



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE
Raeburn Room, Old College
21 January 2020, 10 am

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----------|---|---------------|
| 1 | Minute
To <u>approve</u> the Minute of the previous meeting held on 17 December 2019. | A1 |
| 2 | Matters Arising & Action Log
To <u>raise</u> any matters arising. | A2 |
| 3 | Principal's Communications
To <u>receive</u> an update from the Principal. | Verbal |

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- | | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| 4 | Supporting Black and Minority Ethnic Students and Staff
To <u>consider</u> and <u>approve</u> the paper from Gavin Douglas, Deputy Secretary Student Experience. | B |
| 5 | Confronting Slavery and Colonisation
To <u>consider</u> and <u>approve</u> the paper from James Smith, Vice-Principal International. | C |
| 6 | The Case for the Creation of a Doctoral College
To <u>consider</u> and <u>approve</u> the paper from Antony Maciocia, Dean of Postgraduate Research, College of Science and Engineering. | D |
| 7 | China Merchants Group Update
To <u>consider</u> and <u>approve</u> the paper to follow. | E |
| 8 | Edinburgh BioQuarter
To <u>consider</u> and <u>approve</u> the paper from Ashley Shannon, Director of Operations, Corporate Services. | F |
| 9 | Director of Finance's Report
To <u>consider</u> the paper from Lee Hamill, Director of Finance. | G |
| 10 | People
To <u>consider</u> and <u>approve</u> the following papers from James Saville, Director of Human Resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• People Report• Updated Reward Policies• Updated Discipline and Grievance Policies• Support for non-EEA staff – Indefinite leave to remain fees | H1
H2
H3
H4 |

ITEMS FOR NOTING OR FORMAL APPROVAL

- | | | |
|-----------|---|---------------|
| 11 | Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers
To <u>approve</u> . | I |
| 12 | Service Excellence Programme Update
To <u>note</u> . | J |
| 13 | Planning Round Update
To <u>note</u> . | K |
| 14 | Closure of Agreed Management Actions from Internal Audit Reviews
To <u>note</u> . | L |
| 15 | Health and Safety Quarterly Report: 1 Sept 2019 – 30 November 2019
To <u>note</u> . | M |
| 16 | Staff Experience Committee Report
To <u>note</u> . | N |
| 17 | University Executive Communications
To <u>note</u> the key messages to be communicated. | Verbal |
| 18 | Any Other Business
To <u>consider</u> any other matters by UE members. | Verbal |
| 19 | Date of Next Meeting and 2020/21 Meeting Dates
Tuesday 25 February 2020 at 10am in the Raeburn Room.

To <u>approve</u> 2020/21 meeting dates, on Tuesday at 10.00am: | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 18 August 2020• 8 September 2020• 6 October 2020• 10 November 2020• 15 December 2020• 19 January 2021• 23 February 2021• 23 March 2021• 20 April 2021• 18 May 2021• 22 June 2021• 20 July 2021 | |



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

17 December 2019

[Draft] Minute

- Present:** Sarah Smith (Convener)
David Argyle, Leigh Chalmers, Chris Cox, Sarah Cunningham-Burley, Gavin Douglas, Hugh Edmiston, David Gray, Lee Hamill, Colm Harmon, Gary Jebb, Richard Kenway, Wendy Loretto, Gavin McLachlan, Dorothy Miell, Theresa Merrick, James Saville, Jonathan Seckl, Tracey Slaven, James Smith, Andrew Wilson and Moira Whyte.
- In attendance:** Ashley Shannon (for Hugh Edmiston), Hannah Jones (for Paper B3), Fiona Boyd and Kirstie Graham.
- Apologies:** Hugh Edmiston, Peter Mathieson, Andrew Morris, Sandy Tudhope and Dave Robertson.

1 Minute Paper A1

The Minute of the meeting held on 19 November 2019 was approved as a correct record.

2 Matters Arising & Review of Action Log Paper A2

There were no matters arising and the action log was noted.

3 Principal's Communications Verbal

The University Secretary reported:

- The outcome of the recent election and the timescale for Brexit, with continuing uncertainty over the implications for the sector as a whole and potentially additional complexity for Scottish institutions;
- The recent industrial action and the ongoing issues around pensions, noting the Joint Expert Panel on the University Superannuation Scheme had recently issued its phase 2 report;
- The current visit from representatives Shanghai Jiao Tong University, to consolidate work on the Low Carbon College and explore scope for future collaborations.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4 Student Experience

• Annual and Periodic Quality Reviews – Areas for Development Paper B1

The Executive considered a summary of items emerging from annual quality assurance reviews, noting that the issue identified were in line with areas where

there was already work to take these forward. The issues around space and timetabling were being considered by Space Strategy Group; assessment and feedback issues would be considered by the Senate Education Committee; in relation to the student voice, the Executive had asked for a full review of the course evaluation questionnaire system, to return to a future meeting; affordability and finance issues would be considered further by the Executive's Standing Committee on Student Experience.

The Executive was content that there were ongoing actions addressing the issues raised and noted the paper was useful in ensuring an overview of the different workstreams engaged on the student experience.

- **Annual December Examination Venue Requirements from 2020** **Paper B2**

The Executive had previously agreed that core academic activity should take preference over commercial activity in terms of room allocations. Members were updated on the ongoing challenge of delivering suitable space to accommodate University examinations in December. There was discussion of the underlying issue of the volume of assessment taking place in December and it was agreed this was a longer term issue to be addressed as part of curriculum review. In the meantime, it was noted that Space Strategy Group had reviewed the options for exam space for the December exam period from 2020 to 2023, with the assumption that Adam House would then be available as a single exam venue for 500+ seats. It was noted that the Edinburgh International Conference Centre (EICC) provided a single, accessible location that the student officers consulted found preferable to using a range of different University buildings that may be less accessible and potentially impact on other student activities. Accordingly, the Executive approved continued use of EICC for the December exam diet, and asked that this decision was clearly communicated as being based on the student experience and not financial or commercial considerations.

- **English Language Education** **Paper B3**

The Executive considered English language provision offered by ELE (English Language Education), a subject area within the Centre for Open Learning (COL) and discussed how to address risks to the consistency and parity of the student experience. Points for discussion included commercial opportunities to offset costs and the impact of space and timetabling on these; a focus on English language at the pre-entry and entry stage to move from a remedial approach; and the need to consider this in the context of recent discussions around size and shape.

There was agreement that there was a need to address the quality and consistency of English language provision and to reconsider commercial opportunities, to be developed into fully costed options to take forward through the planning round.

5 Implementation of the University Brand (What makes us Edinburgh) **Paper C**

The Executive considered an update on work undertaken to develop the University brand with a view to providing a stronger foundation to all our communications, marketing and stakeholder relations. The paper outlined a corporate and a devolved approach. As part of the corporate approach, a short life Brand Governance Group

(BGG) had been established to address the lack of consistency of approach and drive responsible use of the brand.

In discussion it was noted that Strategy 2030 was people and value focused but research indicated this was not reflected in perceptions of the brand; there needed to be a balance between the corporate and the grassroots in changing perceptions; the reputational risk of poor brand management; and the need to work collaboratively with partners whilst maintaining our brand. Future steps would be to look at the value of the brand and undertake a brand tracking exercise. The Executive gave endorsement and support to the proposed approach set out in the paper.

6 Edinburgh BioQuarter Update

Paper D

The Executive noted the update on formalising arrangements amongst the University, Scottish Enterprise, the City of Edinburgh Council and NHS Lothian. This covered: development of the Strategic Business Case; design of an OJEU compliant procurement process; principles of governance arrangements; and progress with infrastructure consultancy. The need to integrate equality and diversity considerations and the student experience into this work was noted. This would return to the Executive in the new year with more developed proposals for consideration and if appropriate recommendation through to Court.

7 Director of Finance's Report

Paper E

The Executive noted the University management accounts position up to the end of October (period three). The update on the USS 2019 Interim Valuation was noted alongside the recent publication of the Joint Expert Panel Phase 2 report and the ongoing challenging picture. Progress towards divesting from all fossil fuels by 31 December 2020 was noted and welcomed.

8 EDMARC Report

Paper H

The Executive considered the Equality, Diversity Monitoring and Research Committee (EDMARC) reports on staff and student data for 2018/19, which looks at the demographics by protected equality characteristics for undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research postgraduate students and for academic and professional services staff. Members welcomed the opportunity to discuss this report, noted the University's diversity and drew attention to: differential attainment for Black and Minority Ethnic students; gender issues in terms of career progression; support for older students; and disability support. These were identified as important areas worthy of further discussion and it was noted that at the next Executive meeting it was planned to consider some of these areas in more depth.

ITEMS FOR FORMAL APPROVAL

9 Information Security Guidance for Business Travel to High Risk Countries

Paper F

The Executive noted the information security risk of travel to high risk countries and discussion focussed on how best to operationalise the guidance to maximise

compliance. It was noted that it was intended to provide a bank of clean laptops available for staff to borrow in the new year. It was agreed that the guidance should be incorporated into a broader communication of the support available for implementation, when this was available.

10 Gaelic Language Plan

Paper G

The Executive noted that elements of the plan required additional funding that had not been secured. The Executive was content to approve the new Gaelic Language Plan, subject to revising it to remove the need for resource where this was not available.

11 The Armed Forces Covenant

Paper I

The Executive approved the planned work to identify the required actions across the University to assist veterans and service families, with a view to the Principal signing the Armed Forces Covenant.

12 Postgraduate Research Student Fees and Edinburgh PhD Scholarships

Paper J

The Executive approved the principles for the assigning and charging of fees for doctoral degrees and a rationalisation of University funded PhD scholarships and noted there would be further work required to take this forward through the planning round.

13 University Collections Facility Rainwater Ingress - Report

Paper K

The Executive noted the damage to University Collections caused by rainwater ingress over the period 8 to 9 August 2019 and the response in line with the Library & University Collections Disaster Response and Recovery plan, with thanks to the work of internal staff and local support from the National Museum of Scotland.

ITEMS FOR NOTING

14 Information Security Essentials & Data Protection User Awareness Training Course – Completion Rates

Paper L

The Executive noted members' completion of the Information Security Essentials and Data Protection User Awareness training courses. It was noted not all members had completed both courses and members were reminded there had been agreement at a previous meeting to do so, in order to lead by example alongside encouraging their teams to complete the training.

15 People Report

Paper M

The update on people related matters being taken forward by Human Resources and other University departments was noted.

16 Network Replacement – Information Security Control Improvements Paper N

The update on changes and enhancements to information security controls that will be introduced as part of the Network Replacement Project was noted.

17 University Executive Communications

The Executive agreed to communicate the following: Areas for Development from Quality Reviews; English Language Education; implementation of the University Brand; the Armed Forces Covenant; and the People Report.

18 Any Other Business

There was a brief update on the Gujarat Biotechnology initiative, with a paper to come to a future meeting.

There was an update on Health and Safety, in particular: reporting of near misses; local health and safety committees; and compliance with protective equipment. The Executive noted the shared responsibility for health and safety, including within individual buildings, with further work to be done in this area.

19 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 21 January 2020 at 10am in the Raeburn Room.

There will be a Strategic Away Day on Friday 31 January in St Trinneans Room, St Leonards Hall.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Supporting Black and Minority Ethnic Students and Staff

Description of paper

1. This paper summarises the findings from a number of reviews carried out in 2019, both internal and external, that raise questions about the experience of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) students and staff at the University and in the wider HE sector. The paper recommends the University commits to a programme of work to improve the experience of BME staff and students.¹

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The Executive is invited to discuss and approve the proposed approach to taking forward a programme of work on the BME student and staff experience.

Background and context

3. In the last year and a half, as part of its work on promoting equality, diversity, and inclusivity within the University, work has been taken forward by Senate committees on:

- Diversifying the Curriculum and
- Reviewing and understanding the experience of our Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) students at the University.

4. Both pieces of work identified a range of challenges faced by our BME students and made a number of recommendations for change.

5. These two internal reports were joined in 2019 by
- A joint report by Universities UK (UUK) and the National Union of Students (NUS) into the attainment gap between Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students and other students in the sector
 - A major review by the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) into how Universities handle racial harassment

6. Collectively these reports and reviews suggest an urgent need for action on the part of the University of Edinburgh and indeed the rest of the sector.

Discussion

7. A summary of the two reports follows:

- Diversifying the Curriculum at UoE*
In 2018/19 Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) established a task group to explore “Using the Curriculum to Promote Inclusion, Equality and Diversity.” The task group consulted with students and staff from

¹ The term black and minority ethnic (BME) is generally used throughout, though some reports prefer the term Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME). Regardless of terminology, it is specifically noted while BME / BAME students are often referred to as a group, this masks the varied and specific experiences of ethnic, nationality, colour, linguistic, cultural and religious/belief diversity.

across the University and noted a consensus on the importance of finding ways to have ongoing, open conversations about what a diverse and inclusive curriculum would look like and how this may mean different things in each College, School, and subject area. The Committee approved the [final report and recommendations](#), including a set of Principles and implementation plan to be taken forward during the 2019-20 academic session. Senate Education Committee (the successor to LTC) will oversee the implementation of the recommendations.

ii. *Review of BME Students' Experiences at UoE*

Senate Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) focused the 2018-19 Thematic Review of Student Support on black and minority ethnic (BME) students' experiences of support at the University. Led by Professor Rowena Arshad (CBE), the thematic review panel held consultation sessions with BME students and key staff stakeholders from across the University, providing an opportunity to discuss with black and minority ethnic students as well as staff how ethnicity, colour, religious, cultural and linguistic issues matter within a university environment. Key findings and recommendations were that:

8. Following are a number of findings and recommendations for review:

Finding

- A gap exists between the awareness and racial literacy of University staff and the lived experiences of both UK-domiciled and international black and minority ethnic (BME) students.

Recommendations that:

- the Principal leads a conversation on 'race' in higher education and the implications for the University of Edinburgh
- University Leadership recognise the need to improve knowledge and upskill in the area of developing racial literacy
- the University provides each Head of College, School, and Professional Service area with a copy of 'Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People About Race'.

Finding:

- The impact of attending an institution where BME people are in the minority can contribute to a sense of academic and social isolation.

Recommendations that:

- the University commit to increase the percentage of BME staff, both academic and professional services, with immediate priority in the professional services areas
- the University recruit a new BME Outreach Officer to work with BME communities
- the University is encouraged to use positive action to diversify staffing.

Finding:

- BME students experience barriers accessing support services at the University.

Recommendations that:

- the Service Excellence Programme ensures that a systematic staff training programme is an integral part of the final recommendations of the current Personal Tutor and Student Support Team Review
- the Student Counselling Service use positive action to diversify its staffing.

Finding:

- There is an attainment or awarding gap between white and BME students at the University. BME students experience barriers related to both representation and cultural diversity within the curriculum and learning environments they encounter. Staff with a remit to improve BME inclusion and attainment also experience institutional barriers to achieving better outcomes.

Recommendations that:

- the University address the attainment/awarding gap that exists between BME and white students
- the proposed Curriculum Review enables BME students to be involved in diversifying content, including the co-design of curricula and assessments
- Senate Quality Assurance Committee implement systematic monitoring of retention, progression and degree outcome data for BME students and, if appropriate, recommend interventions where there are clear and consistent patterns of divergence between BME students and white students.

9. The Committee approved the final [report](#) and will monitor the implementation of the recommendations.

10. A summary of two external reports follows:

i. *The BME Attainment Gap*

In May 2019, UUK and NUS produced “Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Student Attainment at UK Universities: #Closingthegap.” This report concluded that

- “Of the disparities that exist within higher education, the gap between the likelihood of White students and students from Black, Asian or minority ethnic (BAME) backgrounds getting a first- or upper-second-class degree is among the most stark – 13% among 2017–18 graduates. “

It called for the sector to “partner meaningfully with students and robustly demonstrate its commitment to addressing the BAME attainment gap” – including by signing up to a nationwide pledge to “close the gap” - and identified a number of steps that institutions need to take in order to do so:

- Provide strong leadership
 - University leaders and senior managers need to demonstrate a commitment to removing the BAME attainment gap and lead by example

- Have conversations about race and changing the culture
 - Universities and students need to create more opportunities to talk directly about race, racism and the attainment gap and to identify what students think is causing it
- Developing racially diverse and inclusive environments
 - University leadership teams are not representative of the student body and some curriculums do not reflect minority groups' experiences. A greater focus is needed from universities, working with their students, on ensuring that BAME students have a good sense of belonging at their university, and on understanding how a poor sense of belonging might be contributing to low levels of engagement and progression to postgraduate study
- Getting the evidence and analysing the data
 - Universities need to take a more scientific approach to tackling the attainment gap, by gathering and scrutinising data in a far more comprehensive way than they may currently be doing
- Understanding what works:
 - Universities can work together to address gaps in the evidence-base by using applied research to ensure that evidence on 'what works' is high quality, and share evidence of what works and what doesn't.

For information, at Edinburgh the University's Equality Diversity Monitoring and Research Committee (in its 2018 [report](#), - a more detailed analysis of which is also on the agenda for this meeting) reports the following BME attainment gap amongst other issues:

"There is little difference between the proportion of white and BME UG students that leave with an exit qualification. (However) there is a divergence of achievement for UK-domiciled BME students where the proportion of students achieving a 1 st or 2.1 honours degree has been lower than white students for each of the last five years (range 2.9%-points to 9.3%-points).

For non-UK BME UG students the diversion of achievement is more pronounced, with the proportion achieving a 1st or 2.1 honours degree being lower than white students in every one of the last five years (range 6.7%-points to 13.6%-points). A lower proportion of BME students achieved a 1st or 2.1 honours degree in 18 out of 20 Schools (range -1.8%-points to -20.3%-points).

Over the five year period for PGT a higher proportion of white UK-domiciled entrants exit with a qualification than do BME entrants (range 2.1%-points to 12.2%-points) whereas for non UK-domiciled entrants the proportion of BME students exiting with a qualification was similar to that of white students (range 2.1%-points to -0.8%-points)."

ii. *EHRC Report into Racial Harassment in Universities*

In October 2019 the Equality and Human Rights Commission's (EHRC) published a report into how Universities across the UK handle racial harassment.

The report ("Tackling racial harassment: Universities challenged") called on Universities to "take greater responsibility to prevent racial harassment before it

happens, to ensure they understand the scale of the issue". It was generally highly critical of Universities' efforts to date:

"We need to support our brightest minds to work collaboratively across disciplines, solve global challenges and find new ways forward, but this innovation and forward thinking has not been used to solve the challenge of racial harassment."

Press coverage repeated this critical view, for example:

- "Universities failing to address thousands of racist incidents" (The Guardian, 23/10/19)
- "Universities ignoring racism, says Equality and Human Rights Commission" (The Times, 23/10/19)
- "Scottish universities unaware of extent of racial abuse, finds report" (The Scotsman, 23/10/19)

More detailed findings

11. On experiences of racial harassment, the EHRC report, found that:

- Racial harassment is a common experience for a wide range of students and staff at universities across England, Scotland and Wales
- Around a quarter of students from an ethnic minority background (24%), and 9% of White students, said they had experienced racial harassment since starting their course. This equates to 13% of all students
 - 20% of students had been physically attacked. 56% of students who had been racially harassed had experienced racist name-calling, insults and jokes. Other common experiences included:
 - subtle and nuanced acts, often known as microaggressions
 - being ignored or excluded from conversations or group activities, and
 - being exposed to racist material or displays
 - In most cases students said their harasser was another student, but a large number said it was their tutor or another academic
- Over half of staff who responded described incidents of being ignored or excluded because of their race. More than a quarter said they experienced racist name-calling, insults and jokes. Much of this harassment took place in office environments, frequently in plain sight of their colleagues.

On Universities' ability to manage such incidents, the report found that:

- University staff often lack the understanding, skills and confidence to manage conversations about race effectively
- Most students and staff do not report racial harassment
- Under-reporting and recording restricts the universities' ability to take action
- Many universities significantly underestimate the prevalence of racial harassment and have misplaced confidence in people's willingness to come forward
- Universities are overconfident in their complaint handling processes

On higher education culture, the report found that

- There needs to be leadership to help embed a culture where racial harassment is not tolerated.

12. The report made a number of recommendations for UK Universities:

- Higher education providers must enable students and staff to report harassment and ensure their complaints procedures are fit for purpose and offer effective redress
- Higher education providers should ensure effective data collection procedures are in place to enable them to develop a baseline in order to evaluate and improve their prevention and response strategies
- Universities UK (UUK), the Information Commissioners Office (ICO) and higher education providers' data protection officers (DPOs) should work together to increase understanding around data sharing to support effective complaints handling and redress
- The regulator, the funding councils and UUK should provide more guidance to support providers to prevent and tackle harassment
- Ensure that initiatives to support mental health in higher education reflect the impact of harassment on people's mental health and wellbeing, and the needs of people with different protected characteristics, to best support a diverse student and staff population
- Higher education leaders and governing bodies demonstrate leadership and accountability for embedding an inclusive culture across their institution.
- Higher education providers use the National Student Survey to improve their understanding around student safety and harassment.

They also made a number of recommendations for government around:

- reinstating third party harassment protections and introduce a mandatory duty on employers to increase protections for staff from harassment
- reviewing regulatory frameworks and court hearing structures within each nation, to determine how best to increase protection from harassment for students
- Strengthening the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) specific duties to enable action on sector-wide inequalities to be tackled more quickly and consistently, drawing on evidence from the EHRC inquiry and 'Is Britain Fairer?' reports.

13. Universities UK (UUK) has set up a task force to support the higher education sector in securing improvements in preventing and responding to all forms of racial harassment experienced by staff and students. This is a continuation of the work initiated by the earlier UUK harassment taskforce and builds on the principles and the strategic framework, developed by the taskforce and set out in UUK's report 'Changing the Culture' (2016). The work of the group will be achieved through developing UK-wide practical guidance to support universities in addressing racial harassment experienced by staff and students. Given that the core principles for addressing racial harassment will be similar for both students and staff the group's remit will include both.

14. Separately, the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) have announced that they have
- Commissioned Advance HE to lead the development of resources that Scottish HEI's can use to "raise awareness of racism and tackle unacceptable behaviours"
 - Started work with other organisations including Universities Scotland to support leadership conversations

- Drafted an MoU between SFC and EHRC to ensure they can “develop a robust evidence base from which we can identify priority areas for action”.

Observations

15. Firstly, we now have very considerable evidence from both internal and external reviews that our BME students face disadvantage at the University because of their race and that this disadvantage impacts on both their experience of University and their learning at University. It is good that the University started working on the topic of BME student experience some time ago, but it is also clear that much more needs to be done if we are to deliver on our goal of an equal, diverse and inclusive environment for all BME students and staff. There is a compelling need for the University to respond to this evidence and these findings.

16. Secondly, there are very strong similarities between the recommendations made across four of the reports summarised above. Common recommendations include:

- The importance of strong institutional leadership
- Having (possibly difficult) conversations about race
- Increasing awareness and racial literacy among staff
- Making better use of data
- Supporting students and staff better if they experience racial harassment; and
- Considering how BME student and staff sense of belonging can be enhanced and supported.

17. Thirdly, we have a lot of recommendations from different sources – probably with more to come from UK and SFC - and a currently fragmented approach across different governance groups as to how we take forward these recommendations.

18. Fourthly, we have made some good progress in recent years in tackling the evil of sexual violence on campus, (and some of the lessons learned and approaches developed in that arena should help inform our approach to addressing racial harassment). To date, like many other HEI's, we have made much less progress in tackling racial harassment on campus and have not taken an institution-wide approach to the issue of race in the same way.

19. Fifthly, while the focus of this paper is inevitably on the experience of BME students, we are equally concerned with the experiences of staff. We should be mindful that ultimately this is about creating an equal, diverse and inclusive environment for all students and staff, and our focus needs also to address the cross-cutting dimensions of disadvantage and discrimination across the characteristic protected under Equality legislation and wider socio-economic disadvantage. While a focus on BME staff and students is imperative, our actions should also support wider structural and cultural change.

Next steps/implications

20. Following are the proposed next steps:

- the University take a holistic approach to responding to the Thematic Review of Student Support on BME student experiences, the work on the attainment gap and the EHRC report

- a taskforce is established by Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley under the Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Committee, to drive forward the recommendations of these reports together with any future recommendations that may be received from UUK etc. This will include “just getting on with it” in areas where quick progress can be made; developing an institution-wide
- conversation on race; and in time allowing the University to obtain the Equality Challenge Unit’s Race Equality Charter. An indicative approach to this programme of work is shown in Appendix A

Resource implications

21. Additional funding (where needed) for this work is expected to be sought through the Student / Staff Experience Action Plans

Equality & Diversity

22. Failure to address the issues raised in the various reviews is not consistent with our equality duties and policies. There is the opportunity to enhance equality of opportunity for BME students and staff and to foster good relations between different groups by addressing the issues raised.

Risk Management

23. Failure to implement and meet student expectations for both learning/teaching and other elements of student experience may lead to reputational damage and affect the University’s ability to attract the highest potential students in the future. Failure to respond to recommendations of internal and high profile external reviews may lead to reputational damage as well.

Consultation

24. Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley; Professor Rowena Arshad

Further information

25. Author & Presenter

Gavin Douglas
Deputy Secretary Student Experience
January 2020

Freedom of Information

26. Open paper.

Please see Appendix A

WARMING UP	GETTING THE CONVERSATION GOING	TAKING CO-ORDINATED ACTIONS	GETTING THE RACE EQUALITY CHARTER MARK
Jan / Feb 2020	Feb / March 2020	March 2020 – June 2021	2020-2021
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise the need to improve knowledge and upskill racial literacy (4.1.3)ⁱ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ UEB / ASG / Court to discuss the findings of the UoE thematic review and the EHRC review into racial harassment at UK HEI's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Principal to co- lead (with a BME leader) a conversation on “race” in HE and implications for UoE (a specific event or a Senate slot) (4.1.4) • Sign up to UUK “Closing the Gap” pledge (4.4.2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leadership ○ Campus conversations ○ A diverse and inclusive environment ○ Data ○ Understand what works • Distribution to Exec and/or Leaders’ Forum of “Why I am no longer talking to white people about race” (4.1.4) • Race equality training for the Executive • Engage with Scottish and national (UUK) task forces developing guidance in response to the EHRC review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmark how other Universities support BME students (including but not limited to mental health support services)(4.1.6 & 4.3.2) • Data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More visibility of EDMARC data (4.1.7) ○ Develop better data on the BME student experience (4.1.7) ○ Develop better data on the BME staff experience • Amend QA processes to ensure that Schools / departments report on BME dimensions of student experience (4.1.7 / 4.4.2) • Recruit a BME Outreach Officer / enhance BME pre-arrival material (4.2.2 / 4.2.3) • Implement positive action in staff recruitment, including in professional services (4.2.2 / 4.3.2) • Bench mark how other institutions have developed positive action regarding staff recruitment and retention • Support campus conversations on race • Consider further actions in light of UUK recommendations in response to EHRC review • Recruit a student intern to help plan for BME History month and help develop a strategic approach to the Equality Calendar 	<p>Set up a group under the EDI Committee to have ownership of this work including ultimately overseeing and delivering the charter mark application (4.1.5)</p>
<p>“Just do it”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce guidance for students on how they can report racial harassment, including micro-aggressions, and what the University will do if a report is received (including what support is available) (4.1.1) • Ensure all conduct investigators have received specific training in investigating allegations of racial harassment or discrimination. • Implement “report and support” software for racial harassment as well as sexual misconduct (4.1.1) • Ensure that trained and professional support is available to those reporting racial harassment (4.1.1) • Ensure that the “sense of belonging” task group (part of the Student Experience Action Plan) focusses on BME sense of belonging amongst others (4.2.1) • This should include ways to recognise and celebrate the contributions of BME staff and students (4.2.1/4.2.4) • Ensure that staff training (on BME issues) is considered as part of the work to introduce new student support structures (4.3.1) • In the curriculum review, ensure that BME students are involved to help diversify curricular content (4.4.1) • Incorporate the questions on “student safety” into our optional NSS question bank from 2020 onwards 			

Governance: Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Committee (Convenor: Professor Sarah Cunningham-Burley) reporting annually to University Executive

ⁱ Numbers refer to the itemised recommendations in Professor Arshad’s report



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Confronting Slavery and Colonisation

Description of paper

1. This paper outlines an approach to a proactive and meaningful engagement with broader concerns about the University's historical relationship to slavery and colonisation. The paper also explores contemporary action to move beyond that historical relationship through a process of reparation, while making a contribution to meeting some of the recommendations of the Thematic Review of 2018-19 of Black and Minority Ethnic Students and to the University's commitment to re-apply for the Race Equality Charter Mark.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The University Executive is asked to consider and approve the actions proposed.

Paragraphs 3-18 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Equality & Diversity

19. Adopting the process set out in the paper can lay the foundation for greatly enhanced equality and diversity practices across the University of Edinburgh, particularly with regards to BME students. The processes themselves can also enhance equality and diversity by providing opportunities for our student community to lead and engage with key aspects of the work.

Paragraph 20 has been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation

21. This paper has been drafted in collaboration and after consultation with a group of academics and students who research, are practically engaged, or are leaders in the study of slavery, race, and reparations. This includes significant contributions from Prof Rowena Arshad, Prof Diana Paton, Prof Naser Meer, Prof Tommy Curry, Dr Nicola Frith and Dr Henry Mitchell. Advice has also been gratefully received from Prof Dorothy Miell and Prof Sarah Cunningham-Burley.

Further information

22. Authors
See above

Presenter
Professor James Smith
Vice-Principal International

Freedom of Information

23. Closed paper.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

The Case for the Creation of a Doctoral College

Description of paper

1. This paper presents the case to support the creation of a University level Doctoral College. This would be a horizontal structure which would play a key role in coordinating and enhancing doctoral education at Edinburgh. It sets out the purpose, key activities, resourcing, risks and work plan associated with this proposal. Further details are set out in the appendix. This is the result of the working group established following the initial paper to the Executive in June 2019.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The Executive is asked to approve the proposal to set up the Doctoral College with an immediate soft launch followed by a hard launch in Autumn 2020.

Paragraphs 3-14 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Equality & Diversity

15. There are no direct E&D issues other than through recruitment of staff. A central administering unit for doctoral education should be well placed to monitor and disseminate good practice in E&D.

Next steps and Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

16. The plans for the Doctoral College will be reported to Education Committee and communicated to College committees. The pre-launch phase will involve consultation and discussion with all relevant stakeholders.

17. Senate Education Committee has already approved the setting up of a Steering Group for PGR to take care of operational matters and this will also oversee the creation of the Doctoral College.

Further Information

18. Authors

Antony Maciocia
Dean of Postgraduate Research, CSE

Presenter

Antony Maciocia

Paddy Hadoke
Director of Postgraduate Research and Early
Career Research Experience, CMVM

Stephen Bowd, CAHSS

Fiona Philippi
Head of Doctoral Education/Deputy Head of
Researcher Development, IAD

January 2020

Freedom of Information

19. Closed.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Edinburgh BioQuarter – Route to Formalising Partnership Arrangements

Description of paper

1. This paper builds on previous papers relating to the Edinburgh BioQuarter and the direction towards formalising the partnership between the University, Scottish Enterprise, the City of Edinburgh Council and NHS Lothian (“the BioQuarter partners”) only.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. University Executive is invited to approve, the proposals, in principle.

Paragraphs 3-20 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Equality, Diversity & Inclusion

30. A principal driver behind the plans for Edinburgh BioQuarter is to bring positive impact to the local communities to BioQuarter in terms of social and economic benefits and inclusive growth. Some of the surrounding neighbourhoods are recognised as the most socially and economically disadvantaged areas in the City of Edinburgh, Scotland and Europe. The BioQuarter partners therefore understand the crucial role BioQuarter has the potential to play in creating educational, employment and social-good opportunities all of which has a strong connection to the University’s Strategy 2030.

Paragraphs 31-33 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation

34. Regular engagement is ongoing internally across key areas within Corporate Services Group, senior academic colleagues, Legal Services and the Senior Leadership Team. This paper has been reviewed by the Director of Estates, the Director of Legal Services, the Director of Procurement, the Director of Finance and the Vice Principal of Business Development and Director of Corporate Services, the Head of College for Medicine and Veterinary Medicine (CMVM) and the Registrar for CMVM. The Vice Principal of Business Development and Director of Corporate Services will look to this senior team to support them in completing the detailed work and finalise the arrangements associated with approval matters noted in 2 above.

Further Information

35. On 30 September 2019, a positioning paper was supported by University Court (which had already been supported at University Executive in August and Policy & Resources Committee earlier in September) setting out the direction of travel.

Authors and Presenter

36. Author & Presenter

Ashley Shannon
Director of Operations
Corporate Services

20 December 2019

Freedom of Information

37. Closed paper – commercially sensitive. Disclosure would substantially prejudice the commercial interests of the University and the other BioQuarter partners.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Director of Finance's Report

Description of paper

1. This paper reports the latest¹ University management accounts (excluding Subsidiaries) position up to the end of November (period four) and provides an update on the University Group Quarter One forecast position. Special Focus Updates on the early results of the 2018-19 Russell Group financial benchmarking exercise and a summary of the second report from the Joint Expert Panel looking at USS pensions are provided in Appendices 2 and 3.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The University Executive is asked to review and comment on the latest update.

Background and context

3. The paper provides a regular update on finance related issues for the University Executive.

Paragraphs 4-19 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Resource Implications

20. There are no specific requests for resource in the paper.

Risk Management

21. The University manages its financial risk by not breaching the Group risk appetite as described in its financial metrics. The current Finance Strategy provides a target surplus range of 3% - 5% to remain sustainable.

Equality & Diversity

22. Specific issues of equality and diversity are not relevant to this paper as the content focusses primarily on financial strategy and/or financial project considerations.

Next steps & communication

23. We would welcome feedback as outlined in the discussion above.

Consultation

24. The paper has been reviewed by Lee Hamill, Director of Finance.

Further information

25. <u>Author</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
Rachael Robertson	Lee Hamill
Deputy Director of Finance	Director of Finance
Stuart Graham	
Head of FIRST (Financial Information, Reporting & Strategy Team)	

¹ At the time of writing full December (period five) management accounts were not available.

13 January 2020

Freedom of Information

26. This paper should not be included in open business as its disclosure could substantially prejudice the commercial interests of the University.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

People Report

Description of paper

1. This paper provides an update on people related matters being taken forward by Human Resources and other University departments.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The Executive is requested to note the content of this paper.

Background and context

3. This paper is an update on the paper presented to University Executive on 17 December 2019.

Paragraphs 4-12 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

13. The University has a low risk appetite for both compliance risks and people risks.

Equality & Diversity

14. Equality issues will be considered on a case by case basis for each individual project/piece of work.

Next steps & Communications

15. Future reports will be presented to each meeting of University Executive.

Consultation

16. The paper builds on discussion at previous meetings of University Executive and has been reviewed by the Director of HR.

Further information

17. Authors

Linda Criggie
Deputy Director HR – Employee
Relations, Reward, Employment Policy,
Equality & Diversity

Presenter

James Saville
Director of Human Resources
13 January 2020

Denise Nesbitt
Deputy Director HR – Learning and
Organisation Development and
Resourcing

Freedom of Information

18. This paper is **closed**.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Updated Reward policies (Job Grading, Regrading and Academic Promotions)

Description of paper

1. This Paper highlights key changes to the University's 'Grading and Re-Grading Processes and Principles'. These have been reviewed in line with the methodology agreed to deliver the SEP supported Employment Policy Standardisation Project.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. University Executive is asked to note the key changes and to approve the new policies.

Paragraphs 3-16 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

17. The policy changes outlined in the accompanying Appendices are key to ensuring consistency across the University and in turn reducing the risk of challenge by individual employees of unfair treatment.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)

18. The equality impact assessments associated with each policy have been reviewed and updated. The proposed changes have no adverse EDI implications.

Paragraphs 19-22 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation

23. Pivotal changes were approved by University Executive in October 2019.

24. The policies were informed by input from the tripartite working groups representing management, the joint trade unions and HR, and endorsed by the HR Executive.

25. Policy authors have consulted colleagues within SEP/H RTP, and HR Services, to ensure the procedures are operationally feasible and take account of any known/emerging process changes required to make most effective use of the new People and Money system.

Further information

26. Author

Linda Criggie
Deputy Director of HR (Employee
Relations & Reward),

Presenter

James Saville
Director of Human Resources

Freedom of Information

27. This paper is **closed** until the policies have been formally agreed with the joint unions and ratified through CJCNC on 5 March 2020 and formally communicated to stakeholders in line with SEP/H RTP agreed change processes.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Updated Disciplinary and Grievance Policies

Description of paper

1. This Paper highlights key changes to the University's disciplinary and grievance policies. These policies have been reviewed in line with the methodology agreed to deliver the SEP supported Employment Policy Standardisation Project.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. University Executive is asked to note the key changes and to approve the new policies which will be effective from 1 April 2020.

Paragraphs 3-16 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

17. The policy changes outlined in Appendices I and III are key to ensuring consistency across the University and in turn reducing the risk of challenge by individual employees of unfair treatment.

18. Whilst the grievance policy is 'bolder' in approach, it complies with the Acas Code of Practice and has been agreed with the joint unions, albeit pending final feedback from UCU's Scotland Office.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI)

19. The equality impact assessments associated with each policy have been reviewed and updated. The proposed changes have no adverse EDI implications.

Paragraphs 20-22 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation

23. Both policies have been informed by input from the tripartite working groups representing management, the joint trade unions and HR.

24. Pivotal changes to the grievance policy were approved by University Executive in October 2019.

25. The policies have also been informed by the themes which emerged from the externally facilitated interviews with 21 senior managers with direct experience of investigating or managing complex disciplinary and grievance cases or personally responding to formal grievances.

Further information

26. Author

Linda Criggie
Deputy Director of HR
(Employee Relations &
Reward),

Presenter

James Saville
Director of Human Resources

Freedom of Information

27. This paper is closed until the policies have been formally agreed with the joint unions and ratified through CJCNC on 5 March 2020 and formally communicated to stakeholders in line with SEP/H RTP agreed change processes.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Support for non-EEA staff – Indefinite leave to remain fees

Description of paper

1. This Paper explains the rationale for continuing to exclude indefinite leave to remain (ILtR) fees from the University's visa reimbursement policy.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. University Executive is asked to note the rationale for, and to approve the recommendations.

Paragraphs 3-23 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Equality & Diversity

24. The non-inclusion of indefinite leave to remain fees within the current reimbursement policy do not give rise to any equality issues. However, non-payment could result in non-EEA staff being unable to afford ILtR fees and so be unable to remain in the University's employment, adversely impacting the diversity of our workforce.

25. The proposed review, and resultant recommendations regarding future support will be informed and underpinned by equality impact assessments.

Paragraphs 26-27 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation

28. These recommendations have been informed by discussion with the Senior Leadership Team.

Further information

29. Author

Linda Criggie
Deputy Director of HR (Employee
Relations & Reward)

Presenter

James Saville
Director of Human Resources

Freedom of Information

30. This paper is **closed**.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers

Description of paper

1. Research Policy Group (RPG) recommends that the University becomes a signatory to the revised Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers. This paper represents a summary of preparation for signing the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers and an outline of the process for producing the Concordat Action Plan in 2020.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. University Executive is asked to:

- Agree that the University should become a signatory to the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers
- Note the process for producing the Concordat action plan
- Endorse the outline action plan (Appendix 1)

Background and context

3. In September 2019, the new Concordat¹ to Support the Career Development of Researchers was published. This followed a lengthy consultation process. The published Concordat was largely consistent with our institutional consultation response, which was approved by Research Policy Group in December 2018. There is a clear steer from funders that institutions should sign. Indeed, major national funders were amongst the first to sign². More fundamentally, however, it reflects our Strategy 2030 intent to be an attractive and supportive employer of research staff, who make a vital contribution to our success in the Research Excellence Framework. Once we sign, the University has up to 12 months to create a Concordat Action Plan.

4. The Institute for Academic Development (IAD) led a consultation through meetings, email consultations and forum events with a range of internal stakeholders to produce a gap analysis which mapped our institutional activities against the Concordat structure. The gap analysis was developed into a draft institutional Concordat Action Plan which was circulated to all interested and potentially affected groups and services. Concordat requirements were and continue to be cross-referenced against other similar charters to eliminate inconsistencies. The final approved Action Plan will be based on existing structures and reporting mechanisms wherever available to ensure there are no tensions or the potential for tensions between various institutional responsibilities for equality and diversity, research integrity and employer good practice. Rather, our response to the Concordat will pull all frameworks together to ensure a streamlined process for achieving our responsibilities, reporting and monitoring.

¹ The Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers is available from <https://www.vitae.ac.uk/policy/concordat/full>

² The current list of signatories is here: <https://www.vitae.ac.uk/policy/concordat/signatories>

Discussion

5. The University is publicly committed to supporting all its academic and professional services staff so they acquire the skills and experience that they can reach their potential. Part of delivering this commitment means tailoring support and training to each grouping of staff. The staff within the scope of this Concordat are at the start of their careers. By signing the Concordat, The University of Edinburgh publicly commits itself to all its supporting its researchers at all stages of their careers, including those who move on and apply their skills in highly-valued careers across a wide range of employment sectors.

6. The recent consultation and engagement process has generated a wealth of suggestions. The headlines are presented in Appendix 1 in the form of an outline Action plan so that University Executive has an insight into the expectations of the plan from stakeholders. Note that some of these will require resources from the University, but that others will offset this through efficiencies and improved mechanisms for sharing good practice. Our expectation is that the action plan will be structured similarly to the outline plan to reflect our relative readiness to address each part of the Concordat.

7. One aspect of the Concordat's expectations is the provision of dedicated Research Staff careers support provision. Developing this will enable us to quickly improve support for research staff, whatever their career trajectory. Unlike many Russell Group institutions, until recently we had no formal provision for careers consultations for research staff, but relied on support from the Careers Service outside their remit. A short-term solution has been the appointment of a part-time Careers Consultant for one year to reduce the immediate risk of impact on academic staff workloads should the Concordat generate more engagement from our 2000 research staff in their career management. The focus of this post will be the development of materials, provision of 1:1 guidance interviews, workshops and projects to engage potential employers outside the academic sector. The only sensible way to sustain this is through the creation of two new Careers Consultant posts.

8. RPG have requested a paper exploring the potential value of a Research Staff Centre for the University. It is important to note that any plans linked to the Concordat, particularly those which involve a central provision, will be developed to complement the strong support our research staff receive from their managers, their schools and institutes, and their Colleges. Developments to support research staff, such as those in place in the School of Biological Sciences and those currently gaining momentum in the CMVM already involve close working with IAD and other services. The plan to consider a more visible central provision for research staff will include all these stakeholders and will be based on adding value to the University and research staff. Research staff are most influenced and most supported by their close colleagues, so there will be no question of reducing the role of schools, institute or colleges. Rather, the case must be made for enhancing local activity if any form of Research Staff Centre is to be developed here.

Resource implications

9. The development of the action plan will be resourced from existing staff time. It is anticipated that the USG submission to the planning round will include a proposal for

two careers consultants, which is supported by RPG. An interim short-term post is being funded for one year using grant income in IAD. The comprehensive action plan will consider the potential value and resource implications of matching the approach of many equivalent institutions, such as the University of Cambridge, by carrying out a cost-benefit analysis of establishing an equivalent to their “Office of Postdoctoral Affairs”. RPG will consider a paper on this theme at its next meeting in February.

Risk Management

10. By convening a diverse and representative group with specific expertise on all facets of the Concordat, we can be confident of delivering on our responsibilities and raising the reputation of the institution as a place to develop researchers’ careers. By using the rest of the academic year to develop a robust and effective action plan we reduce the risk of missing key opportunities, rushing the integration of Concordats and Equality, Diversity and Integrity policies or failing to fully engage experts and stakeholders.

Equality & Diversity

11. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) are infused through the Concordat. Responding with the degree of thoroughness and connectivity that we have set out here will enable us to demonstrate how we integrate one of our core institutional values of being diverse, inclusive and accessible to all into policy and practice.

12. IAD intend to make use of the Equality Impact Assessments being carried out by Governance and Strategic Planning as a part of REF2021 preparations that relates to the group of staff within the scope of the Concordat.

Next steps & Communications

Development of an Action Plan

13. The consultation process has demonstrated that to fully engage in the ethos of the Concordat, we cannot rush the process. All stakeholders that IAD has approached have been keen to engage and view this Concordat as an opportunity to reflect on our support for research staff. They want to critically evaluate how to develop their practices, whilst balancing the needs of this group with other staff. The University is also in the midst of a period of change with new systems and approaches which it is expected will allow IAD to report more effectively on its work with research staff and those who support them. Through the remainder of the Academic Year 2019/20 IAD will explore how the new core system will help the University to meet our Concordat responsibilities and present this in the detailed and robust Action Plan.

14. An Implementation group will be established to look at the Concordat holistically, before allocating responsibilities for identifying KPIs, responsibilities, reporting mechanisms and deadlines. A workshop for the Implementation Group convened by IAD in early 2020. The IAD will retain oversight, working with these subgroups to develop an Action Plan which will run for 24 months from submission to Universities UK (who will oversee the Concordat at national level). Once reviewed, the plan will come to the meeting of RPG on 1 July 2020 for approval.

15. A small ‘task and finish’ group will also be set up to determine detailed deliverables, deadlines and actions. With insights gained from the very effective

Technician Steering Committee, IAD has invited representatives from HR (Colleges, Schools and Central ensuring coherence with our EDI frameworks); staff who support research staff (both professional services and academics in roles like the CSE Postdoc Champion); research staff and managers of research staff; union representatives and Edinburgh Research Office (bringing expertise on two areas – funding and research integrity). RPG has nominated relevant staff.

Communications

16. The process of developing the action plan will be collaborative, so must be effectively communicated throughout the institution. This will be done through IAD mailing lists, communication through College, School and Institute channels, use of Research Staff Societies and key staff who support research staff (including Postdoc Champions and Directors of Research.)

Consultation

17. This paper is a result of consultation and feedback from research staff, their managers, research staff societies professional services staff who support researchers, HR at College, School and University level, Edinburgh Research Office and colleagues in IAD. The consultation has included the Research Integrity Manager to ensure the development of the action plan to address new Universities UK Concordat on Research Integrity fits with outline plans for developing the Concordat on Researcher Development as there are considerable overlaps between the two Concordats.

18. At its meeting on 18 December RPG agreed recommend that the University becomes a signatory to the Concordat on to Support the Career Development of Researchers, the outline action plan, and the proposals to develop a comprehensive plan in 2020 to meet the expectations placed on the University.

Further information

19. Authors

Dr Sara Shinton
Head of Researcher Development
Institute of Academic Development

Presenter

Professor Jonathan Seckl
Vice-Principal Planning, Resources and
Research Policy.

Dr Susan Cooper
Senior Strategic Planner
Secretary to RPG
Governance and Strategic Planning

Freedom of Information

20. This paper is open.

Themes to be addressed in the Outline Concordat Action Plan and our readiness to address them

Our expectation is that the plan will be structured to reflect our relative readiness to address each part of the Concordat.

Green actions will be in progress already and we will be confidently able to deliver these in the first 24 months after signing.

	Publish a new Research Staff website with much clearer, integrated information. A draft of this is in preparation and will include material generated by Colleges, Schools, research staff and research staff societies.
	Review and refresh the CMVM “Managing your Research Teams” programme to make available across CAHSS and CSE. This will embed many of the Concordat recommendations about highlighting EDI good practice to managers of research staff.
	Ensure consistency with other Concordat/Charters (Research Integrity, Athena Swan, HR Excellence) and integrating the responsibilities linked to each into a wider consideration of Research Culture.
	Develop a career development toolkit* for research staff managers to reduce the risk for increased academic workload from increased research staff engagement in career development and options. (see 9 below)
	Offer a tailored careers service* for research staff with 1:1 appointments, workshops and new online resources. (see 9 below)
	Strengthen support for research staff societies with core administrative provision
	Improve representation of research staff on key institutional decision making bodies
	Support research staff and their managers to make better use of redeployment at end of contract. This will be part of a wider consideration of the complexity surrounded fixed-term contracts for research staff
	Consider the case for a “Postdoc Centre”, similar to those in many other Russell Group institutions

Amber actions will require resources or changes to systems and approaches which require a more considered, evidenced response. Many will rely on much higher levels of research staff engagement, commitments from managers and colleagues in professional services. Our 24 month plan will commit to finding mechanisms to deliver them.

	Provide research staff with dedicated space on each University campus for events and meetings to facilitate researcher-led activity and engagement.
	Report on uptake of development activities by research staff (this is linked to the new Core System and developments in the annual review process.)
	Improve data on research staff population (numbers, contract status, contract length, start date, career destinations; this is linked to the new Core System)
	Core funding* for two career consultants for research staff (see 9 below)
	Embed Concordat Actions in existing strategies and policies (this will be done carefully to ensure the circumstances of other staff groups are not ignored)

Red actions cannot be addressed by The University of Edinburgh in isolation, but will require sector level actions and funder engagement. We are already working with two networks - the Scottish institutions and the Russell Group – to explore these collectively and to work with our key funders to think creatively about new approaches.

	Find reliable approaches to gathering data on research staff destinations
	Consult with other HEIs and funders on alternatives to short-term research contracts

UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Service Excellence Programme Update

Description of paper

1. This paper provides the University Executive with a periodic update on the Service Excellence Programme. A further update will be provided to the University Executive following the 30 January 2020 Board which will discuss and make decisions on number of important elements of the programme.

Action Requested/Recommendation

2. The University Executive is asked to note the paper.

Paragraphs 3-12 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Freedom of information

13. This paper is closed.

Further information

14. Author

Barry Neilson
Programme Director
Service Excellence Programme

Presenter

Sarah Smith
Vice-Principal Strategic Change &
Governance and University Secretary



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Planning Round Update: medium-term improvements in the Cost Base

Description of paper

1. The paper provides an update on progress in the delivery of the medium-term improvements in the cost base anticipated for years 2 and 3, during the 2019-22 planning round. The planning round assumed that this would generate £10m per annum from 2020-21 onwards replacing the short-term cost cutting needed in year one of the approved plan.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. University Executive is invited to note the update and potential implications for the next planning round. Identification of new areas for improvement and barriers to progress are welcomed.

Paragraphs 3-7 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

8. The overall risks associated with the planning round will be reflected in each College and Support Group risk register which flows into the University's risk register; managed by Risk Management Committee. Risks associated with individual measures may be considered by the budget holders as part of the planning round.

Equality & Diversity

9. Individual proposals will be assessed for equality and diversity impact as necessary.

Paragraph 10 has been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation

11. Consultation has taken place with finance staff in the support groups and FIRST.

Further information

12. Author and presenter

Tracey Slaven

Deputy Secretary Strategic Planning

Freedom of Information

13. Closed until completion of planning round.



21 January 2020

Closure of Agreed Management Actions from Internal Audit Reviews

Description of paper

1. This paper provides an update on the closure of agreed management actions arising from Internal Audit reviews.

Action requested/Recommendation

2. The University Executive are requested to note the paper and support closure of open management actions included in the paper within their own areas of responsibility.

Paragraphs 3-6 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk Management

7. Follow up and closure of agreed management actions arising from Internal Audit reviews is an important element of the University's overall governance and control framework and contributes to the University's overall management of risk.

Equality & Diversity

8. No specific considerations.

Paragraphs 9-10 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Consultation

11. All agreed action owners will be contacted for status updates.

Further information

12. Author

Paul McGinty
Head of Internal Audit

Presenter

Leigh Chalmers
Director of Legal Services

Freedom of Information

13. This paper is closed.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

**Health and Safety Quarterly Report: Quarter 1:
1 Sept 2019 – 30 November 2019**

Description of paper

1. This paper provides a summary of health and safety related incidents that took place during the period 1 September 2019 to 30 November 2019, as well as relevant health and safety issues and developments, to provide information and assurance to the University Executive (UE) on the management of health and safety matters.

Action requested / Recommendation

2. The Executive is asked to note the contents of the report.

3. That UE notes the statistics included in the Appendices as illustrative of the University's accident and incident experience, and notes the issues and developments which are also described in the Report for this Quarter.

Paragraphs 4-16 have been removed as exempt from release due to FOI.

Risk management

17. The University has a low risk appetite for both compliance risks and for people risks. Monitoring of health and safety accidents, diseases and incidents ensures that risks to health are being managed and provides early warning of more serious issues.

Equality & Diversity

18. This report raises no major equality and diversity implications.

Consultation

19. This paper, with minor alterations, will also be presented to the next appropriate meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee.

Further information

20. Author

Karen Darling
Deputy Director of
Health and Safety
9 January 2020

Presenter

Hugh Edmiston
Director of Corporate Services

Freedom of Information

21. This paper is closed as its disclosure would substantially prejudice the legal interests of any person or organisation.



UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE

21 January 2020

Staff Experience Committee Report

Committee Name

1. Staff Experience Committee

Date of Meetings

2. 22 October 2019 and 17 December 2019

Action Required

3. University Executive is invited to note the key items discussed at the meetings as detailed below.

Key points

October meeting

4. There was a discussion on the proposed work to be undertaken by the Talent & Performance Development Task & Finish Group. The Committee agreed there was sufficient information for the Group to progress this work, with the aim of defining a set of recommendations for the University's approach to this area over the next 5 years.

5. Committee members shared a range of informal views sought from other members of staff on what it was like to work at the University. Areas discussed included; culture; pay and working conditions; change programmes; mentoring; promotion and re-grading processes; staff awards; the importance of staff feeling they are being listened to; better articulation of positive news stories; and the role staff can play with the implementation of the 2030 Strategy.

6. The Director of Human Resources updated the Committee on a number of recent activities that had taken place that positively impacted staff experience. This included; work underway to update and improve three of the University's reward policies; changes to the Academic Promotions policy; preparation work around Brexit; visa workshops for staff; submission of Stonewall application; further staff discounts; availability of e-vouchers in Voucher Reward Scheme; and the first career development programme for technicians which was launched on 30 September 2019.

December meeting

7. Committee members considered a proposed approach for the agenda and operation of the Staff Experience Committee over the next 12-24 months. It was agreed to establish a regular agenda supporting a strategic overview role, under a number of proposed headings including Leadership and Team Development and Staff Recognition and Wellbeing.

8. Committee members heard updates from the Task & Finish Groups on Talent & Performance Development and Staff Communications. It was noted a number of initial recommendations had emerged from the Talent & Performance Development

Group, and these would be finalised at meetings early in the new year. The Staff Communications Group reported initial discussions around the planned communication strategies for Strategy 2030, including the role that the Staff Experience Champions could play. Further meetings were planned for January and February 2020. Final reports for both Groups would be presented at the Staff Experience Committee meeting in March 2020.

Full minute

9. All papers considered at the meetings can be accessed at the following link:
<https://www.ed.ac.uk/governance-strategic-planning/governance/university-committees/othercommitteesandgroups/staff-experience-committee>.

Equality & Diversity

10. Issues related to equality and diversity were considered within each paper as appropriate.

Further information

11. <u>Author</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
Jamie Tait	Sarah Smith
Projects Officer & Policy Advisor to the University Secretary	Vice-Principal Strategic Change & Governance and University Secretary

Freedom of Information

12. Open Paper.