

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK
BOARD OF THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND MEDICINE
OPEN MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2021
VIA MS TEAMS

Present	Professor Lorenzo Frigerio	LF	Chair
	Professor Gary Bending	GB	Life Sciences
	Professor Gill Cooke	GC	Faculty Education Committee representative
	Professor David Davies	DD	Deputy Chair
	Professor Steven Dixon	SD	Physics
	Professor Jon Forster	JF	Statistics
	Professor Miriam Gifford	MG	Life Sciences
	Professor David Haddleton (until 15:27)	DH	Chemistry
	Professor Yulan He	YH	Computer Science
	Professor Paul Jennings	PJ	Warwick Manufacturing Group
	Professor Adam Johansen	AJ	Statistics
	Professor Sudhesh Kumar	SK	Warwick Medical School
	Professor Toby Mottram	TM	Engineering
	Professor Mark Newton	MN	Physics
	Dr Anastasia Papavasileiou	AP	Faculty Education Committee representative
	Professor James Robinson	JCR	Mathematics
	Professor Jose Rodrigo	JLR	Faculty Education Committee representative
	Professor Yulia Timofeeva	YT	Computer Science
	Dr Helen Toner	HT	Senior Tutor for the Faculty
	Professor David Towers	DT	Engineering
Dr Cagatay Turkey	CT	Board of Faculty of Social Sciences representative	
Professor Mike Ward	MW	Chemistry	
Professor Derrick Watson	DW	Psychology	
Professor Martin Wills	MW	Faculty Education Committee representative	
Attending	Yvonne Budden	YB	Head of Scholarly Communications, Library
	Professor Greg Challis	GC	Chemistry
	Ruth Cooper	RC	Faculty Director of Administration
	Professor Chris Dowson	CD	Life Sciences
	Craig Franklin	CF	Administrative Officer, EPQ
	Robin Green	RG	Librarian
	Carole Harris	CH	Assistant Director R&IS
	Louise Hasler	LH	Secretary
	Karen Jackson	KJ	Academic Support Manager, Library
	Professor Mike Shipman	MS	Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International)
Dr Meera Unnikrishnan	MU	WMS	
Ref	Item		
001	<p>Apologies for absence</p> <p>Apologies were received from Professor Pierre-Philippe Fraiture (SMC), Karen Jackson (Library), Aesha Pan (PGT student representative) and both Professor David Towers and Professor Martin Wills, who were only able to attend for part of the meeting.</p>		

	<p>The Chair thanked the outgoing Chair of the Board, Professor Caroline Meyer, and wished her well in her new role. The Chair also thanked Louise Hasler and welcomed the new Secretary to the Board, Craig Franklin.</p> <p>The Chair also welcomed representatives from other Faculties, new members and new student representatives. It was noted that a representative undergraduate student member was to be elected via by-election.</p>
002	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>No new declarations were made.</p>
003	<p>Membership and Terms of Reference 2021-22</p> <p>The Secretary introduced the paper (003.BFSEM.21-22) as an annual reminder of the terms of reference of the Board and a note of current membership. No requests to alter the terms of membership were received.</p>
004	<p>Minutes of last meeting held on 24 May 2021</p> <p>The minutes (004.BFSEM.21-22) of the meeting held on 24 May 2021 were received and approved.</p>
005	<p>Matters arising from last meeting held on 24 May 2021</p> <p>Matters arising were reported as follows:</p> <p>(a) Rules for Award (minute 29)</p> <p>That JR had raised the Rules for Award policy which had been considered at SEMEC and had emphasised the importance of further consultation with those departments for whom there were exemptions under course regulations. It had been agreed that the Chair would raise with DD (for whom apologies had been received) to ensure he was aware and interceded as necessary.</p> <p>(b) Race Equality Charter (minute 32)</p> <p>Chris Warhurst had indicated that it would be beneficial if a note on the construction of these data could be shared with departments. Kulbir Shergill is currently recruiting two new posts in her team: these colleagues will take a detailed breakdown of the departmental level Race Equality Charter data out to departments to discuss and analyse in more detail as soon as they are in post. Kulbir Shergill had reported that she will be feeding back to heads of department in due course and this will be proceeded by a session with the Warwick Leaders' Forum.</p> <p>(c) Library (minute 33)</p> <p>JF had proposed that for the sake of clarity, principle 6 set out in the paper be rephrased in line with YB's verbal description 'the requirements of the funder acknowledging the paper'. RG had confirmed that principle 6 had been updated appropriately.</p>
006	<p>Chair's Business and Actions</p> <p>(a) Approval of membership of Faculty Science, Engineering and Medicine Education Committee</p> <p>As the 'parent' committee of Faculty Education Committee, the Chair had taken action to approve membership because the first SEMEC meeting was prior to the first Board meeting of the year.</p> <p>It was noted that a representative of the Board of the Faculty of SEM was required for the Board of the Faculty of Arts, as the previous representative was no longer a member of the Board of SEM. Expressions of interest were requested. Action: ALL</p> <p>(b) Approval of change in membership of the First Year Board of Examiners</p> <p>A late change in membership of the Faculty's First Year Board of Examiners had been approved to ensure a quorum was achieved.</p>

	<p>(c) Good news from the Faculty</p> <p>That there had been a donation of £3,500,000 made to astrophysics. This was the first substantial philanthropic donation made to the Faculty and it was hoped that it would open the door to others.</p> <p>That the 2020 Warwick iGEM team had been awarded a gold medal.</p>
007	<p>STEM Grand Challenge Science Precinct</p> <p>A verbal report, accompanied by slides, was received from Professor Mike Shipman, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International) and the Programme Sponsor. MS summarised the objectives of the wider STEM Grand Challenge and the specific benefits of the science precinct and shared details of phasing, decant and relocation. It was noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of the activity was very large as capability needed to be grown by 40%; • The timelines were lengthy: the 10 year development programme was phased to reduce impact on students and researchers; • Consideration was being given to shortening the timeline but this would provide a challenge for cash flow; • Priorities were still evolving; • There would be a dedicated education building and this provided an opportunity for new pedagogies; • A decision needed to be made with respect to the future of lecture theatres and TEG could help with that. <p>In response to comments from DD, JF and CT, it was noted that input had been widely sought and that it was hard to completely balance inclusivity with effective decision making.</p> <p>In response to a question from MG about the role of students, it was noted that there had been student involvement but that should be increased in respect of the education building.</p> <p>MS concluded by encouraging departments to confirm their interest in being involved in the science precinct.</p>
008	<p>a) Revised UKRI Open Access Policy</p> <p>YB introduced a paper (008a.BFSEM.21-22) and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was the first review of the open access policy since launched by the Research Councils in 2014; • There were two routes to compliance (green and gold); • The use of UKRI funds for publishing in a 'hybrid' journal that is not part of a transitional agreement will not be permitted (unless part of a transformative agreement); • UKRI had expressed a clear preference for a CC BY licence (attribution only); • The Scholarly Communications Team was keen to attend departmental meetings to provide regular updates. <p>During the ensuing discussions it was noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was lack of clarity regarding what constituted a transformative journal; • The process for alternative licences was also unclear; • That a hybrid journal was both published as part of open access and had a subscription aspect; • That the 'green' route was only open access if no embargoed period, so only useful for UKRI purposes; • That a quick guide to regularly targeted journals for use prior to publication would be very helpful. <p>YB was thanked for the clarity she brought to communications in this area.</p>

	<p>b) Elsevier Negotiations Consultation</p> <p>RG introduced paper (008b.BFSEM.21-22) and gave a verbal summary of the current status of the Elsevier ScienceDirect negotiations, including the pre-prepared counter proposal 'Core Plus' and the ultimate option to walk away. The following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The aim was to secure an agreement; • This was the first time the UK had been in such a strong position; • There will be a further consultation in December or early January; • It may be possible to achieve aims without action being required; • Views on proposed measures were welcome, including comments off line.
009	<p>a) Proposal for the Establishment of a University Research Centre (Category II) – 'Centre for Global Jewish Studies'</p> <p>CH introduced the paper (009a.BFSEM.21-22) for the proposed Centre for Jewish Studies, which aimed to position itself broadly, in order to maximise opportunities for external funding. It was noted that the other Faculty Boards had given strong endorsement of the proposal. The Board approved the establishment of the Centre without reservation.</p> <p>b) University Research Centres – Triennial Review</p> <p><u>Centre for Mental Health & Wellbeing Research (II)</u> The continuation of the Centre was approved without reservation.</p> <p><u>Warwick Anti-Microbial Interdisciplinary Centre (WAMIC) (II)</u> Professor Greg Challis, Professor Christopher Dowson and Dr Meera Unnikrishnan jointly made a case for Warwick's continued involvement in anti-microbial research on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently a lack of human capacity and capability in this area; • Multidisciplinary solutions were important; • That the training provided was important for capability building; • The Centre had been successful in attracting philanthropic funding (\$250,000); • There was scope for significant further development and industrial engagement. <p>The continuation of the Centre was approved without reservation.</p> <p><u>Warwick Centre for Integrative Synthetic Biology (WISB) (II)</u> Professor John McCarthy made a case for the continuation of the centre, the main points of note were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was created as one of six national synthetic biology research centres; • It had made an important contribution to training and career development; • It had built up a large network of companies; • It had led to two start-up companies and a lot of interaction with international partners; • Conversations were currently in train with UKVI regarding how to move forward. <p>LF shared the view that the definition of engineering biology was currently open to interpretation and this was an opportunity to shape it. The continuation of the Centre was approved without reservation.</p>

	<p>The Centre for Health Economics at Warwick (CHEW) (III), the Centre for Complexity Science (III), the Mathematics Research Centre (III) and the Centre for the History of Medicine (CHM) (II, Arts) were considered. JR offered that the future of the Centre for Complexity Science and Mathematics Research Centre were being considered as part of the Institute's strategic renewal process. The Centre for Applied Mathematical Sciences would be a natural successor to the Centre for Complexity Science but it was worth both centres being allowed to continue until funding was clearer</p> <p>The continuation of the remaining centres under consideration was approved.</p> <p>GB offered the general comment that despite the value that research centres offered in bringing departments together and successfully bidding for grant money, the University does not provide them with any financial support. It was agreed that LF would raise this with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research). Action: LF.</p>
010	<p>Items from the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Medicine Education Committee</p> <p>DD spoke to the report (010.BFSEM.21-22) and emphasised that the main issue discussed had been the shape of the academic year. Whilst it was recognised that the lack of time between the conclusion of reassessments and the start of the new academic year was problematic and that alignment with approaches undertaken internationally might be advantageous, some models for an academic year were very different to our current approach and it was important that everyone had a chance to share their thoughts as part of the current consultative process.</p> <p>The work to review and improve the course approval system included in the report on the priorities within the Education Strategy for 2021/22 was welcomed.</p>
Items below this line were for receipt and/or approval, without discussion	
012	<p>Representation on Faculty and University Committees</p> <p>The Committee received and noted the report (012.BFSEM.21-22)</p>
Next meeting: 14:30, Thursday 24 February 2022	

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS			
ITEM	DECISION/ACTION	LEAD AND DUE DATE	STATUS
2021-2022			
006 Chair's Business	To submit expressions of interest in acting as the Board of the Faculty of SEM representative on the Board of the Faculty of Arts.	ALL, asap	
009	To raise with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) the lack of University funding of research centres.	LF, before next meeting.	