UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK BOARD OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 12:00, WEDNESDAY 26 FEBRUARY 2025 SENATE HOUSE, COUNCIL CHAMBER		
Present	Professor Rachel Moseley	Chair and Vice-Provost
	Dr Bryan Brazeau	School for Cross-faculty Studies (left at 2.00pm)
	Professor Paulo De Medeiros	Department of English and Comparative Literary Studies (left at 12.55pm)
	Professor Teresa Grant	Centre for the Study of the Renaissance
	Dr Marta Guerriero	Deputy Chair of Faculty (Education)/Chair of Faculty Education Committee
	Professor Stuart Hampton-Reeves	School of Creative Arts. Performance and Visual Cultures
	Professor Elisabeth Herrmann	School of Modern Languages and Cultures
	Professor Christoph Hoerl	Department of Philosophy (arrived at 1.00pm)
	Professor David Lambert	Director of CADRE
	Professor Tim Lockley	Department of History
	Professor Zahra Newby	Department of Classics and Ancient History
	Dr Michael Niblett	Department of English and Comparative Literary Studies (left at 1.55pm)
	Dr Simon Peplow	Deputy Chair of Faculty Education Committee (left at 1.55pm)
	Professor James Robinson	Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine
	Dr Jane Webb	School for Cross-faculty Studies
Attending	Oliver Cooper	Faculty Director of Administration
	Alison Greenhalgh	Secretary
	Karen Jackson	Library Research and Academic Manager
	Eleanor Sanger	Assistant Secretary
	Dr Margaux Whiskin	Faculty Student Engagement Coordinator

Ref	Item
017	**Apologies for absence:** Apologies were received from Sophie Bourne (PGT Student Representative), Professor David Fearn (Department of Classics and Ancient History), Amanda Kowalczyk (Faculty Senior Tutor), Dr Lydia Plath (Department of History), Dr Ben Richardson (Faculty of Social Sciences).
018	**Declarations of Interest:** No new declarations were made.
019	**Freedom of Information and Equality and Inclusion:** The Committee noted and agreed to abide by the Freedom of Information and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policies.
020	**Minutes of last meeting on 12 November 2024** The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2024 (020-BFA260225, Public) were **approved**.
021	**Matters arising from last meeting on 12 November 2024** **(a) Warwick Venice Centre** • Warwick Venice Centre had changed to a different licence and was now under the umbrella of the University's International group. • The agreement for the building in Venice was in relation to education and research-related activity, and there was a very small margin for other activities at the Centre without breaking the terms.

	• The University wanted to make more use of the space and needed to find a way of changing the nature of the licence.
	• The financial reporting line was in the process of being changed away from the Faculty Board to the International group.
	• The Digital and Operations Committee was also changing the status of Warwick Venice Centre to be a cultural foundation.

	Chair's Business
022	**Chair's Business and Actions**
	The Committee received and noted an update from the Chair with key details and discussions, as below:
	(a) Faculty Priorities – Midlands Arts and Humanities Futures Network
	• The first meeting of the Midlands Arts and Humanities Future Network had taken place.
	• This was a network of peers from all universities in the Midlands brought together by the Chair with the aim to create a peer space to collaboratively talk about issues facing the sector, advocacy and influencing work, and lobbying for change; working within Chatham House Rules to have a sense of what is happening in a joined-up way and to collaborate and support.
	• The first meeting was well-attended and very productive and would be hosted at Warwick next term. As the network becomes established the aim will be to connect up disciplines across institutions as well.
	• Colleagues from the Faculty and SMLC, had a productive meeting at the University of Birmingham with Heads of Modern Languages and the Deputy Chair of Education. Everyone found it a supportive experience and an opportunity to learn from each other in terms of what others were doing, what was working, and how to approach challenges that the sector was facing.
	• This was part of a move to make more connections in a collaborative way across the sector and the Midlands. It also applied to research interests across departments and would be useful to know of any existing research collaborations across institutions.
	• The Russell Group culture network had restarted after being dormant for a few years. The Vice-Chancellor was currently the representative for Warwick, but would be good if someone else wanted to pick that up.
	(b) Financial Sustainability
	• Things were changing very fast. Academic departments were going to be held to gross surplus targets in cash terms as well as percentage terms. This would mean stopping doing things we could not afford to do to meet those targets.
	• Masters programmes that were not recruiting needed to be paused so teaching could be moved into other spaces. Where it was not essential, optionality should be taken out to move colleagues into other teaching to reduce GTA spend. Colleagues should not be asked to teach more than their 100%, but needed to make sure that everyone was teaching to full capacity.
	• It was not a case of permanently cutting courses, but in the current recruitment context some could not afford to run and needed to be paused if not recruiting. If a PGT course had not yet received applications it could not run next year and staff who would have taught on it would teach elsewhere, depending on the discipline or where there was speciality. 2026 entry should be looking to have a redesigned offer that was more streamlined, otherwise the issue would continue to exist.
	• Targets needed to be realistic. Some current targets were stretch targets, which were fine if prepared to take risks; staff could not be moved from one discipline to another just like that.
	• Everyone should be able to teach core first and second year modules, although more difficult in interdisciplinary space.

	- MA modules should not be taught with fewer than 15 students in the room. The number 15 was to do with staff to student ratios. The Provost's line was that some departments had a ratio of 5:1, while others had 25:1, which was not acceptable, unless there was a distinctive pedagogic need.
	- It had been pointed out to the Provost that there were areas that could not be held to a minimum of 15 because it was an existential question that could mean cutting out postgraduate provision for an entire discipline.
	- Students liked optionality and flexibility, without this finances would improve but NSS results would suffer.
	- There were also practical issues, for example, in the FAB some rooms only had capacity for 13 students. If going to move every class in 13-seater rooms out, campus was already full, so there would not be other spaces around campus. There was also a need to have spaces available for exchanges students.
	- Connect programmes could really help us think about this and provide optionality. Needed to think about a process if a course did not go into clearing but students wanted to go into something else. The practicalities of module recruitment meant that a centralised system was needed. Timings needed to be aligned so things could happen earlier but need timetabling and space management to support that and make it effective.
	- The Chair would speak to MCI about the possibility and cost of crafting something that would attract to all Arts Faculty MA programmes.
	(c) Warwick Transformation
	- The consultants were due to leave at the end of March, although there was some delay with the University's central services.
	- The Faculty had talked about what should be in a hub and were having conversations with the other two Faculties about doing stuff together.
	- A lot of central professional services were in consultation or approaching the concept of hubs, so lots of comms and culture building about what that would look like. People asked not to request any moves into Faculty offices until central services were informed and on board.
023	**Termly Faculty Assembly**
	The Committee received a verbal report with key details and discussions, as below:
	- The Assembly would connect to the PGT review and Faculty strategy planned for the end of April.
	- Term 3 would bring wider consultation and the opportunity to have staff from across different departments working together.
	- One aim was to protect the Faculty's PGT courses by looking at how they could be more efficient but also thinking of new courses and potential collaboration. For example, a proposal to use research teams identified last year as collaborative teams, working together around the design of new courses.
	- One quick win would be for departments to collaborate on skills training for PGT. There was a lot of skills training running that was not necessary, e.g., teaching to reference did not differ across the Faculty. This would bring resources together and free up workload. Similarly, UG skills could also join up across the Faculty.
	- Also consider which courses would be paused or merged, then launch with MCI as package of new PGT courses.
	- Research themes were a good idea as there was funding attached and were an important tie to research-led teaching.
	Faculty Business
024	**Student Representatives Update**
	The Committee received a verbal report with key details and discussions, as below:

	(a) **UG Representative**

(a) UG Representative

There was no UG representative at the meeting.

(b) PGT Representative

There was no PGT representative at the meeting.

(c) Student Engagement Coordinator

- Departments had been contacted about the personal tutoring review being conducted by the Dean of Students Office. Every department should have discussions with SSLCs around four questions set and create a document answering these questions. The deadline was 7th March with a recommendation that the document be seen by the department Senior Personal Tutor.

- There had been general discussions around signage issues; a list would sent after Term 2.

- A meeting had taken place with Faculty reps and SSLC chairs/secretaries across departments to see what issues needed to be discussed and brought to Faculty-level, e.g., a conversation around lecture capture. If not explained to students, they simply saw it as a refusal to do lecture capture without understanding the reasons behind it. It would be helpful if they were provided with a rationale and a move to what they wanted in terms of lecture capture. Another meeting was planned in April in time for the Faculty Education Committee.

- A meet and greet EDI session had taken place to bring together student network leads across departments to see what they had been working on and share discussions.

---

025 | **External Engagement Update**

No external engagement update was received.

---

026 | **Academic Governance Review – Faculty Governance/Steering Group**

The Committee received report (026-BFA260225, Public) and key points and discussions were as follows:

- The Senate agreed the formalisation of Faculty-level education and research committees with direct reporting lines to University parent committees.

- The Faculty Board would be replaced by the Faculty Steering Group (FSG), the shape of which would be agreed by the Academic Strategy Committee and University Executive Board.

- Term 2 and 3 Faculty Board meetings would be used as a consultation space to gather views about what the FSG should look like.

- The Faculty governance task and finish group had recommended an arrangement with more direct line, in both directions, to UEB. The Faculty Board currently reported to Senate but never did anything in that space.

- Grouping of this kind at Faculty level would be more effective in terms of strategic steer for the Faculty.

- Initial suggestions that the FSG would look at probation and promotion had now changed. This would still be done at Faculty level but via a different structure.

- The FSG would continue to have links to Senate through the Faculty-level education and research committees and would have sight of decision making in those committees and be able to advise and make recommendations.

- A two-way flow of information between all committees had been a priority of the Academic Governance Review. The FSG would have a breadth of voice and a direct route of challenge up and down.

- There was concern that decisions made by the Faculty-level education and/or research committees would bypass the FSG. The FSG would have advisory power, as well as reports from the committees and members that would sit on University-level education and research committees.

- The steer from the Doctoral College was that PGR should sit in Faculty-level education, whereas on a departmental level it often sat in research.

	• The FSG would need to ensure that decisions were made in the right way. If there was conflict between the Faculty-level education and research committees, it would be brought to the FSG or HoDs' Forum. There were also spaces outside of formal committees to have conversations and share issues. • Decisions made by the Faculty's education and research committees would go to FSG before going to the University-level parent committee and Senate. The FSG would have the opportunity to challenge or feed into any decisions. • Student voice: currently departmental representatives reported to Faculty representatives but not vice versa. It would be useful if Faculty representatives who attended meetings would report back to SSLC chairs. • Faculty-level strategies such as diversity, sustainability, enterprise and innovation, regional and international would sit within the FSG. • Frequency of meetings would be crucial to enable two-way communication between all Faculty committees. • It was also the responsibility of committee members to act on behalf of the committees and feed into and back important issues both inside and out of formal committee meetings. This would be supported by effective secretariat coordinating the process to ensure things were not missed. • There was concern around possible situations where people might not understand the ramifications of particular decisions, and that unsustainable decisions would get made if the right people were not in the room. • Often members would just bring a perspective of the department, not a Faculty perspective. The FSG could have oversight to ensure that, in line with the framework, there was diversity of voice in terms of role, area, and expertise. • There was a timetabling issue to be considered to ensure meetings were timetabled before teaching to enable members to attend.
027	**Government Missions** The Committee received a verbal report with key details and discussions, as below: • Conversations were taking place across Faculties and departments on what they were doing to align themselves with the government's five missions. • A lot of Faculty research contributed to all of the five missions, and the Faculty's public engagement strategy should speak to all of them. • Mission 4 around breaking down barriers to opportunity was the closest to what the Faculty was doing. • Mission 1, kickstarting economic growth was relevant to SCAPVC and creative industries, with SCfS working on Mission 2 to make Britain a clean energy superpower. • Mission 5, building an NHS fit for the future, applied to the Centre for the History of Medicine, and CMPS related to Mission 3 to take back the streets by halving serious crime. • Questions were raised as to why this is was coming to the Faculty in this format. What was the intention and how was it cross referenced with the University's new strategy. It was important to question the connection and relations between government and the University. • There was a need for a conversation to take place across the University as to what the University was trying to do and what the point of the University more generally was.
	Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion
028	**Arts Faculty Education Committee minutes** The Committee received and noted the report (028-BFA260225, Public).

029	**Arts Faculty Research and Impact Committee minutes**
	The Committee received and noted the report (029-BFA260225, Public).
030	**Arts Equality and Inclusion Forum minutes**
	The Committee received and noted the report (030-BFA260225, Public).
Other	
031	**Any other business**
	There was no other business.
032	**Senate Subcommittee Minutes and Reports**
	Board of the Faculty of Arts http://warwick.ac.uk/committees/bfa/minutes
	Faculty Education Committee https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/bfa/fec/minutes/
	Education and Student Experience Committee https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/esec/minutes/
	Learning and Teaching Subcommittee https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/lts/minutes/
	Postgraduate Research Subcommittee https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/prs/minutes
	Quality and Standards Subcommittee https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/qss/minutes/
	Student Success Subcommittee https://warwick.ac.uk/services/gov/committees/sss/minutes/
Next meeting: 12:00, Tuesday 13 May 2025	