

00:11:31 Aimie Lambert: Hi everyone, This meeting is being recorded so it can be shared with staff who aren't able to attend. If you don't want to appear, please turn your camera off. You can turn the subtitles off - click 'live transcript' and 'hide'

00:13:09 Niels Walet: Can we mute everyone?

00:15:55 Steve Pettifer: Thanks Philippa — I will go away for now and return at around 11:15; if the timings change I can be summoned back sooner by Teams 😊

00:18:14 mwwsslr: Please can everyone mute themselves unless invited to speak by the Chair. thanks

00:18:30 Nikesh Solanki: Fyi, the host can mute everyone else.

00:19:48 Nikesh Solanki: Will the university provide any guidance on mask hygiene?

00:21:17 John Warren: What is the best method to raise that there are lot of empty mask boxes in building entrances?

00:22:16 John Warren: thanks

00:24:13 Judith McGovern: I don't think the formulae are visible...

00:27:00 Judith McGovern: Currently funded and not costed hours on grants are being used

00:27:03 Lloyd Cawthorne: When will inaccuracies be updated?

00:31:05 Wendy Flavell: This is not just an STFC - EU etc also

00:31:58 James Allan: Could do with information on how capital grants are recorded and credited. These aren't recorded in PURE the same way as research grants.

00:33:32 Sean John Freeman: There is a STFC CG in Earth Science too.

00:33:49 Phil Manning: Can competitively awarded synchrotron time all be reviewed?

00:33:53 Emma Reilly: How we record FTE will be discussed with the PURE team today, we're aware that there are cases where we attribute FTE but can't recover so will be looked at in detail

00:33:57 Phil Manning: Also be reviewed!

00:34:56 Roy Wogelius: Unless I'm mistaken, it seems that the allocation of individual research time for all academics, which was discussed at length in this forum, has disappeared.

00:35:09 Perdita Barran: There are lots of cases where we attribute FTE and it's not accounted for.

00:36:04 Judith McGovern: No it isn't shown.

00:37:06 Charles Darko: he 20% must take into consideration, conferences, scholarships items and pedagogy research.

00:37:18 Perdita Barran: Are we moving to a situation where each academic has a 'quota' code that comprises the Pcodes of students in their groups + some contribution to ongoing lab costs? This is the case in other institutions.

00:37:55 Judith McGovern: The "Hours deployable" is shown as 1540 for me (full time)

00:38:20 Charles Darko: *The

00:39:02 Judith McGovern: That's 32 hrs per week for 48 weeks a year

00:41:03 Jonathan Redfern: I thought we were moving away from use of acronyms to be more inclusive...

00:42:14 Perdita Barran: Please talk with the senior technical specialists about equipment and please provide evidence from the Labcup asset management system that such kit does not exist or is end of life Or from PPMS overbooked.

00:43:29 Nikesh Solanki: What plans are there to "stabilise" PS staff i.e. reduce turnover in the Departments?

00:44:15 mwwsslr: @Perdita - we are involving those colleagues in discussions too so we capture all requirements.

00:44:39 Nikesh Solanki: Also, is there any audit on workloads for PS staff? It seems to have increased significantly over the past couple of years.

00:45:57 Rob Sansom (he/him): Thank you for introducing the COVID relief fund. Can I ask how the first round went? i.e. number of requests received, number requests funded, amount allocated so far

00:54:03 Eric McInnes: triggered by what?

00:55:04 Sally Brown (she/her): <https://www.manchester.ac.uk/coronavirus/support-current-students/assessment-commitments/>

00:59:31 Philip Withers: Reinforcing Alex's point staff were also concerned about how easy it would be for students to access academics in MECD on an informal basis

01:02:40 Lloyd Cawthorne: I agree with Alex's point; I do not think an upset student would like to walk across a crowded building to have a private discussion. If they know this will happen, it might prevent them from reaching out in the first place.

01:04:22 John Warren: Phil/Alex as per the DoM forum this is not just an academic issue. Technical and PS staff have, nationally, been recognised as often being the first point that a student will reveal an issue.

01:05:30 Stuart Lyon: There is no alternative then so why bother reviewing

01:05:49 Andrew Horn: The operation of the FEB *has* been reviewed - that's why the processes and meetings are blended into the exam board schedule such that there is no effect on release dates and graduation this academic year.

01:05:52 Wendy Flavell: How does this work in MIB?

01:07:06 Richard Winpenny: But the FEB remains. We didn't review whether it had any value

01:07:32 Romain Tartese (He/Him): What does FEB mean?

01:07:45 Richard Winpenny: Faculty Exam Board

01:07:50 Romain Tartese (He/Him): Thanks

01:08:04 Perdita Barran: In MIB we meet students and other people we line manage in our individual offices, it is sometimes difficult as the offices are like fish bowls. I tend to put the student with their back to the door, and the rooms are sound proofed at least.

01:09:03 Lloyd Cawthorne: Could this group Philippa is proposing have student input?

01:09:13 Richard Winpenny: I second that proposal

01:09:32 Philip Withers: I would hope the success of this system be reviewed after a trial period - other faculties have had really negative student feedback in this area I think. I am really worried that we are placing lots of barriers between student and academics.

01:09:44 Mike Shaver: The issues have been raised for several years now - I'm unclear how plans have changed in response to this feedback. If it is a change in practice by academics, then clear

01:10:35 NF Morrison (he/him/Neil): with increase in working remotely and shared offices, the door knocking approach is hard to support, sadly. In maths i booked several small teaching rooms to enable new advisors (without individual offices) to meet advisees

01:11:51 Stuart Lyon: It's not just about upset students - it's also about informal and necessary feedback to students after lectures, projects, etc. which would seem to be impossible. All future contacts must therefore be booked in advance - there is no open door

01:12:05 Perdita Barran: There is quite a lot of evidence on this already. We are front line and we are people who have a real responsibility to the students, especially as the rest of student support is hubbed and not discipline specific (i.e. they always deal with a new person).

01:12:13 NF Morrison (he/him/Neil): open zoom

01:12:33 Roy Wogelius: Thank you Bill for your candor

01:13:34 Pamila Sharma: Could such an approach (non-open door) have some potential university reputational concerns worldwide?

01:15:37 Perdita Barran: This also has been made a little harder with all the hybrid working of PS staff, so its academics who are in the building.

01:15:47 Jonathan Redfern: I think we also feel in EES an impact of the new Student Hub, with the effective closure of our Dept office where students used to come for advice etc. Of course this has been effected by Covid, but the lack of a way for students to have direct contact in the dept buildings is detrimental to student experience.

01:16:42 Richard Winpenny: Thank you Jonathan. Exactly the same issue in Chemistry

01:17:09 Perdita Barran: That is the same in Chemistry.

01:18:20 Alan Brisdon: Absolutely from chemistry. Students have not visited the hubs they instead inundate staff with emails resulting in getting a much slower response than if they can ask the questions face to face.

01:19:03 Nikesh Solanki: I would echo what Rob Sansom is saying in the Department of Mathematics context.

01:19:12 Jonathan Redfern: We could have advised you why the footfall would reduce. Because they are remotely located.

01:19:45 Judith McGovern: Another case where we are not listened to...

01:21:01 Lloyd Cawthorne: Do we have any feedback from students about this? (Perhaps some of the reps present might have some information.)

01:21:02 Nathan Owston: When we are evaluating/reviewing the effectiveness of the hubs could this be tied to the rationale (and evidence) for their introduction please?

01:21:04 Charles Darko: I believe we are teaching matured students but is there a process to report or deal with problematic students as a safeguard for staffs?

01:21:28 Arthur Wilkinson: Similar experience to Alan B, in Materials the email traffic to our student support email address (the replacement for the support office?) and to staff has increased significantly.

01:21:38 Alan Brisdon: All FSE DHoEs when consulted said "no" to hubs!

01:21:45 Perdita Barran: Where are the results of that process? We are all stating the opposite now.

01:21:46 Carl Poree: Students in the Chemistry Staff-Student Liaison Committee were unanimous in their preference for student support at a *departmental* level.

01:22:08 Eric McInnes: every consultation event I was involved in was very clear about the danger of losing local (deptl) contact

01:22:11 Mike Shaver: A consultation and changing plans in response to a consultation are two different things.

01:22:25 Sally Brown (she/her): it's not going to happen. SEP is WELL under way at University level.

01:22:30 Jamie Gooding: We've similarly expressed that support at department level is crucial in Physics

01:22:33 Bryony Quick (she/her): There was a SEP consultation process about student hubs across the uni, everyone that I know of (including in other faculties) said they didn't want them and that it was a bad idea, and then they went ahead with the hubs plan anyway.

01:23:21 Stuart Lyon: I'm sure a central hub is "more efficient" BUT is it "more effective"

01:23:26 Simon Cotter (he/him/his): The fact that a consultation has taken place is not evidence that a consultation was heard. Were the results of the consultation published?

01:23:50 Eric McInnes: we have discussed it, many times

01:24:00 Judith McGovern: I don't think we need more discussion

01:24:04 Stuart Lyon: Who was consulted and what were their views?

01:24:57 Bill Sampson: Everyone says that they don't want a centralised hub; we get centralised hubs. Almost no one says they want shared offices (actually an option that was never consulted on -- open plan was consulted on) We get shared offices. To what extent is consultation actually informing decisions?

01:25:21 NF Morrison (he/him/Neil): perhaps fairer to hear the case for the defence first

01:26:21 Mike Burton: It is a concern that university-wide decisions through SEP cannot be discussed or changed even if they might not be working as planned, demonstrated with low footfall in the central hubs.

01:27:20 Sally Brown (she/her): What happens to the grades 6 and 7 who have these SS&W roles starting in March across the University? It's too late.

01:28:05 Jamie Gooding: Unsure if reps are full voting members, but if not then I would like to make it clear that I would be voting in favour and that this is a view which has been widely held in physics for many years now.

01:28:33 Jamie Gooding: *held by students in physics !

01:28:56 Diyaco: I second Jamie's point

01:29:10 Kai Prince: Same here on Jamie's point

01:29:44 Cas Burton: Same here on Jamie's point

01:31:01 Ed: Same for me, students agree with all of these concerns, given they are aware of them. 3rd and 4th years understand (and oppose) these changes better than 1st and 2nd years, given that the latter basically don't know anything different.

01:35:58 Alex Eggeman: Just a quick comment about how does the feedback work the other way w.r.t senate and faculty committee? Are we doing everything we can to ensure issues from senate/faculty get raised at school board and hence onto departments. The last section of this meeting felt very rushed and it's hard to be sure we're raising all necessary/relevant issues

01:37:01 Judith McGovern: Good point Alex

01:38:06 Richard Winpenny: Alex. We have many Senate members - Phillipa, Bill Sampson, Nick Weise, me for example. I'd be happy to answer emails on what is going on in Senate. Mainly it has involved discussing implementation of the Halpin report on governance recently.

01:38:10 Philippa Browning: Good point Alex. We should have written reports from Senate and Faculty Committee and I will try and organise this. But ideally should also discuss. We should indeed send our views to Senate/Faculty - and we have done this in the past. It may get better if School Board Chairs are on Senate as reps of School

01:38:40 Philippa Browning: Meetings being rushed is a perennial problem. I don't know the answer. Suggestions on a postcard please

01:39:00 Alex Eggeman: the written report would be helpful to circulate for discussion at fora

01:46:42 Wendy Flavell: @Perdi: evidence also from IOP Publishing on this.

01:48:03 Meera Mehta: female and ethnic names also gets discriminated against by editors and referees when submitting to journals.

01:49:08 mwwssslr: Thanks Giles for all your work on the AS application

01:49:50 Lloyd Cawthorne: Can this open letter be shared?

01:50:59 Bill Sampson: Thanks, Giles.

You had the FCM listed as a positive. Does the submission show how the FCM aligns with recommendations of the Athena Forum's 2018 report of Work Allocation Models?

01:51:09 Merren Jones: Giles, in your analysis were you able to distinguish between the no. female applications for academic positions received, versus % of female applicants received who were shortlisted?

01:51:52 Diyaco: Lloyd do you want the open letter shared here?

01:52:02 Kai Prince: I don't know if this is the same letter Jamie is referring to but this one has 837 signatures currently:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1p7mj9l4ydJP_vttvIHB8XTd4zaA3JQEu/view

01:52:24 Giles Johnson (he/him): @merren, yes and overall the numbers were pretty flat. This does not however take into account possible hidden bias (eg female applicants better qualified on average but not shortlisted more)

01:54:49 Ed: I think that may be referring to the idea that the exams may have had to be put on online and thus were written with that in mind. So they are now closed book but written to fit both open or closed book style

01:55:36 Richard Winpenny: Going forward, please could we put the student reps early in the School board?

01:57:07 Bill Sampson: Agree with Richard -- don't want student reps feeling rushed.

01:57:48 Ed: I'd also just like to point out, many students have said that even if they had covid they would rather go against university/government advice and sit the exam, rather than risk forgetting the exam content/waste the revision time they have already spent. It's unfortunate, but really this situation penalises students for doing the right thing. (Not going to an exam and having to sit it in some less ideal circumstances later)

01:58:27 Philippa Browning: Fair enough. We do ask student reps for issues to put on the Agenda, so that in principle time can be allocated for things that need discussion. Apologies to reps this time for rushing you.

01:59:08 Diyaco: There is almost no support in place to give isolating students a fair chance

02:01:01 Cas Burton: Ed's point also emphasises the worries that students have that people with covid will still attend the exams, despite guidance otherwise. Students (especially those at high risk) will risk their health for exams with no guarantee that others will follow guidance

02:06:08 Richard Winpenny: Could Andrew answer the questions in chat from Ed, Diyaco and Cas please?

02:06:27 Kai Prince: There are also concerns about travel to exams. Some needing to take the train or trams. I personally take public transport regularly and regularly see that passengers do go against procedures by not wearing masks and shutting windows due to cold weather. This issue was brought up by those students in Maths who live at home in Greater Manchester

02:07:06 Ed: I fully appreciate that in person exams are essential to reduce cheating. However, the trade-off appears to be student health and well-being. I think students would like justification for that.

02:09:40 Merren Jones: You have done a great job Philippa- thank you