

**UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK**  
**BOARD OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS**  
**OPEN/RESTRICTED MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 12.00-2.00PM, TUESDAY 25 MAY 2021**  
**VIA MS TEAMS**

<b>Present</b>	Penny Roberts	PR	Chair and Vice-Provost
	Katherine Astbury	KA	School of Modern Languages and Cultures
	Jennifer Burns	JB	School of Modern Languages and Cultures
	Rebecca Earle	RE	Department of History
	Hakan Ferhatosmanoglu	FH	Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine Representative
	Stuart Hampton-Reeves	SHR	School of Creative Arts, Performance and Visual Cultures
	Sarah Hodges	SH	Department of History (left at 1.00pm)
	Christoph Hoerl	CH	Department of Philosophy/Faculty of Social Sciences Representative
	David Lambert	DL	Department of History
	Emma Mason	EM	Department of English and Comparative Literary Studies
	Rachel Moseley	RM	Department of Film and Television Studies
	Zahra Newby	ZN	Department of Classics and Ancient History
	Stephanie Panichelli-Batalla	SPB	School for Cross-faculty Studies
	Lorenzo Pericolo	LP	School of Creative Arts, Performance and Visual Cultures
	Sidney Pycroft	SP	Undergraduate Student Representative
	Sarah Richardson	SR	Chair of the Faculty Education Committee
	Gavin Schwartz-Leeper	GSL	School for Cross-faculty Studies
	Michael Scott	MS	Department of Classics and Ancient History
	Helen Wheatley	HW	Deputy Chair
	Tim White	TW	Deputy Chair of the Faculty Education Committee
	Tom Whittaker	TWh	School of Modern Languages and Cultures
<b>Attending</b>	Rachel Dickinson	RD	Faculty Senior Tutor
	Ana Fernandez Martinez	AFM	Reward and Academic Processes Advisor (item 046 only)
	Alison Greenhalgh	AG	Faculty Secretary
	Lee Martin	LM	Faculty Green Action Team (item 044 only)
	Catherine Mcstay	CM	Compliance and Assurance Programme Manager (item 046 only)
	Kulbir Shergill	KS	Director of Social Inclusion (item 046 only)
	Diana Stonefield	DS	Faculty Director of Administration
	Nathaniel Tkacz	NT	Director of the Centre for Digital Inquiry (item 045 only)
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Item</b>		
	<b>Change to agenda</b>		
	The Chair informed members of a change to the order of the agenda in that item 045 Centre for Digital Inquiry would now follow after item 039, the Termly Faculty Assembly.		
033	<b>Apologies for absence</b>		
	Apologies were received from Pierre-Philippe Fraiture (SMLC), Elisabeth Herrman (SMLC), Paul Botley (ECLS).		

034	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> No new declarations were made.
035	<b>Freedom of Information and Equality and Inclusion</b> The Committee noted and agreed to abide by the Freedom of Information and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policies.
036	<b>Minutes of meeting held on 2 February 2021</b> The minutes of the meeting held on 2 February 2021 (036.BFA.250521) were received and approved.
037	<b>Matters arising from meeting held on 2 February 2021</b> The matters arising were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a) Application of Green Levy to Externally Funded Travel (item 021b)</b>  The RIS team were still seeking clarification alongside the ongoing discussion of the International working policy. For the time being it was assumed the charge would still apply to travel on externally funded grants; to be established on a case by case basis whether these costs could be included in the budgets. This could be a problem for some funders particularly Leverhulme who would not appreciate the levy.</li> <li><b>b) Termly Faculty Assembly (item 023)</b>  HW reported there would be no Faculty Assembly this term but planning was going ahead for a Faculty Assembly with a focus on research for the start of next term. This was partly due to workload but also so the Faculty would be able to invite the new PVC for Research, Caroline Meyer, together with the rest of the Research Executive.</li> <li><b>c) Arts Education Committee Terms of Reference (item 027a)</b>  The Senate had approved the removal of clause (h) from FEC ToRs: <i>To consider and approve, on behalf of the Board, changes to undergraduate modules in the Faculty, pending the availability of Phase 2 of the SITS workflow.</i></li> <li><b>d) Arts Faculty Research and Impact Committee (item 027b)</b>  HW reported that David Coates had been appointed as Curator of the Faculty of Arts. He had already begun work on planning how to enliven the new Faculty of Arts Building in a culture sense.</li> </ul>
037a	<b>Approval for extension to Chairship</b> The Chair of the Faculty Board was due for renewal after a three-year term. The Chair left the meeting while the Deputy Chair asked members to consider the approval of the Chair's continuance for another year. <b>DECISION:</b> Board members approved the Chair continuing as Chair of the Faculty Board for another year.
<b>Chair's Update</b>	
038	<b>Chair's Business and Actions</b> The committee received a verbal update from the Chair and key points were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair offered congratulations to the two students from ECLS and History who were part of the Warwick team who won University Challenge.</li> <li>• Congratulations were offered to those staff from the Faculty who had been promoted; all who had applied were successful.</li> <li>• HW would be stepping down as Deputy Chair of Faculty; with enormous thanks to HW for all her hard work on the Faculty's behalf, particularly in supporting research and impact in the Faculty. Jeremy Ahearne from SMLC would be taking over as Deputy Chair and also the research and impact brief. HW would continue to uphold her role in relation to City of Culture.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robert O'Toole was the new Director of Student Experience and Progression (DSEP) for Digital Arts and Humanities.</li> <li>Fiona O'Brien was the new Alumni Engagement Executive connected to the Faculty.</li> <li>The Chair thanked those who had returned the Athena Swan departmental reports with added congratulations to CFS who had submitted their Athena Swan application. It had been a difficult year to move forward with regards to Athena Swan. The Faculty needed to engage more fully as the institutional Athena Swan group would require regular annual progress reports from departments.</li> </ul>
039	<p><b>Termly Faculty Assembly</b></p> <p>The committee received a verbal update from SR and key points were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Termly Faculty Assembly had taken place on 4 March 2021, with the theme of education.</li> <li>The Assembly had been very successful - 17 members from the Education Executive team attended and 40-50 members from Faculty departments.</li> <li>It had been very pleasing to be able to showcase the innovative modules from a variety of different departments. It was particularly illuminating for members of Ed Exec who at that point had no one from Arts among their numbers, and had helped to raise the Faculty's profile and demonstrate how teaching, learning and assessment was carried out in the Faculty.</li> <li>The break outs groups proved very useful, giving the opportunity to have some frank discussions about a range of issues that affected Arts.</li> <li>Thanks to everyone who attended, depts who put forward examples, the people who chaired, and BS who helped with the delivery of the Assembly.</li> </ul>
040	<p><b>Faculty of Arts Building Update</b></p> <p>The Committee received a verbal update from DS and key points were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DS provided a link to a summer internship opportunity for two students to work with DSEPs on a project about the student experience in coming into the new building, in order to help students navigate the building and consider the wider student experience.</li> <li>The building was progressing well. The front area and cladding would soon be completed and work was going ahead to fit out the building.</li> <li>Completion and hand over date was still expected to be 11 August 2021. Specialist film and theatre spaces would not be completed until mid October.</li> <li>It was hoped that furniture would go in 2-11 August. A part-time project officer, Maxine Haddleston, had been appointed to support and work on the move from 1<sup>st</sup> April.</li> <li>Tours of the building were going ahead Friday mornings but places were limited.</li> </ul>
041	<p><b>HoDs' Forum Update</b></p> <p>The Committee received a verbal update from the Chair and key points were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HoDs were still meeting on a weekly basis as per the first lockdown. There had been a brief period of meeting fortnightly but there was still so much to do and keep on top of.</li> <li>HoDs were working very hard with HW, SR and DS to keep things moving on every front with the Forum being an essential part in bringing together all the activities taking place.</li> </ul>
<b>Faculty Business</b>	
042	<p><b>Student Representatives Updates</b></p> <p>The committee received a verbal update from the student representatives with key points and discussion as follows:</p> <p><b>a) UG Representative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SP reported that plans for next year had resulted in a fair amount of shock, surprise and criticism from students. This included the continuation of online exams particularly in respect to proctoring, privacy or accessibility, and the continuation of a blended approach.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RM reported that regarding online exams, the Senate had agreed to a wording of 'preferred' not 'compulsory.' It had also been agreed that the Senate would return to this after having gone through a cycle to look again at what the issues were. RM was confident that colleagues would raise at the next meeting of the Senate due to take place shortly.</li> </ul> <p>Further comments and discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KA: Asked what students were unhappy about when it came to blended learning, considering the University needed to keep some form of social distancing to ensure all students and staff were safe.</li> <li>• SP: Students were expecting things to be back to normal come the new academic year and there would be a lot of complaints if students were able to do things in the wider world but not at the University. Students were also not looking forward to starting the new academic year in a state of distress and flux thinking they were going to experience another year similar to the last. Students wanted a full return to normal in universities especially if the rest of society had returned to some form of normality.</li> <li>• KA: The University had chosen the 1.5m classroom distances because it was not expecting things to return to normal. As a result, all teaching plans were based on the expectation that there would be limits on classroom sizes.</li> <li>• PR: There was a great deal of caution at the moment and until government guidance became clear on this there would not be a shift in the University's approach.</li> <li>• TM: A model based on restricted capacity meant that spaces were available to accommodate everybody. It was a lot easier to go from a situation of 50% capacity to 100% then to do it the other way round.</li> <li>• SHR: Acknowledged the frustrations of facing another year of disrupted education but did not think things would be back to normal in term 1. Many 18-21 year olds would not be fully vaccinated until the winter. Students would like to see a clearer road map from the University and a commitment to a return to normal and conditions that would allow that.</li> <li>• SR: It was felt that the University had not communicated a clear roadmap which would be very useful but students were also concerned that by the time they got to term 2 there would not be time to change things and it would result in blended all year.</li> <li>• PR: Did not think the University was being deliberately not open but that communication and consultation needed to be improved. The Faculty was very sympathetic with the student position on this and would be feeding back student feeling around this and student comms.</li> </ul> <p><b>b) PG Representative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no report as no PG representative had been appointed.</li> </ul>
043	<p><b>Reports from Committees</b></p> <p><b>a) Arts Education Committee</b></p> <p>The Committee received the unconfirmed minutes of the meeting held on 5 May 2021 (043.BFA.250521) and a verbal update from its Chair with key points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Student Learning and Engagement Committee (SLEEC) were looking at adding an inclusion question into the module evaluation. Cathy Hampton, the Faculty's representative on SLEEC, was collecting views on this via a Padlet so would be very helpful if people could add any thoughts on this to the Padlet.</li> <li>• The Arts Faculty had been phenomenally successful in the URSS scheme with 76 successful projects compared with around 25 from the previous two years. This was due to a growth in applications which had all been successful.</li> <li>• A request to circulate to department colleagues that there was enhanced academic technology support available to the Faculty. The academic technology support had been generally underused and could be taken away if not being used.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Inclusive Education Strategy was going to the Senate's next meeting with an action plan; thanks to everyone for departmental feedback.</li> <li>• Important policy changes were going through the next Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC): Right to Remedy Failure would have a number of implications for exam boards and exam board processes; the Rules for Award paper clarified all the disparate bits of policy and regulation and put them in one place for the first ever time; the Committee fed back quite a few points to Christopher Bisping's paper on Academic Integrity; there was also a policy paper going through on online proctoring for which the basic assumption was that online proctoring would not be approved unless there was no alternative.</li> <li>• The Committee discussed a request from Ed Exec of what they might want to keep from the experience of blended learning going forward. A lot of input from both the Faculty Online Teaching Groups and AEC had been received. Any further feedback would be welcome and a report would be going to ED Exec by the end of June.</li> </ul> <p><b>b) Arts Faculty Research and Impact Committee</b> The Committee received the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2021 (043a.BFA.250521) and a verbal update from its Chair with key points as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There had been a reinstatement of various internal funds to support research for the next academic year, including the Research Development Fund (RDF) and Humanities Research Fund (HRF).</li> <li>• In relation to research funding, there was a push towards colleagues thinking about Horizons Europe schemes. James Green from Research and Impact Service (RIS) was happy to support colleagues across the Faculty make those big Horizon bids.</li> <li>• The policy on Leverhulme Fellowships for 2021/22 would be clarified in the next few weeks. Last year the caps on the Leverhulme Fellowship were said to be in place for two years but James Green thought there could be some reconsideration of that for the next academic year.</li> <li>• In relation to impact, the Arts impact team had been doing an audit of the Faculty's REF impact case studies, looking at the types of evidence gathered, the partners we were working with, and the kind of funding that supported the impact case studies. They would be reporting at the forthcoming AFRIC meeting in week 9. This was part of a bigger piece of work planning for impact pipeline looking at how we supported colleagues to continue to do impactful research for the next REF: the relationship between impact and public engagement and how these were recognised in the workload planning; how impact and workload engagement was factored into workload models and how they might be considered in relation to promotion cases; and how people might be supported in making promotion cases on the basis of their impact and public engagement work.</li> <li>• The Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) were about to launch an Impact Acceleration Account (IAA) to bring us in line with the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and other research funders which meant that the Faculty needed to build a business case for having a AHRC IAA here at the University.</li> </ul> <p><b>c) Arts Equality and Inclusion Forum</b> The Committee received a report (043b.BFA.250521) from the Chair of the Equality and Inclusion Forum who was unable to attend the meeting.</p>
044	<p><b>Faculty Green Action Team</b></p> <p>The committee received a verbal report from Lee Martin with key points and discussion as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There would be a lot of activity happening over the summer and into the autumn as the University had agreed that there was a climate emergency going on.</li> <li>• Set targets included to net zero carbon emissions on campus by 2030 in terms of buildings and energy use, and to be net zero in all activities by 2050.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The university was identifying green champions in every department who would be responding to the 2050 target.</li> <li>• The 2050 target would include all activities: staff travel to and from work, international conference travel, and international students coming to the University becoming carbon neutral, either by offsetting the carbon or by finding different ways to teach International students.</li> <li>• This was a huge commitment that would require behavioural change from staff and students across the University over the next 20 years. A Green Champion network of staff and students would begin a process of educating about the targets and capability building before bringing that behavioural change.</li> <li>• Capability building would be done in workshops by getting staff in the Faculty to work on the problem together and come up with ideas that could feedback into the University and be implemented within strategic planning. Sustainability needed to be embedded into our curriculum across the Faculty over the next decade.</li> </ul> <p>Further comment and discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RE: Asked how our relationship with Monash would sit in particular to this and how the green champions would work as certain people would be necessary to have disciplinary expertise in order to think about the areas that were going to be challenging. Concerned that departmental green champions would be responsible for designing the solutions to these challenges when the expertise lay outside of departmental disciplines.</li> <li>• LM: Currently identifying all the problems that these targets were going to generate so the workshops would initially run for green champions to build their capabilities in terms of working with departments. In terms of the solution within departments, solutions would come from the people that work there. The green champions would effectively be mentors or aids to bring out those solutions. If a department had a problem that required expertise then that expertise would be brought in. Not sure how the relationship with Monash would play out, imagine more reliance on internet technologies but too early to say.</li> <li>• TW: With these particular targets, what mechanism do we have in place to measure and audit any progress? Were there points at which we would determine the extent to which we were coming closer to or exceeding those things that had been set out?</li> <li>• LM: The University's Green Team would do that; over next 12 months departments would be setting KPIs for their response to these targets. How it would be monitored was open to us. The Faculty had a target and we had to return a response to that target and that would happen on a departmental level. There was an expectation that depts would set their own KPIs and report back on them to the University.</li> <li>• EM: There was not the capacity in departments to take something on that was this important. Good to have individual input from departments on what they would need but ultimately the decision the University would need to make would be the same for all of us. Important to have a centralised team working on this and central policy and guidance from people that were experts in this field that could come in and help in the way that they would in any other business.</li> <li>• LM: Most of my research has been about these kind of blocks to behavioural change in sustainability context. That was why the workshops were important because there could not be an effective top down strategy or central strategy without awareness of the problems that people in departments were facing. Not a huge commitment or lot of time from people would be required but to just be aware of the blocks to change that exist in every department and the nuances that exist that are vital for these strategies.</li> </ul>
045	<p><b>Centre for Digital Inquiry (moved to after item 039)</b></p> <p>The committee received a verbal report from Nathaniel Tkacz, Director of the Centre for Digital Inquiry (CDI) with key points as follows:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Centre was launched in June 2020 as a home for digital humanities research at Warwick but also a space for other kinds of ‘digital-focused’ research, communicated as “thinking with and through the digital” and using digital tools for research but also engaging with digital topics.</li> <li>• The past year had been spent setting things up by putting together an advisory board and building a member base through engagement.</li> <li>• Activities included building a public face (website/design) and social media presence, categorising images and running a number of events.</li> <li>• Active in applying for research grants – awarded £60, 000 from UKRI Covid rapid response for Project: CoVID-19 App Store and Data Flow Ecologies - would like to support others applying for research grants under the banner of CDI.</li> <li>• Aim was to create a “community infrastructure” and build a funding related research network, to build digital research capacity at Warwick through training, events, support research and consultation on funding bids. Hope to have support resource available including people to answer questions, deliver training and workshops, have drop in sessions and provide a space for interested people to come and ask those questions they are unsure of.</li> </ul>
<b>University Business</b>	
046	<p><b>Race Equality Charter</b></p> <p>The Committee received report (046.BFA.250521) and a verbal update from Catherine McStay (Compliance and Assurance Programme Manager) and Kulbir Shergill (Director of Social Inclusion) with key points and discussion as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report summarised key points arising from an analysis of the Faculty’s data in preparation for Warwick’s application for the Race Equality Charter Mark (RECM).</li> <li>• Analysis had included all aspects of the student and staff life cycles, a survey of 3000 responses and several focus groups.</li> <li>• The aim was to speak individually to Heads of Department about the survey data and how it fitted into the inclusive education model, the social inclusion strategy and the widening participation strategy.</li> <li>• Three areas to be addressed as a priority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increasing diversity of ethnicity of colleagues in higher grades across all types of staff;</li> <li>- Experience of staff and students in being excluded;</li> <li>- Racially motivated incidents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There had been some positive things come out of the student surveys around how well conversation around diversity were managed in their lectures and class discussions; it stood out how the Faculty’s students felt satisfied with how their courses were run.</li> </ul> <p>Further comments and discussion were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RE: A really important report and incredibly sobering reading, necessary to galvanise change. Student feedback should not obscure the fact that the Faculty was not doing well in many areas. Report highlighted the range of areas in which we needed to be making improvements.</li> <li>• HW: Do other Arts faculties look similar across the sector - was there an opportunity to learn from other Faculty of Arts that were addressing this successfully?</li> <li>• KS: There were a few universities who had made some big leaps so there were things for us to learn from that. Needed to be aware of the context and culture of Warwick compared to other universities. Learning process for a lot of universities how to shape curriculum and have those conversations with students. A lot to learn from other sectors where some of this stuff had been in practice for much longer.</li> <li>• SHR: Recruiting staff with more diverse backgrounds was the key to it all. A more representative staff would unlock a lot of issues in the University and it raised the question of why scholars of colour did not apply to Warwick. Top level commitment would be really valuable in encouraging these applications, with a roadmap of where we were now, where we wanted to be and the steps we needed to take to get there.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GSL: Real buy in and pressure was needed from University leadership and recognition that we might need to make strategic investments in particular areas that did not see a gross surplus in terms of departmental budgets.</li> <li>SR: QAA review of subject benchmark statements would include EDI as central. Attended workshop at University of Birmingham looking at EDI issues in each subject at a subject benchmark level and they were keen to role this out to programme level. A helpful tool that did not just look at curriculum but staff attitudes, inclusivity, attainment gaps in order to get us to reflect on what the core values of each subject were and how you could promote EDI.</li> <li>KS: It was heartening to hear response and recognition for need for this kind of work from the Board. Senior leadership teams were very aware of what was coming out of this and what Warwick needed to do to make that change. The data showed there were huge gaps in understanding staff experiences because we did not have that data as we do not record it. There would be recommendations around how we improve, how we monitor things, as well as how we do things.</li> <li>CM: On the staff side there were comments in the surveys and discussion groups re. HR processes and lack of transparency and consistency throughout.</li> <li>KS: Survey came out loud and clear that the PDR and the promotions process was one thing that people were really dissatisfied with and saw as a barrier to promotion. People did not see Warwick as a place of opportunity and progression for them.</li> </ul>
047	<b>Library</b> The Committee received report (047.BFA.250521). Due to lack of time, Yvonne Budden would engage with the Board through circulation.
<b>Other</b>	
048	<b>Any other business</b> There was no other business.
<b><i>Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion</i></b>	
049	<b>First Year Board of Examiners</b> The Committee received (056.AEC.20-21) without comment.
	<b>Senate Committee Minutes and Reports</b> Board of the Faculty of Arts <a href="http://warwick.ac.uk/committees/bfa/minutes">http://warwick.ac.uk/committees/bfa/minutes</a> Faculty Education Committee <a href="https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/bfa/fec/minutes/">https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/bfa/fec/minutes/</a> Board of Graduate Studies <a href="http://warwick.ac.uk/committees/bgs/minutes">http://warwick.ac.uk/committees/bgs/minutes</a> Partnerships Committee <a href="http://warwick.ac.uk/committees/partnerships/minutes">http://warwick.ac.uk/committees/partnerships/minutes</a> Academic Quality and Standards Committee <a href="http://warwick.ac.uk/committees/aqsc/minutes">http://warwick.ac.uk/committees/aqsc/minutes</a> Student Learning Experience and Engagement Committee <a href="https://warwick.ac.uk/committees/sleec/minutes">https://warwick.ac.uk/committees/sleec/minutes</a> University Education Committee <a href="https://warwick.ac.uk/committees/ec/minutes">https://warwick.ac.uk/committees/ec/minutes</a>
<b>Next meeting: 12:00, Tuesday 16 November 2021</b>	

<b>DECISIONS AND ACTIONS</b>			
<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DECISION/ACTION</b>	<b>LEAD AND DUE DATE</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
<b>[2020-21]</b>			
007 Chair's Business and Actions	<b>ACTION:</b> HW to provide clarification around the University's travel policy on claiming the surcharge for air travel for research expenses when externally funded.	HW, Feb Board meeting	Completed



037a Approval for extension to Chairship	<b>DECISION:</b> Board members approved the Chair continuing as Chair of the Faculty Board for another year.	HW, May Board meeting	Completed
--	--	-----------------------	-----------