as outlined on the report. It was noted that there was a need to ensure students got good feedback to ensure they could successfully pass their modules, and that those sitting for the first time were properly prepared. There was a need however to maintain our academic standards so decisions would need to be taken on a case-by-case basis. It was recognised that this is resource intensive and that these students are those who have had an incredibly disruptive few years and who have less experience of taking examinations.

Considered in discussion: (1) that there was agreement that assessment and feedback work was critical. The Faculty of Medicine was already working with areas which get good results on feedback but it was felt that more could be done to ensure that students understand what is expected of them from assessment. The issue of assessment and feedback came through all the major external surveys.

(2) That the Imperial College Union wanted to highlight the score for the Union in the NSS and celebrate their success.

2645 Student Discipline Procedure Review

Received: An interim report from the Student Discipline Review Group (**Paper Senate/2021/23**) presented by Professor Terry Tetley, Chair of the Group and David Ashton, Academic Registrar.

Reported: (1) That the scope of the Working group had been to undertake a root and branch review using the Group, evidence gathered from across the sector and relevant sector frameworks from the Office for Students and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), and a number of internal expert stakeholder groups. The Group had concluded from their initial work that the procedure had the necessary key steps but needed some further work. Thanks were expressed to Hayley Smith and Ewan Roberts from the Education Office for their support to the group.

(2) That this initial work had identified a number of themes to be addressed and provide a focus through the review including support for all parties, misconduct which was also a criminal offence, placing restrictions and clarifying the roles and responsibilities of those involved, reviewing the range of penalties within the procedure and consideration to communications about the procedure and disclosure of misconduct.

(3) That the Group had agreed a number of principles for the procedure to guide its revision and that these aligned closely with those set out in the OIA's Good Practice Framework.

(4) That a number of initial recommendations had been made in the interim report which included the development of a separate Student Code of Conduct to clearly set out the College's expectations for student behaviour and was included in the paper, along with a proposal for a higher-level web page for students. The report also included a proposed Investigation Protocol, which could also be used to support other areas of student casework.

(5) That recommendations also included, amongst other things, updating the College's current policy on sexual harassment and misconduct, that where there was a police investigation, the College could also continue with its investigation following liaison with external authorities, to monitor the Report and Support to keep track of information and identify any emerging themes, to review the mechanisms for imposing restrictions on students and considering how restorative justice approaches could be used. There were also recommendations about diversifying the College Panels who consider major cases and increasing the resource to support the management of all student casework, including discipline.

(6) That the group would be seeking further advice from the College's Legal Services team before finalising the procedure and would return to Senate before the end of the calendar year with a full set of proposals

Considered in Discussion: (1) That the discussions had clearly been extensive with many areas considered. The need for ongoing restrictions to keep all students safe in the most serious of cases was discussed and it was noted that there was already significant support available for students. It was further noted that the Casework Team already work very closely with Faculty Senior Tutor's to ensure that support is in place but that there was a need to ensure parity across all Faculties in terms of support for students.

(2) That the Imperial College Union would continue the work in collaboration with the College through the Working Group.

(3) That in terms of Report and support, it would be useful to be able to measure its effectiveness. It was noted that many reports were anonymous and so could not be taken through to the Discipline Procedure. Data about misconduct for last few years may not be reliable and had been skewed by Covid breaches so it was difficult to get a stable number.

(4) That in respect of the Student Code of Conduct, there was a question whether it should include a specific point that students should remain responsible for their behaviour when under the influence of drink or drugs as this was often provided as a defence for poor behaviour. There was also a suggestion that the Code as presented was quite long and whether it could be condensed.

(5) That members welcomed the recommendation about additional resources to support casework.

(6) That Senate members endorsed the work of the Group so far and the further work that had been identified.

2646 Teaching Excellence Framework: Update on approach

Received: A paper from the Director of Strategic Planning (**Paper Senate/2021/24**)

Reported: (1) That the paper outlined the proposed approach for the College to prepare for the next TEF submission in January 2023. Strategic Planning was working with the education teams in Faculties to prepare for the submission. It was noted that there was a change of approach based on initial hypotheses and that the College could use the submission to argue upwards as the TEF would be a holistic exercise looking at the metrics and the submission. The metrics would be based on a 3 year rolling average and include the NSS results – this years results will have helped (despite assessment and feedback). It was considered that the College would be in a similar place between the previous silver and gold and so the submission would need to be strong. It was noted that the sector was still waiting for the consultation response on what the outcomes would be.

(2) That a further difference was that students can make a student submission and that consultation has to be with the student body and not just the student union. Agreement from Emma on what Malcolm has said – still a challenge despite good NSS results and we need to get the narrative right when we get the subject data. Need to show an evaluative approach to making improvements.

(3) That the Imperial College Union has been in discussion with the College about the TEF and will hand over to the next Officer Trustees. New Daniel will set up a writing group to inform their approach to the submission and identify evidence to be used. Would be good to reflect together on the metrics to ensure a common understanding of the evidence base. Helpful to all be in the room together to discuss the TEF.

Considered in discussion:

2647 Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee

Received: A report from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (**Paper Senate 2021/25 and Paper Senate 2021/26**)

Reported: (1) That at the March meeting, QAEC considered an amendment to the regulations for PGT programmes to allow an additional 2.5 ECTS above the standard 90 credits for a programme. Senate approved this amendment.

(2) That QAEC had also approved the Religious Observance Procedure and Policy following minor updates and a final review from the Director of Student Services.

(3) That QAEC had approved updates to the Unsatisfactory Engagement Policy and Procedure which set out that a student should be permitted to continue with their programme during a period of appeal to ensure that they were not disadvantaged during the appeal process and did not experience any visa issues.

(4) That QAEC had considered the Undergraduate and the Postgraduate Taught programmes External Examiner reports which both confirmed overall confidence in the academic quality and standards of the College's assessment processes.

(5) That QAEC had reviewed the undergraduate annual monitoring report and noted the following cross-College themes:

- Space constraints and timetabling
- Progression and degree outcomes
- Assessment and feedback
- Student support
- Staffing

2648 Appointment of External Examiners

Received and noted: (Paper Senate/2021/27: the names and affiliations of External Examiners for undergraduate and Master's degrees appointed since the last Senate meeting.

2649 Sector Updates

Received and noted: (**Paper Senate/2021/28**):

2650 Date of Next Meetings

Wednesday 14 December 2022

Wednesday 1 March 2023

Wednesday 10 May 2023

Wednesday 28 June 2023

All meetings start at 15.00hrs