



**University of
Nottingham**
UK | CHINA | MALAYSIA

University Strategy Consultation

Comments received in the White Paper
consultation online questionnaire

If you wish to add further explanation for any of your responses, please use this space to do so. For example, if you have comments about any of the individual goals.

- I understand the concept that disruption can be positive (eg disruptive technology) however, disruption can also be very negative and soul-destroying, so I feel that the use of the word 'disruption' in the overarching vision could be misinterpreted.

- How is it going to be possible to ensure that every student and staff member has a global experience? It might be possible to provide an opportunity for this, but not everyone will be able to take up the opportunity. Not sure it will even be possible for *all* staff to have a global opportunity, let alone experience.

- I can see reference to students, academic staff and technical staff and students, but not other job families.

"Nurture potential by recruiting, and supporting individuals with the highest potential to succeed as students and staff." Talking about anonymised applications for staff, but it's not enough if people from under-represented groups aren't applying in the first place. More pro-active/ positive discrimination might be needed in how/ where jobs are advertised to appeal to those who may not consider a career at the University a possibility for them currently. Also, advertising many more jobs as being possible on a flexible/ PT/ job share/ term-time basis (and encouraging managers/ HR to consider how this could be possible in advance of advertising). Unfair to expect candidates to know how the job might be possible on this basis to justify this in their application, and puts off many potentially strong candidates who have caring responsibilities etc. (i.e. those from under-represented groups, especially in senior positions).

"Recruit to all staff posts using anonymised applications" - and recruitment process, staff pay/remuneration and other benefits should be equal on the three campuses not to disadvantage certain campuses in attracting researchers and lecturers of the highest quality

"Create a sabbatical leave entitlement to be used to develop new international research partnerships" - and ensure this is a blanket decision across Schools, Faculties, and Campuses - also, increasing primarily research staff numbers in schools and on campuses where teaching takes priority

"We could... Recruit to all staff posts using anonymised applications" - yes I think that some members of staff are excellent in their field of field of research but awful at interpersonal relations, or get a job through academic nepotism, so let's hope that the we could becomes we will

"We empower and support talented people – students and staff"

Then you are going to need to train managers to aid this. As far as I am aware managers at the University do not receive any sort of management training and that is one of the reasons why the management, at least in Student Services, is dreadful.

"Health and wellbeing – a caring community within which each individual is able to thrive in a safe and supportive environment"

To achieve this, workloads will need to be reduced and/or more staff employed. Whenever I tell my manager, or any other managers in Student Services, that I am insanely busy all I get is a shrug of the shoulders and a "well, tough" response.

"Quality in all we do – holding ourselves to high standards, and supporting each other to achieve them"

I am ridiculously busy in my job and it is impossible to concentrate on quality. I have to cut corners constantly. If the University wants more quality it will have to cut workloads and/or employ more staff in Student Services.

(a) Vision... "We are a university with beautiful campuses in three countries, inspiring a global outlook." - how does having three beautiful campuses inspire a global outlook? This seems very vague and tokenistic. How are the Values being transmitted to those campuses? Is there an EDI agenda on the international campuses? Are minority groups in the Malaysian and Chinese population adequately represented in the make up of the student bodies?

(b) The word 'disruption' in the Vision and mission statement should be reconsidered. Is disruptive innovation compatible with the stated values, especially 3, Fairness (etc) 4 Health and Wellbeing, and 6. Quality in all we do. All the signs in society are that disruptive innovation contributes to a reduction in wages, workplace rights, health and safety standards etc, In addition the word 'disruptive' is in vogue at present but will seem dated very quickly.

(c) "Future-proof our students" (see Goals section). This is nonsensical jargon. The phrase 'lifelong learning partnership' is adequate and could be clarified by adding something like "to support our students and alumni in adapting to ever changing environments".

(b) The environmental and sustainability goals are admirable but need to be addressed holistically rather than in siloed 'tick box' exercises. e.g. if we have a carbon-neutral campus but innovated technology that will contribute further to global warming the the former will simply be a 'fig-leaf' of environmental respectability.

...where disruption is seen as opportunity...' In Game of Thrones, Lord 'Littlefinger' famously said 'Chaos is a ladder'. This seems uncomfortably close to the line from the strategy document, and note that Littlefinger was at the core of a lot of very unpleasant and unfortunate events. When I think of some recent disruptions, I think of Brexit (which the university is rightly concerned about) and project transform (which has just generated a 100 page investigation and a historic apology from UEB) - I would say stability was a better opportunity to staff being able to get on with their jobs. Endless re-inventing systems and structures is not helpful to academic staff, even if it may keep some other staff members busy and employed.

Further, the goal 'Nurture potential by recruiting, and supporting individuals with the highest potential to succeed as students and staff.' is all very well as far as it goes, but what will the university do about students and staff who do not have the HIGHEST potential? Will staff who are not performing at quite this level be got rid of? it is rather ominous. And what about students who are struggling in some way - there is no hint of support for anyone who is not in the absolute top bracket. What is perhaps should say is 'Nurture potential by recruiting, and supporting individuals TO HAVE the highest potential to succeed as students and staff.'

Finally, in the text at the bottom right of the document it says we could 'Create a sabbatical leave entitlement to be used to develop new international research partnerships'. This is all well and good but the type of sabbatical that most staff probably need is one where they get the chance to write up their accumulated backlog of publications, rather than chasing new money that will lead to an ever-increasing pile of not-quite-finished-off work. Recall that funding often brings in a post doc or a PhD students and these often leave a few months before the end of the project (post docs) to get a new job and PhD students rarely write up all the papers they could out of their theses - so the backlog ratchets up with time increasing the mental and actual work-load burden

on staff who have a decreasing ability to catch up as the years roll on. The type of Sabbatical that would probably be most valued by staff is thus a proper catch up sabbatical - leading to publications, not new grants per se - but the university does not seem in the least interested in activities that do not directly generate money. It should be realized that chasing money and thus not being able to complete current work properly is extremely bad for staff well being. Further, writing-up sabbaticals would be almost guaranteed to produce outputs (books, papers) while applying for funding typically leads to failure (are there ANY sources with a >50% success rate? in my field it is 10-20%).

o

1. It may be helpful to clarify what is meant by 'succeed' 'success'
2. Not sure fully anonymised applications for staff positions is the way to go
3. Very positive about exploring creative use of space to promote collaboration/synergy
4. It is an ambitious strategy, to deliver it I would like to see better appreciation of the pressure on e.g. R&T staff, and a move towards more focused roles
5. Many research staff would welcome a more formal sabbatical entitlement. In my experience this is only ever offered if you raise your own funding and employ teaching staff to cover your teaching load. There needs to be more slack in the system to facilitate research active staff taking 'study leave' (a more accurate term than the literal meaning of sabbatical...although I would welcome the latter as well!). This will foster more creativity and international collaboration.

1. The bits that excited me most were the aspects that not all other UK HEIs would necessarily have in their strategies in the ways we can, viz. the environmental sustainability and international/global angles. The other goals, however, would be shared by practically all HEIs, certainly Russell Group ones, and they leave me feeling a bit underwhelmed. 'We are stewards of a pioneering and entrepreneurial tradition of creativity and innovation.' But couldn't most universities say the same? Is there something unique about Nottingham's foundation that we could reflect more explicitly here?
2. Can we frame some of this in terms of building community? And the interconnectedness of these communities - students, staff, alumni, employers, civic engagement all benefiting one another? Given Nottingham's motto (sapientia urbs conditur), could we be more obvious about the impacts on the city that we hope to have in the future - there are some good ideas in the green paper report, but many of these seem a bit low key (opening up our facilities to local groups, enabling local people to work here etc.) Is there something more ambitious we could be doing that's different from NTU?
3. Be careful about how the Nottingham 'core' might be seen by prospective students; it might seem like a straitjacket to some, and not as a selling point. And really the elements of the core should be embedded as appropriate in the year 1 subject-specific modules (what we need is better curriculum design, not just a bolt-on: it will be resented by students).
4. Having an international mind-set: instead of framing it 'decolonising the curriculum', can we be more positive? - can we talk instead about creating inclusive curricula? Doing this broadens the discussion from 'just' issues of race (important though those undoubtedly are). It also reinforces the idea that we are very serious about our Access and Participation Plan objectives; (I like the idea of contextualised offers, though this would presumably be very resource intensive).
5. We should definitely move to anonymised staff recruitment.
6. We need to be careful how we nuance offering paid placements etc. for all students, though the aim is a noble one. How is that relevant to students taking a PGCEi, who are usually already working as teachers in other countries? We need ways to ensure that every student finds an identity they recognise in this strategy. Beware of oversimplified goals framed in ways to make them easy to remember - is there a meta goal we are aiming at here? Is it that we want all our students to have real-world, hands-on national/international experiences? and offering paid placements might be one route to that?

A core value could be: Active, in body and mind - physical activity and sport promotes development of an active mindset, as well as a culture of teamwork. (recognising value of opportunities provided by UoN Sport and the David Ross Sports Village - a facility to rival all other Universities, and simple value of sports/activities offered by the Uni to promote well-being, as well as future employability through values sport teaches, eg discipline of training, time management, teamwork, people management, awareness of self and others, leadership opportunities for captains, dealing with disappointment)

Importance of the University's sport offering is illustrated by the positive impact that UoN sports membership, or playing for a club, has on future employability of students - evidenced in research data by University's Careers and Employability Service.

In Goals section, to include collaboration with sporting associations, as well as academic subjects and disciplines.

A couple of comments/suggestions:

1) How much buy-in is there from staff for the following: "where disruption is seen as opportunity"? In reality, I suspect that only a very small proportion of staff/students would agree with this; instead we cope as best we can with disruption in the University/wider political landscape. I would prefer to take that bit out, or consider rewording it to better reflect how staff/students are likely to feel about disruption and how we respond to this.

2) Have we checked the following with external stakeholders: "a culture of experimenting which recognises that experiments do not always succeed"? This may not play well with the lay public ("experimenting" often seen in a negative context, e.g. doing nasty things to animals)

A couple of things I'd like to comment on:

- Not all programmes can be made part-time and/or flexible - please consult with all schools on this as anything involving placements (eg in NHS) or involving partnership with other HEI will be difficult to convert.

- Giving all alumni access to online learning resources - not sure which resources so please consult with all schools and IT on this; during my years here, we've used the Portal system, WebCT and now Moodle so there are massive implications; also, GDPR should be considered if it is teaching materials. However, if it's giving them access to ever changing resources, then there's just the IT issue of maintaining "millions" of IT accounts.

A lot of emphasis for research is being given to the Beacons, what about supporting staff especially women in mid-career who have unique research excellence but do not fit in the Beacons? The gap between various faculties needs to be eliminated by encouraging more inter-faculty relationships. at present, there is a huge gap in communication between faculties. The University does not seem to operate as one entity when it comes to for example REF return where an individual's contribution across disciplines (faculties) might simply be ignored if there is no contributing member from another discipline. This does not encourage researchers to maintain their research excellence.

A phrase that I have considered valuable is to create students prepared to take full responsibility as global citizens.

The phraseology is quite University centric rather than centred on the student impact upon others as a consequence of being at Nottingham with its multiple benefits. Similarly the research statements could be more strongly phrased to emphasise the global impact of research output on world communities.

Academic justice and freedom must be guaranteed, and students' life affairs and party and government conditions should not be contaminated with academic work. Schools should review the existing activities. Students are reluctant to participate in some activities because of their own quality problems, publicity problems or redundant activities. Students should have the right to

choose whether to participate in activities or not. At the same time, the school should examine whether the existing community organizations are redundant, and provide necessary site support for the corresponding community organizations and student activities. For community organizations, offices and exclusive site equipment are necessary, without which it is difficult for them to maintain the current level and continue to develop at the current level. In addition, the time arrangement of different departments in schools is very independent, without considering the actual situation of students. [Text redacted] Then, can we have a department that can carry out inter-department communication and coordination on behalf of students from the perspective of the essence of students based on similar situations? At the same time, compared with the department, the business school of the Chinese campus has much poorer resources, such as no special library or classroom videos. Can we take into account the three colleges in the development of our university? We can see the rapid development of polytechnic with many subordinate research institutes. Business and humanities and social sciences also need the support and attention of the school, and enjoy the same treatment as the school of business.

Add [text redacted] as one of our organizations.

Adding supervisory department

Adding supervisory department.

After read the white paper, I fully interest to read the digital infrastructure section, especially for high performance of digital communication that focus on country geographical and also can reduce air travel. I pleasure that it has been consist for the proposal strategy. I can't imagine that the three campuses of UoN which have different time and geographical would be connecting for the live dialogue, meeting, lecturing, supervising and collaborating at the real time. Moreover when 5G has been coming for UNNC, and I hope next for UNUK and UNM, then connected and linked, for that and other purposes for better sustainable growth up.

Agree very much to the idea of 'Consolidation' rather than just growth.

Also would like to re-emphasise the need to inter-connect the three campuses - through structure (governance) and technology - given its two prime assets in Malaysia (node for South East, South and West Asia) and China (East Asia) - be it for research or teaching/learning.

Although great environmental steps have already been made, more ambitious environmental goals are needed, such as a total ban on single use plastic across all campuses.

Although I understand that this strategy has to be quite general to cover the breadth of the entire University, I feel that they are quite vague and so difficult in the long-term to actually assess whether we are achieving our strategy overall. The sustainability section is a concrete marker, but not sure about how we assess and reflect on the other sections as easily. For example, it is not clear what examples of how the university will 'Nurture potential by recruiting, and supporting individuals with the highest potential to succeed as students and staff.', particularly staff in the examples, as this is very student focussed and needs to be supplemented to cover staff. Agree that EDI is important, but within this, it should be clearly stated, that this would be used to ensure the most talented and ambitious staff are recruited, so it does not just seem like a quota filling exercise.

An additional University goal should be to develop better linkages with key sectors of Industry both research support and education. In particular, areas of key strengths such as Food and Engineering.

As a member of UNNC, everything in this school makes a difference to me. And I will try my best to contribute to this school.

As a student in China campus, I do feel like a better connection with international partners and companies should be more integrated, as this will increase the likelihood of us, students, being recognised by the world.

As a student in foundation programme, I think that the first semester break given to foundation students of April intake(between Semester 0 and Semester 1) is too long for them to spend. I am

now having the semester break and I don't know what to do other than waiting for the lessons to start. Hope that change will be made accordingly.

As always, I'm proud of myself as I was one of the graduates of the Uni of Notts . I suggest the university make a big event by inviting its alumni at the University Park that will make the world happy alumni day.

As an exchange student from Europe (but not UK) I like the international focus. Please keep on doing so!

As Director of ESE at NUBS I have a few comments.

There is much to applaud in the mission, vision, values and goals being proposed.

I have some concerns relating to some of the proposals and examples.

Idea: "Recruit all UK undergraduate students via contextualised offers". I would welcome some clarity on this. Does this mean a different offer, in principle, to each applicant? If so, does this not require a significant resource to manage? What will be published as a course's entry requirement? How will this effect entry tariffs as used in league tables?

Idea: "Make all our programmes genuinely accessible on a part-time and flexible basis, using technology to support this". This would need careful consideration. There is clearly an adverse implication for programme design and innovation brought about by the necessary staggered nature of this type of offering. There will also be many other hidden costs for staff involved in running and teaching those courses which have both a full-time and part time variant, as we have experienced with a few of our courses which have attempted this model. Regarding undergraduate programmes in particular, is there evidence of strong demand?

Green Paper: more provision of online courses. There needs to be a thorough assessment of costs and market demand of this form of provision. Where our competitors offer this, the production values are invariably very high quality and therefore these courses are expensive to produce. An assessment needs to be made of the longevity of recorded materials. Demand needs to be carefully gauged, as experience in the business school sector suggests that these courses are only viable for a few top-ranked Schools.

Green paper: "More flexibility in the curriculum with opportunities to study across traditional discipline boundaries". This seems laudable but we must not lose sight of the great value placed on discipline based courses by our students. In addition, curriculum regulations make it problematic to share modules across different degree programmes, in particular in respect of making changes at the module and programme level. Also, many schools (including NUBS) face accreditation requirements which militate against this form of programme.

As mental health is a major issue on campus, this needs more focus and practical ways in which to tackle this need to be outlined - particularly around physical activity. Over 25,000 students are involved with sport in some form at the University and this involvement can benefit their health and wellbeing greatly - from simply being a way to make friends, to improving graduate job prospects, to supporting the development of their confidence.

Basically 'apple pie and mother hood' but not ambitious enough on sustainability, and the rest is a bit hard to read.

It is odd to start the whole document focusing on the real estate.. I'd make that the last of the mission points, and link it to sustainability right there at the top of the document- this is likely to be something that is of importance to the young people we teach and to be an existential issue for us all in the period of this text anyway.

Very very happy to see sustainability as a goal, and a proposal to become carbon neutral. We can lead the way in this. However the examples for future plans under this goal are largely 'green wash'. What about some real tangible goals on sourcing renewable power, installing hardware or software to turn off pc screens at night, and to turn of computers which are idle (you may assume this already happened by I can see them all illuminating the offices next to me as I leave the building at 7 pm)

Since sustainability RIGHTLY gets a highlight shouldnt EDI too? [also honest commercial practices (anti bribery and anti slavery) also get a mention somewhere although they only indirectly link to the UoN hopefully]

You dont nurture potential by recruiting people with potential! You recruit people with high potential and then nurture them to achieve their best

future proofing students seems a silly use of language which will antagonise many.. why not 'we will equip our students with the flexible approach needed to excel.... '.

Some of the goals (particularly 3 4 and 6) are too wordy.. because they are trying to cover all bases.. it might be better to just saying ;in all our activities' (in goal 3 'its' should read 'their' but it is bad english anyway- We will solve problems and improve lives !! 'improve lives' would be enough).

Collaboration features strongly, as it should, in several goals. My experience is that this area is not strong in Nottingham and it requires a step-change in culture and approach to ensure all categories of staff and students are respected and valued as partners. However it should be included in the goals.

'Future proofing' students is probably impossible although I appreciate the genuine wish behind the statement. However we must make our goals real and a stating something that is beyond (ours or indeed anyone's) ability devalues the impact. We need to ensure we do the best we can and not include in our content things we cannot influence or change.

International collaboration (last 2 goals) is essential and we should focus on what we hold dear and not claim we can remove all international borders. We must be aspirational, but not worded in a way that can make us sound pretentious or out of touch

Sustainability is essential as a goal but this will mean we need to ensure our buildings really are heading towards sustainability - at present I do not see evidence of this.....but hopefully in the future I will.....

Improved infrastructure is not mentioned as a goal but is referred to in the draft. The current fragmented nature of systems, ways of working and approaches is, for me, the most frustrating and limiting aspect of our working environment

Despite a rather vague reference to Health and Wellbeing in values, there is nothing within the strategy that seeks to drive value from within health and fitness sector. Nationally, a huge emphasis has been placed on supporting students through physical recreation, sport and fitness asa positive enabler to enhancing and supporting welfare. It feels completely absent within the universities current strategy and is an omission from the current white paper.

The University has not only a duty of care to its students in providing such opportunities but embracing sport and activity generates ancillary competitive advantages in student recruitment and marketing.

The University current has excellent facilities in the sport, but should make a commitment to continuing to improve the provision of sport/fitness to enable a healthy and happy campus to

thrive in support of its academic prowess.

For the pursuit of a healthy and active campus to be absent from the University strategy, either stated or implied is remarkable. Particularly considering the University of Nottingham's standing as the 2019 University of the year for Sport. It would seem appropriate to embrace this achievement and the national recognition for delivering excellence in sport and fitness on campus, rather than reject it and/or consciously ignore the role that sport and fitness plays in student welfare and wellbeing.

To write this glowing aspect of University of Nottingham out of its future direction would be a grave mistake.

EDI suggestion- free sanitary products in all bathrooms for staff and students who menstruate. Period poverty affects students and staff who menstruate at all levels. The 'Equalities Impact Assessment for the scheme to provide access to period products in education institutions in England' largely focuses on primary and secondary school education (https://www.equallyours.org.uk/departments-for-education-impact-assessment-period-products-scheme/?utm_source=Equally%20Ours%20Newsletter&utm_campaign=44367e0f17-July%20newsletter%2018%2F07%2F2019&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_104ed5022f-44367e0f17-112939125&fbclid=IwAR0IzB9Vpx07Q3fLZNjF7Hg4ZrHAffqwVsP2MNz15STdx_E-sMUjti3pTRk). However, many of the findings from the report could relate to the Higher Education sector. Furthermore, anecdotal evidence from a 'free period products' scheme in the Humanities Building indicates the importance of free sanitary products as one student remarked that they were a 'huge help as she's basically not able to afford the products all the time and that period poverty affects her studies otherwise'. Small initiatives are being started in Schools and the Vice Chancellor for EDI Sarah Sharples is on board. However, there needs to be a coordinated campaign for donations at Faculty level that is strongly supported by the University in order for best practice to be shared. This would be a boost to student experience that would be in favour of the University. Anecdotal evidence also suggests that there would be a strong positive response from menstruating staff.

everything is right now

Excellent job, all the best

One comment

In terms of the enabler: Decision making could include also the resident but also other stakeholders e.g. distant alumni that have adopted the legacy and are ambassadors of the university. Perhaps in an advisory role, Organise the Alumni Summits?

Explanation of how to achieve the balance between central and local decision making would be very helpful. In particular, mention of working in partnership with campus trade unions and emphasising the importance of Senate in decision making would help underscore the commitment to good governance. In terms of health and well-being, tackling the problem of excessive workload is essential and its absence here is surprising given that this is a matter of which HR and virtually every University manager is aware. Finally, in terms of ambitions toward sustainability, it would be worth considering a scheme such as the following:
<https://www.climateperks.com/>

EXTERNAL RELATIONS: LEADERSHIP TEAM RESPONSE

Summary View:

The key ingredients are all there, but needs some wordsmithing to be more inspirational.

Mission:

Descriptive and insufficiently distinctive – could be more active: “Our mission is to be a global university, helping address the big global challenges, looking outwards for partners and

collaborations, and inspiring our students to do the same. This global outlook is embodied in our three beautiful campuses.”

Vision:

The ‘University without borders’ ambition is powerful and could guide the Vision, esp in a world where borders are hardening. ‘Borderless’ covers our global outlook, inclusion, local community, lifelong engagement, future proofing, pedagogy and research, partnerships and engagement. (cf University of Reading strategy – “Limitless.” A single word that expresses its entire approach.

Strong reaction against buzzwords like “disruption” - over-used, dating quickly, and will become a negative in the post-Brexit chaos we will face. It also underplays the fact that universities are also places of history and tradition – we preserve as well as disrupt.

Crudely, but perhaps: “A university without borders, proud of its history as a place of creativity and integrity, but open to new ideas, and open to the global, national and local communities of which it is a part.”

Values:

These are good – but could we say more about how we will ensure we all live up to them?

Goals:

These are strong, but could some of the example actions be more emblematic? Could we introduce more quid pro quo? Plenty here about what the University will do – what do we ask of staff and students in return?

nurturing potential: eg diversity is not a compromise to excellence but fundamental to it; in the mission to be excellent, but that it is fundamental to it.

future proof: the lifelong connection offer looks really interesting

solve problems and improve lives: perhaps more emphasis (re-statement) on the mission-driven approach?

sustainability: we could (and should) make so much of this, are the actions sufficiently inspiring? Could we eg say how this will guide our choices on research, partnerships, carbon reduction?

Enablers:

Greater emphasis needed here, as they are important hygiene factors for staff and students, so they need emblematic actions too.

people: more on expectations as well as offer...we will reward excellence, engage, consult but we expect staff to be part of distributive leadership, live our values etc

decision making: need to overcome (mis)perceptions of limited staff autonomy, can we say more about delegated decision making, distributed leadership?

infrastructure: need to be 110% clear that this is about improving what we have NOT feeding the UCU myth of grand projects at the expense of staff.

fundamentals: leading with health & safety is a double-edged sword. Yes, it is important, yes we need to improve, but in an all-encompassing document like a corporate strategy, the term is open

to ridicule. Could we present this in a different way, perhaps talking about working environment that enables staff to thrive (links to infrastructure above).

risk management: more here about a culture and processes that encourage calculated risk taking, and acceptance that we will accept failure as well as success (much as happens in our research activities?).

Extra Curricular activity such as Societies, Sports, Volunteering etc. is not mentioned.

Disappointing to see given that ownership, affiliation, community, well-being, philanthropy, employability and international inclusivity are all by-products of EC activity.

Feedback on the University Strategy White Paper

Vision & Mission

- I believe that one of our core purposes is to help develop our students at a vital transition point in their life, and ultimately help them to achieve their potential, become the best version of themselves they can and prepare them for the future. I think we could be more explicit about this in the vision statement. We make reference to 'empowering people to achieve their potential' in the enablers section. I would move it in to our Vision and Mission. For example the second point 'we empower and support talented people – students and staff – to collaborate in learning, scholarship and discovery across the full breadth of human experience, solving problems, improving lives', would benefit from adding 'and achieving their own potential' at the end.

- The statement 'where ambitious people enable us to thrive' almost sounds a bit self-indulgent and exploitative of our students / staff. Surely it would be better to talk about creating an environment / culture that enables our students / staff to thrive, and equally to talk about the impact we will have on the wider community (like Imperial below).

- Personally I get little sense from the Vision & Mission of where we are looking to position the university in the broader landscape, and how we know if we have achieved success. When I read other University strategies they talk more about being world-class establishments, about excellence, for example

- o Warwick: 'By 2030, Warwick will be one of the world's exceptional universities, helping to transform our region, country and world for the collective good'

- o Imperial College London's mission is to achieve enduring excellence in research and education in science, engineering, medicine and business for the benefit of society.

- o UCL: Our distinctive approach to research, education and innovation will further inspire our community of staff, students and partners to transform how the world is understood, how knowledge is created and shared and the way that global problems are solved.

- o Manchester: Our vision is for The University of Manchester to be one of the leading universities in the world by 2020.

- o Bristol: 'Our vision is to sustain and improve upon our world-leading reputation for research, and embrace educational innovation that will nurture skilled, adaptable and resilient graduates.'

- o Edinburgh's purpose: As a world-leading research-intensive University, we are here to address tomorrow's greatest challenges. Between now and 2030 we will do that with a values-led approach to teaching, research and innovation, and through the strength of our relationships, both locally and globally.

I am not sure I get a sense of that here. The values and how we want to behave comes through very clearly, but I am not sure I am clear where we want this to take the University.

Values

- ‘Inclusivity’ comes through strongly throughout, which is good.
- It is good to see the word ‘Ambition’ in here, noting some of my other comments.
- Noting the national crises in mental health and obesity, it is good to see ‘Health & Wellbeing’ as a value. However I do feel the definition that follows is a little woolly. Terms such as caring, supportive and safe do not necessarily steer people towards an active and healthy lifestyle, which is something we ought to be promoting to act as a prevention as well as a cure for some of the aforementioned national crises. We are also one of the leading Universities in the country for sport and physical activity, and I genuinely believe some of the benefits from this such as attainment, graduation prospects, inclusion, retention, alumni affinity all stem from this. The recent investment in the David Ross Sports Village has clearly demonstrated our intent in this space. Therefore I feel we ought to be more explicit about sport and physical activity if we are to be serious about promoting Health & Wellbeing, noting that it also delivers a number of

First and foremost, kudos for doing this. I admire the intent to involve the alum community in exploring new strategic options. It will be interesting to see how the feedback received translates into the final document (at least the visible part of it made available on the website).

At the same time, there are a few issues that are quite puzzling. First, the word “technology” is mentioned in a dense two-page document only once. It is not clear, how this prepares the school for the world where thinkers and doers are pushing humanity to expand consciousness beyond one planet and merge it with AI in the not-so-distant future (Musk et al.) Second, even though research commands a strong presence in the proposed content, the role of science appears to have been downgraded from Values to Goals. Especially, when compared to a simple statement in “Our vision for 2020”: Undertaking fundamental and transformative discovery. I am not sure if the school’s pivot towards becoming an edutainment facility would be welcomed and/or respected by many. Third, the understanding of community seems to be shifting from being rather inclusive (“Sustaining and improving the places and communities in which we are located”) to signaling exclusivity through the use of the determiner “our”. It would be great to see the school taking a more proactive approach in contributing to the development of the diverse communities, which play an immense role in supporting innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems that drive progress.

To sum up, if disruption is to be seen as opportunity (as envisioned), the content of the strategic document must reflect that in word and in spirit.

Regards and respect,

[text redacted]
MA in Marketing
2014

p.s.: Nott taught me a lot. Critical thinking was one of the greatest gifts I received there. I hope that by challenging the established thinking I will inspire change. Change that helps my alma mater break away from the confinement of path dependency and organizational politics to propel a good school to greatness.

For 21st Century, the proposed strategy is not forward looking as one needs to realise that current university model is not really compatible to the aspirations of the 21st Century students and

probable available future opportunities. Although, idea of Nottingham Innovation Centre and offering every University of Nottingham student an international opportunity are brilliant.

For environmental goals, I suggest the implementation of banning single-use plastics on the campus in accordance with the global movement in going zero single-use plastics.

Besides, the university should provide education to the food stall owners on campus in reducing single-use plastics, they may provide a more eco-friendly alternative for take-away containers. Although there is an initiative in encouraging students to use their own containers to take away, it is not enough if the consumers do not know the reasons behind it.

I suggest that to educate the consumers and also give consumers who bring their own containers any kinds of discount as they save the cost of the single-use container, also to encourage more consumers to do so.

For waste management, I am satisfied with the existing plan that the university send the food waste collected at the cafeteria to be composted. Also, I am happy to see there are recycling bins provided in the cafeteria area, but my question is, are the recyclable trash sent to the recycling authorities or treated as general waste and send to the landfill?

I also hope to see food waste bin provided in accommodation areas so that all food waste goes to compost. Sending food waste to be compost instead of landfill could save the university on the transport cost, reducing the carbon footprint and also compost could reduce the emission of methane gas from the food waste to the atmosphere.

I suggest having students be educated on managing food waste correctly so that the university could save cost on sending trash to the landfill.

In promoting the university into a greener campus, I suggest the university to organise more green activities to encourage students to be more aware of the environmental issues happening around us. This is because the implementation is useless if people do not understand the reason. Before entering the society, the university plays a significant role in educating students to be more responsible towards our planet.

I hope there are more and more on-going programmes to raise awareness of environmental issues on the campus, such as more development in the existing community garden on campus, reducing the use of single-use plastics in everyday life / during the bazaar on campus, etc.

I hope that the university will look into my suggestions and carry out possible implementation as soon as possible.

For the "sufficiently ambitious" to move to "strongly agree" I'd like to see a date on the carbon neutrality goal - we're making progress but think we should be further along and leading in this area. I'm glad to see this in the strategy though.

Give the employment suggestion for the last-year postgraduate students who are graduated in November.

Given that there is now significant political will and pressure to close the growing inequalities gap, we should strive to focus on supporting the most vulnerable in our society.

Specifically, there is significant health inequity and I would like the university to invest in exploring ways we can develop new interventions and care pathways. I suggest the following changes to the goal:

"Solve problems and improve lives of everyone, particularly those who find themselves marginalised, through education, research and knowledge exchange of the highest quality and through its application to local and global challenges."

Given the importance of sport, fitness and physical activity to our students and staff (improved mental health, reduced risk of chronic disease, help with relaxation, improved energy levels, weight control, social integration, making friends, having fun, list goes on) i am surprised there isn't greater reference and importance placed on it in the strategy. I accept that there is 'significant support for the continuation of our world class sports facilities' and reference to 'improved facilities at Sutton Bonington' but i strongly feel that this isn't enough to keep pace with the students and staff needs and trends. We are experiencing great success in our sport teams and awards for participation programmes, which is helping to reach to inactive students, but there is still much more work and investment required. Our sports and fitness facilities are becoming busier each year, which is great to see as we are helping students and staff (for all the reason above), but we will need further investment and development to maintain this service and support level. Improving student and staff Health and Wellbeing is rightly a hot topic at present and sport and fitness directly influences and supports this aim. To support this, I note that 'By far the highest number of comments in this category (Health, safety and wellbeing) were related to student mental health and a perceived lack of capacity and resources in this area'. Sport, exercise and physical activity is proven to support mental health and wellbeing so surely this has to go up the priority list to support students and staff.

Finally, Sport and fitness has been at the heart of the institution since its conception; quote from UoN website - 'The sport's facilities were an integral part of Sir Jesse's vision for the new campus. He believed that providing students with open spaces and the opportunity to exercise would improve their health and enable them to get the most out of their studies. I hope that consideration can be given to raise the positioning of sport, fitness and physical activity in the strategy.

Given the slide in the University Rankings I would suggest that priority #1 should be to raise standards across the university in teaching, testing and a laser-like focus on outcomes. A lot of what is in the strategy document is somewhat woolly and misses the number one point of University - education.

Yes I agree university is a great place to prepare students for life, a great place to find your feet after leaving home, to interact with like-minded people and to discover who you really are, but that's secondary to its original purpose. I had one of the best times of my life at Nottingham, but I originally went there based on its reputation as a place to learn, not to do the Campus 14 (fun as that was too)!

Once you address the standard of education provided you can spend time and resources on everything else. A well-rounded university 'experience' isn't worth much if the university education standards continue to slide versus our competitors.

I like the idea of the university acting as a local ambassador to local schools to improve their standards and help students. This doesn't/shouldn't cost much, helps secondary/primary students in local schools, generates goodwill towards the uni and isn't a distraction from raising standards at the uni back to the levels they were at 20-years ago (speaking from a rankings table perspective). An obvious pool of talent to do this are the students at the university itself.

I hope you find some of what I have written to be useful.

Regards,

[text redacted] (Postgrad Economics 1997 & 1999 graduation)

PS- I can recommend the book: Good Strategy/Bad Strategy (The Difference and Why it Matters), by Richard Rumelt

Good job! Keep it up!

Great to see this on two sides - really easy to digest.

My only feedback is around the simplicity of the Values. Having 4-6 one word values (even better if they form an anagram!) make them so much easier to remember and recall i.e. Innovative, Collaborative, Excellence, International, Caring, Transparent

Having ambitions to do better is good, but not to the extent of overworking staff and students. It needs to be accepted that sometimes we should accept more modest goals if that means that staff and students have a better balance between work and home.

Having more short study abroad opportunities and not imposed any limits as long as the study is essential or directly related to the student's major.

[redacted response suggesting that too many international students are recruited and that admissions requirements for these students are lower than those for Home students]

Hello - could the order of the values be re-ordered - having the first value being about the beautiful campuses - could this value be lower down and not the first thing we read
For the goals some of the examples given show that there is a commitment to Widening Participation and being a civic university but the headline goals maybe don't convey this - so make this clearer in the wording of the goals

We could:

Offer every student a paid placement.....

As a member of staff involved in helping students secure placements I welcome that this could be extended to more students. For every student - this would require a huge investment in resources to support this. Aston Uni committed to this but found they could not get higher than 70% I think - some students want to go into teaching, a PhD or have other reasons for finishing their degree in 3 years. I think Aston then had no staff for other careers activity. This needs to be written in consultation with the Careers & Employability Service.

The idea of a common module sounds good - for students at Sutton Bonington and Jubilee this could be a way for these students to work with students at Uni Park. The idea about sustainability is good and Sheffield Uni have recently made a similar commitment.

Hi, a few comments and some ideas below.

In short though, I think there is an issue with how innovation and vision is put into place in reality in this University. The issue is essentially of gatekeepers and hierarchy - the institution is old fashioned, with a culture of roles, rules and outdated promotion routes. Far too much of a managerial approach (not a leadership approach) from academics who have been promoted within, but don't have the vision or skills to effect genuine change. Well paid individuals who don't have the drive to take Schools forward and who don't take the lead in making changes.

E.g. There is resistance to things like registration being electronic. Leaders of courses wanting to play safe, do what they've always done. Moving from flipped learning back to large lectures (because it's what they've always done). Paper, they understand and so on. Where we have had genuine innovators, they are often tempted away by other organisations as they're not appreciated fully.

We're losing to competitors, in my area [text redacted] we don't have the latest equipment for all divisions to recruit effectively in Open Days as compared to competitors.

Make open days more exciting. We shouldn't be recruiting or going through clearing in [text redacted], our courses are good. We're getting left behind other non RG universities. We can't and shouldn't rely on RG.

The NSS issues are very often process related. We have a timetable system that is crap. It looks appalling, we can't even order or view courses in chronological order, academics find it a nightmare to sort their module timetables each year. It's core business, it shouldn't be such an issue.

It is hard to get Marketing support. In my experience, marketing is conservative, particularly where there needs to be movement, e.g. Distance learning. Let's just get on with it - the University takes an age to do anything. It needs to take risks, but also to use the talent with its walls. Too much reliance on outside consultancies who only want our business (see Project Transform for reference).

You don't use the talent of APM staff enough. We're constrained by job roles and often don't have autonomy to lead on projects with academics - example. I was brought into a project to create exciting learning materials for an online course. But in the end, I was asked to book meetings and do project admin and the exciting work was farmed out to the central unit. I have 20 years experience in that area, but felt incredibly sidelined and not respected professionally. (element of sexism there also I suspect).

Good ideas - flexibility - flexible start dates. Lets do it (Coventry are, why can't we?).

Distance learning - let's just get on with it. We could be using the huge reach of e.g. FutureLearn/EdEx/Coursera to market distance courses.

Environment - put 'reuse' first. E.g. every item in the new cafe Hipps for instance is thrown away. Recyclable doesn't mean it's best for the environment. Reuse is preferable.

Produce a carbon footprint for every project - and look to reduce plane travel where possible. We have the tools to remote work - online conferences etc. A lot of trips aren't strictly necessary, and not everyone needs to go.

Educate staff and students to recycle. It's a micro point, but even locally bins are full of the wrong thing. Maybe appoint staff as 'green advisers' in their local work area, similar to appointed print champions! Also a good opportunity for staff to gain new areas of expertise.

Salary increase/vouchers for non-car users - incentives.

Opportunities for staff to undertake modules of interest around the university - build up credits over the years?

Thanks, I'm sorry if it sounds a bit cynical, but I think the biggest issue is putting it into practice - it needs to be worded in such a way that it will happen effectively, and in all parts of the University. Culture change will be the biggest challenge.

High level description with no specific and timed targets. Research ambition seems to be revolving around the Beacons that however do not map to all research groups in the University.

What about supporting blue skies research?

<p>Honestly, it all seems a bit vague. Little of contrite value to the problems we see here in UNNC.</p>
<p>hope can consider how to focus on the development of PG students in UNNC</p>
<p>Hope to see structures that will allow for more global integration</p>
<p>How will this feed into the student union and the way we conduct our work.</p>
<p>I agree with the proposed content. I think it valuable for future development for UNNC</p>
<p>I am a bit disappointed that sport and physical activity hasn't been mentioned in the strategy. For myself and a number of colleagues and peers I know that Sport can support so many parts of University life (for example student mental health, providing staff the opportunity to network, physical health and wellbeing of both staff and students, allowing a work/life balance, developing life skills, providing stress release during tough times of the year.</p>
<p>For myself, it would be great to see Sport and Physical Activity represented.</p>
<p>I am a member of the Sports Board and I am concerned that the Strategy does not have enough in it to do with ensuring the Health and Wellbeing of the students.</p>
<p>I am an Full time International MBA student in Malaysia and have lived one in campus too. The strategy that is being made is for UK campus look like it. If is for Malaysian campus as well then I am sorry to say that it will fail badly for international students. As I made a lot of friends during this one year from all across the world on campus we all had the same issues. The career office is not helpful when it comes to international students it seems like they only helpful to Malaysian National students, This I have heard from former students as well. Secondly, the MBA is offered at KLTC and is a shame that university does not have a place for international students to stay near the KLTC one has to live on campus and the come for classes travelling every day. There has been no effort by the university to connect MBA students from rest of the university. I lived on campus so I took part in nation cup and made new friends where as others have no clue what the university is doing. If you want to have higher ranking for MBA you need to have Dean who not discouraging to international a students to apply in the region he sounds racist and unhelpful. The dean and careers office should help international students look for jobs around the region but they like to sit on their bump and do nothing,</p>
<p>I am eager to go abroad !</p>
<p>I am not clear which one is our mission statement. Maybe we may start the statement with "Our mission is".</p>
<p>I especially like the Values Statement. Of course we will need to share best practices to staff especially medium and top management so that they show good example to the staff who are on the ground how we may embrace these principles.</p>
<p>I am particularly pleased to see the strategy move from a statement of 'grand ambition' to goals that are more grounded in the 'how' as much as the 'what'. This is a big step forward. The strategy's goals also better reflect the changing nature and expectations of HE within the UK - the goal to more closely couple teaching and research as mutually beneficial and reinforcing activities is very helpful and should begin to address the divisive attitudes to these different activities that have pervaded the University over the last decade. The prioritisation of environmental sustainability is critical - we simply must show leadership in this area and the strategy is correct to identify the environmental impacts of our international travel and suggest incorporating environmental sustainability into all of our curricula (a potential USP for us). However, we must be careful not to over-emphasise 'big-ticket' environmental issues such as carbon-neutrality at the expense of other critical issues of environmental sustainability (e.g. where do our catering suppliers source their ingredients from and what are the impacts of this?).</p>
<p>I am pleased to see that EDI looks to be integrated well into these goals and aims - I think this is crucial. I would support the introduction of anonymised applications and a revamp of the</p>

recruitment process; at the moment, I feel we tend to recruit 'people who look like us' and there is a real lack of diversity in some areas of the institution. To me, this is the first priority.

I am positive about this document, and like the format too. I have only chosen 'neutral' for the decision making question, as I have no way of linking the document to how it would impact on decision making.

I think the idea to offer PT/flexible courses to all is intuitively positive sounding - however, I worry that it risks embedding the sense that we offer a service that can be easily carved up. Students should, in a serious and sustained way, be learning FROM EACH OTHER. This aspect of the student experience is so easily forgotten, and would be further challenged and eroded by a roll out of even more PT/flexibility of study.

A research funding support unit sounds great - but would love to hear more about this. Academics are utterly bombarded by funding calls from across this university. Lack of knowledge of calls is not the problem - the problem is we need to change the system so academics are supported, including AFTER they have won a grant.

Offering students paid places in research teams sounds great - years ago I was involved in summer student intern schemes, and these were great.

Nottingham common module that all students take - again, a great and ambitious idea. Sounds great! As per my comment about learning from each other, I think something about HE values (HE citizenship?) would be good, and ethics perhaps.

On nurturing, I would also suggest introducing a scheme for research active staff, as the VC at Warwick did, of a post maternity/paternity research leave scheme. So, if you take 7 months off, you get 7 months research leave immediately when you come back. This is separate to the sabbatical system.

I am slightly confused as to why the reference to having "beautiful campuses" is the headline. There's a lack of a true north goal (a big "why") that all employees can get behind. I am not sure what "disruption is seen as opportunity" actually means in practice.

I'd like to see a far greater emphasis on how we're different from other RG institutions. Aside from the reference to the China and Malaysia campuses, I don't see much that makes us distinctive. In line with this, I'd like to see far greater emphasis on communicating our research history and strengths to the outside world. From a staffing perspective, while it's good to read about nurturing potential, I would like to see explicit reference to the word "Leadership". Shearer West has talked about a devolved leadership model and there's no reference in here. Perhaps it could be worked into the Values section. It needs to be recognised that in order for the university to be effective, we need leaders at all levels across the all campuses and disciplines. I'd like to read about the culture and behaviours that we wish to promote.

I am very appreciative of the university striving for net carbon neutrality and the current plans set in place to achieve that goal. However, I do think that more proactive actions have to be taken for the goal to be truly effective. While I do think that the construction of more sustainable-compliant buildings and offering of sustainability related modules are great, I would really appreciate an outlet where the members of the university can actively participate in reducing emissions. This initiative could be sparked by encouraging a sustainability club of some sort (or to cohort with an existing club) to organise events that could for example encourage zero-waste lifestyles, or plant-based diets. The university could cooperate with initiatives of the sort by disallowing single-use plastics campus-wide, or by suggesting to cafeteria stalls to offer more plant-based food options. I understand that these actions will have implications outside of the intended effect, but I feel that

<p>if the university is able to back up initiatives like this, it will start paving the path towards a university that can act in accordance to the SDG goals (for example), and allowing more discourse on subject-related matters.</p>
<p>I believe that there is over emphasis on the Beacons which are divisive, do not include the majority of outstanding researchers and have captured resource that could be spent better nurturing early career colleagues</p>
<p>I believe that there is scope for the ambition of UNNC in terms of growth and outreach to be far greater, leading to a higher level of regional impact. The current plan seems to be one of consolidation, which does not feel appropriate in the context of China.</p>
<p>I believe there should be a more ambitious focus and objective specifically for health and wellbeing that adopts a holistic approach that considers both physical and mental aspects of health and wellbeing that should cascade throughout all of our activities. I believe encapsulating and promoting health and wellbeing as a core focus that is central to our student experience, we will be able to better support and enable our students to reach their potential whilst they are at university as well as helping embed positive health and wellbeing habits and behaviours for their life beyond. In addition to this, health and wellbeing should be a central pillar in terms of our staff workforce and how we support and enable our employees to succeed in their day to day roles and responsibilities. Sport can be used as a powerful vehicle to help deliver this objective - promoting healthier and active lifestyles, whilst also promoting social inclusion and community and developing transferable skills to support employability.</p>
<p>I can see this having limited impact on my ability to make decisions - and the illustrative examples, while helpful, support this. However, as someone in a research support capacity, I concede this may be more appropriate within an updated research vision into which I hope I will be offered a chance to input.</p>
<p>I cannot believe that one of the items under review is having car free campuses. How can this ever be achieved - I work at SB and don't live locally. It is a great aspiration but totally unachievable.</p>
<p>I despair that the University that I am proud to be an alumni of has lurched to the left and is now promoting policies that are not supported by the silent majority. As an example, the latest newsletter is not worth reading as it contains articles promoting positions that are not supported by facts. Please return to a neutral, unbiased view of the world and not the latest politically correct social media fads.</p>
<p>I do hope that alongside UK students, international students will receive more support regarding jobs in the UK after they've finished university. I didn't feel supported enough and I had to leave the UK even though I didn't want to and the decision has left me sufficiently unhappy. I hope future students do not go through the same thing. The international student community both brings revenue for the uni and provides a whole another degree of excellence that the university benefits heavily from. The UK owes its international student community for the high reputation that it has regarding education, there's a debt to be paid by the nation here.</p>
<p>I do hope that the University could spend more time on improving the overall ranking in the world. International students care about ranking. More students would come to Nottingham to study if the University ranks top 60, or even top 50 in the world.</p>
<p>I do not see anything in the document regarding Digital Transformation.</p>
<p>I do not see much of those strategies being emphasised here at Malaysia campus</p>
<p>I feel like the suggestions for future development in sustainability don't go far enough. There are some ambitious aims which would require significant financial investment in the other areas. But when it comes to sustainability we'll need to take financial hits to make a difference and push behaviour change. It doesn't feel like that's reflected here.</p>
<p>I feel that a goal encouraging communication between international and domestic students would be very appropriate. As it stands, even though international and domestic students attend the same classes, they stay pretty well segregated. I feel that some of the University policies like having two completely different iweek groups partially leads to this.</p>

I feel that encouraging and supporting physical activity is a crucial area for student and staff wellbeing and should be more explicitly referenced as a goal.

I feel that there could be a mention of collaboration with the SU in the following areas: collaboration and inclusivity, health and well being, international students.

To ensure that healthy networks are available to students, involvement in SU activities and particularly societies and sports is key. The strategy doesn't directly mention how important sport is to the University whereby the thousands of students who use the facilities and activities on offer would probably say that it has made their university experience worthwhile. This is an absolute shame when the University of Nottingham is fastly becoming the most inclusive and best place to be for any type of sport or active leisure in the UK. Surely we would want to continue this?

I feel that there needs to be greater recognition of the impact that sport and physical activity have. Particularly the role it can play in so many different aspects of University life, whether that be student mental health, physical wellbeing of the University community, promoting social integration and preventing social isolation, reducing sick leave, developing life skills, improving career prospects, building university affinity, helping address equality, diversity and inclusion issues or improving academic performance to name but a few.

I felt a bit underwhelmed by the latest iteration of the strategy, having previously felt like there was a real appetite to be more ambitious / distinctive. My particular area of interest is the civic elements and I just don't feel like the current document captures our ambition in this regard. We should be bold and proud about wanting our institution to have a positive impact on our place and we should set ourselves some stretching and ambitious targets under this agenda. The commitment to this needs to come from the top down and we actually need to mean it. Some examples could be...

We are silent on CSR...loads of teams would really value being able to spend some time away from the office to put something back into the community and build team relations at the same time. That wouldn't take a huge amount of resource to administer and there's an appetite for it. Why not say we want our students to have a civic education as well as an academic one? We could introduce student civic projects with sponsorship from big local corporates.

We can do more to try and make our procurement processes accessible for SMEs and particularly local suppliers.

We could consider how we civic integrates into our teaching / learning agenda - do we use local case studies / projects / examples. Do we encourage local work experience? (Archaeology dept recently did a good module where students had to develop a local heritage attraction concept - lots worked up ideas for apps...is anything happening now to share that intellectual property / inspiration with partners who might just be able to do something with it?)

Maybe we should lobby for the REF to credit research that is tackling a locally identified challenge with local stakeholders? The current criteria don't incentivise our academics to think locally about the application of their research.

There's loads more I could say here, but this is just to illustrate that we ought to be more ambitious and intentional about our civic agenda. The focus still feels very global / international and whilst I agree that this is an important aspect, I don't feel the balance with a more local and civic focus is there.

Also, a final observation on tone, there feels like there's some kind of inherent snobbery / elitism in the language used ...although admittedly its hard to strike a balance between striving for excellence Vs only being interested in the best of everything.

I fully appreciate we are a research-led academic institution. However, it is hugely disappointing that there is no direct reference in the Strategy to Sport. Clearly, the University have recently invested a significant amount of money into new and improved sports provision and staffing, with

excellent results in BUCS (2018/19). Indeed, the UoN are now established as one of the leading sporting universities in the UK. However, a large proportion of investment was sourced from external partners and alumnus. I feel it is essential to sustain the development of sports facilities. Notably, a number of universities are not only opening new facilities, but adding to their portfolios. Our facilities are excellent, but as with all infrastructure, they need to be modernised and maintained, which all requires money. Thus, the UoN Strategic Plan must reflect this. In addition, the University has to appreciate the potential benefits sport brings to its community of students and staff, e.g. socially, psychologically and physiologically. Sport is much more than simply participation and performance. Indeed, not all students are interested in actively participating in sport and exercise, but they might be keen to become involved in supporting in other ways, e.g. officiating, media and first aid, etc. Please do not lose momentum and focus on the holistic value of sport.

I had taken the mechanical engineering course and been working in the building industry for 3 years. My personal opinion is that the university can and will be a learning place for student to build their personality, attitude and the spirit to continue improve themselves. Must let the students understand the real world is harsh, and thus, we all must prepare and never let ourselves give up.

I have found it extremely disheartening to find no reference in the new Strategy to Sport. It's power in developing outstanding academic students and enhancing personal growth have been well evidenced in this university and countless others. Students that compete in competitive sport achieve above the university average in degree grades and develop skillsets that greatly improve their employability.

The sport department at the university have worked tirelessly in recent years and have been achieving unparalleled success. In 2019, the university rose to 2nd best in the country for sport - an achievement never accomplished before at the University of Nottingham. Sport at Nottingham is now recognised nationally and internationally as a leading institute and we continue to be recognised in awards against our peers (most notably winning the Times Sport University of the Year 2019 and an unprecedented 5 out of 11 awards at the 2019 BUCS conference.

Given this success and the data supporting competitive sports' influence on a higher student academic achievement, I would urge the university to reconsider the strategy to highlight the importance of competitive sport in its future direction.

I have no idea what "where disruption is seen as an opportunity" in the vision means!

I think that many of the proposals for further action are really exciting and, dare I say it, radical, and hope to see some of them incorporated further down the line.

Empowering staff to succeed suggests streamlining systems so they work for staff rather than against them as if often the case nowadays.

I have no idea, and I think this strategy is very good.

I haven't ticked any of the boxes above because the strategy is just the usual high level waffle that all universities would embrace. How will any of these goals be actually enforced and monitored? It's fine to make worthy declarations but the devil is in the detail

There is one proposed solution that seems absolutely bonkers to me, the anonymization of applications. This simply won't work for academics given the degree of detail that we need to know about the prospective candidates. Candidates always include references to their own work and activities. Even if the names were redacted it would be very easy to google the information and find out the candidate's name. And this would require useless work on the part of the members of the selection committee.

More generally the last thing any of us needs is more work. the strategy should be to rationalise and streamline administrative procedures rather than adding to them when academic staff are at breaking point.

I hope more courses about my major will be arranged in the first year of UNNC.

I hope that this is seen as constructive criticism.

1. I cannot access the Tableau Workbook which is sent in Andy Long's email (I tried my Uni Log and that didn't work) - I asked my colleague and he can see it. I can only assume it is because I am an associate (P.S. I love Tableau, so I was slightly sad when I couldn't see it myself!)

Anyway, back on track... 2. If possible, at some point in the future, once IS is no longer in a state of limbo or Outsourcing is completed - whichever comes first - would it be possible to get rid of the Associate accounts and make everyone a "normal" member of staff. I'm 99% sure that this has already been discussed many times, and while there are more than enough painful reasons why this cannot be done, I would still be very happy if it could be completed - it would just eliminate a very unnecessary bottleneck of issues and save lots of time for everyone. I am not disregarding the issues that this will bring (including GDPR) - but if this could happen in the next 2-3 years, that would still be a good outcome.

3. In particular, I hope that: "anonymised applications" & "alumni lifetime access to our online learning resources" & "Offer every student a paid placement with an employer, in one of our research teams or with an international partner" becomes a reality. The latter of those is probably most ambitious.

4. Good luck!

I hope the school can give us opportunity to learn sth what we want

I just graduated BSc Finance, Accounting and Management. I have studied at the business school. Over half of my colleague students were from abroad and many from outside the EU as well. We have paid between £9,000-16,000 and the only learning materials we were provided for this excessive amount of tuition fees paid was copy-pasted A4 sheets of paper from our presentations and a box for notes next to it. From out of my 36 modules over 30 did it.

I am very able to read in English and use a notepad to take notes. I do not need the lecturer to play the lazy card and just print off some slides on a piece of paper and think their job is done.

I want to see that they are providing an actual content in these paper handouts. The modules are already predominantly self-taught. So in essence what I am paying my £9000 for and my colleagues from outside EU £16000 is just for a few 10 slide presentations and a moody face standing in front of me and reading them out for me. I can read, I can make presentations, I can stand up against an audience and be moody.

I want value for money which is not offered here. These printed presentation "handouts" are a second-rate practice and it can be found in every faculty.

Forbid lecturers to copy-paste .ppt on paper and hand them out as handouts because they are too lazy to make one.

I like and feel encouraged by the direction defined for the Uni in this. Some of the values and activities feel like 'must do's' for any academic institution in this day and age, so whilst relevant and right To have as strategic pillars that will

Influence how the whole institution operates I wonder if more could be done to pull

Out the distinctive elements that make UoN stand out. Eg how to be a uni without boundaries work across more aspects of the Uni. This feels a powerful proposition if it can be brought to life

I like particularly the idea of a common module based on business or research.

I like the focus on creativity from a university that is very strong in science, engineering and medicine, as this acknowledges the role that arts, humanities and social sciences play in innovation. I hope that the goal to nurture potential will be extended to all staff job families (R&T, APM and O&F), to include those colleagues who do so much hard and skilled work to ensure we have beautiful campuses and excellent facilities. I note the reference to transparent and agile

decision-making with a balance between central and local, but don't The ideas proposed are certainly ambitious and I fully support them. Initiatives such as offering all students paid placements, support for setting up businesses, and lifetime access to resources, along with establishing an innovation hub in the centre of the city, cannot be achieved without significant investment in staff and infrastructure. I also wonder how the carbon offset purchase will work in practice, if this cannot be claimed from external grant funding and the cost met by the University. Will this be centrally supported or administered on a School or Department level? Could it discourage research dissemination and exchange in areas of the University with less budget available for travel?

I like unnc

I liked the vision statements.

Under values - I wonder if there is a more positive way of phrasing "whilst recognising that experiments don't always succeed.

Good to see a carbon neutral target

Goals look good, especially agile decision-making

Infrastructure - possibly include something about being a resource to support the local community

I once worked at a company which put a lot of energy into strategy/value documents just like this one, instead of really focusing on what mattered. Their share price plummeted and they went bust. I think it's very sad senior management wastes energy on such things rather spending effort on encouraging Research and Teaching - in that order.

I realise this is a very summarised version of the strategy but I was disappointed that there was little about education mentioned. There are great plans around "futureproofing" students but little said about their experiences while they are here (e.g., what is the new strategy following the old one about personalising the students learning experience?).

I really appreciate that sustainability find a place within this new strategy. I also understand that carbon neutrality can only be reached within our means. However, the deadline should be in any case 2025 the latest as we really only have 16 months left to scope out a plan that then can be implemented and keep climate change at a survivable level. (see: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-48964736>) As we are a very big and important organisation within the UK we have to - and should be - on the front line of making these changes. This will also give us an advantage from a risk management perspective as well as marketing perspective.

I really like the idea pf giving students life-long access to our learning resources, I think it shapes a stronger community. May I also suggest to give them email access - or at least a bit longer after graduation. I heard from PGR students that they felt 'turfed out' while they were vulnerable and looking for posts. I think we could create a better community.

I like the common module and the idea of a transition year and last year free, I think it could massively increase diversity. I would like a much stronger commitment to support staff in crucial engagement with communities. Currently a staff member who wants to engage with no-traditional communities does ALL the work (when I rang the team I was told they only 'facilitate which meant giving me an address and gazillions of forms to fill in. I never asked again) , there is no reward (only or the institution) and a lot of work. I think it is really important for us to go to schools and talk to bright students to come here.

I like the shadowing - it is so important for people to understand how others work and what their timelimes are. One of the worst are HR and I really think it would be useful for [text redacted] and her team to see how much we work and how much her emails are upsetting everyone. Same for [text redacted]. We are all interested in doing the best research and teaching: let's work on the obstacles.

I think we have a dilemma at our hands with needing to travel a lot and sustainability. While videoconferences and skype are good nothing replaces a visit to a place. I think we need to have a really good handle on what is 'necessary travel and much more support to help with plane-free

<p>travel. Currently I have to try and find all train journeys by myself whereas the business centre helps me with flights. A designated operator whom you can ring up and who would source journeys by train would help.</p> <p>Where are our solar panels? We should not have plastic/ paper/styrofoam containers for food on campus: instead ask people to bring their own container and offer a discount. Have proper crockery and ask for a deposit of say £2 which the student/staff member gets back when they return it. This is done at festivals in Germany and it works.</p>
<p>I really like the Values, but I am unsure if any of the Goals can apply to my role (Professional Services)</p>
<p>i really looking forward for this new strategy, because it will really helps every student and staff to actually developed into their best version of them selfs and find their own life goals.</p>
<p>I see a lot of bold, ambitious statements, which is great, but where in all of that is the commitment to change the University's current culture from a rather toxic, blame-culture environment in which employees do not treat each other very well, to one in which all people are treated with dignity, civility and respect?</p>
<p>I see the words...but the reality is a tick box exercise. university needs to be people thinking rather self appointing. I speak from experience ..and now , leaving after 30 years.</p>
<p>I strongly agree.</p>
<p>I strongly believe in the importance of sport and physical activity and the role it can play in so many different aspects of life to our students, whether that be mental health, physical well being of the University community, promoting social integration and preventing social isolation, reducing sick leave, developing life skills, improving career prospects, building university affinity, helping address equality, diversity and inclusion issues or improving academic performance to name but a few. the large number of students who decide to take part in sport and activity is huge and feel this should be recognised.</p>
<p>I strongly believe in the importance of sport and physical activity and the role it can play in so many different aspects of University life, whether that be student mental health, physical wellbeing of the University community, promoting social integration and preventing social isolation, reducing sick leave, developing life skills, improving career prospects, building university affinity, helping address equality, diversity and inclusion issues or improving academic performance to name but a few. I fear no mention of this in the strategy or sport for this will have a major impact on our student and staff experience and satisfaction.</p>
<p>I think improving the rating in QS is quite important in the coming 2020.</p>
<p>I think it is difficult to balance our international ambitions with those of environmental sustainability, in light of the impact of carbon emissions through travel (notably air). Perhaps an impossible task? Our own behaviour as an organisation should take priority over teaching sustainability (but still do it!). I don't think we have got the fundamentals right in many areas of our processes and environments. And to me the strategy isn't radical enough, or forward thinking enough - it looks like it could have been written 20 years ago by any University - it says nothing about us as "uniquely UoN" so perhaps doesn't give current staff and students an inspiring vision of where we are going - nor is it thought provoking enough to attract talent here.</p>
<p>I think it is great.</p>
<p>I think it is important not just to further encourage students from different socioeconomic and racial backgrounds. Offering foundation programmes and giving contextualised offers are a great idea. However I also think it is important encourage and support potential learners who may have other difficulties in accessing higher education, including but not limited to neurodiverse individuals (including ASC and ADHD) and those with physical disabilities. Nottingham has an excellent opportunities to develop their offer and support to these learners as they have access to specialist services in neurodiversity within the city and they could form formal links and potentially make themselves an (inter)national leader in this regard.</p>

I think its hard to answer these questions as there is not enough information on the document. I understand that you are purposely trying to make it less wordy though. For example, one of the ways in which I commented on the green paper was via the Health and Safety Department (the green paper never mentioned these words or phrases before). Now I see the word "health" mentioned once and the word "safe" mentioned once, but its difficult to tell how this is incorporated into the strategy through just mentioning the words once each in the white paper.

I think that Sport needs to play a big part in the strategy going forward. The proof of Mental well being linked to playing sport is massive and the physical well being goes without saying. It help with social integration in the university community and also sport helps prevent social isolation, reducing sick leave, developing crucial life skills to improve career prospects. Sport also helps build university affinity with UoN Sport brand, helping address equality, diversity and inclusion issues and maybe the main reason, help improve academic performance.

I think that Sport should be mentioned as a strand on it's own. There is a lot of press about obesity and mental health issues in young people, Sport is a good way to address these factors.

I think that the current draft is excellent in many ways and I congratulate those who have led the consultation in being able to distil it to this point. There is much here that I am comfortable with and will be happy to align my work and leadership approach with, in order to contribute to the University. However I have not put 'strongly agree' across the board as there are a few key points that I would like to be considered as the strategy is finalised:

1. I have reservations about putting 'disruption' into our Vision - I know we are not meant to be commenting on words but I feel that 'disruption' is something of a buzzword and a lot of people who have disrupted have not made things better. I realise that one option is to hit the trend head on by including it, but I worry that it might date our strategy and ally us with disruption that has not turned out to be all good: Air B&B and the demise of cities, Facebook and the demise of, well, many things (and falling out of favour fast), We Work's latest stock market float attempt... I could go on. The term is heavily used by the Big 4 and Consulting organisations to take a view/generate business and I don't want us to look as if we are jumping on a bandwagon or coming late to a party.

2. I have similar views on the word 'agile' within the decision-making enabler. There is much scepticism about such terms, even though principles are sound. If there are ways of articulating the principle without resorting to clichés I think that would increase buy-in.

3. In terms of the goals, I am feel that an articulation of our teaching is light. Other than reference to teaching when in partnership with research under goal 5, it is not mentioned and I wonder if that is helpful, given the work that is being done to 'elevate' teaching to stand alongside research in the minds of some. Even the examples of 'what we are already doing' doesn't make explicit reference to our teaching activity other than with reference to our spaces. This is likely to make it harder to generate enthusiasm and buy-in for a strategic delivery plan focussed on teaching.

4. In terms of 'what we are doing already' , while it is great to see the Nottingham Advantage Award featured for the Goal on Future-Proofing our students, I feel the work on Professional Competencies and Digital Capabilities is a stronger example given that the work encompasses all disciplines and levels of study and is explicitly designed for long-term capability, given that it is based on the World Economic Forum's work on IR4.

5. Offering every student a paid placement with an employer, in a research team, or with an international partner is fraught with complication and impossible to achieve, so would be a risky ambition. Our current placement ambitions are realistic and have seen a significant increase in

student placement experience, all in line with good practice across the sector, including approaches to unpaid placements.

I hope this is helpful. Thank you again for all your work on this on our behalf.

I think that you should be seeking to attract and recruit the best UK academic talent. Giving lower offers just to fill a “diversity” or “social equality” quotient cheapens your academic reputation and it does no favours for the token recipients either. If they haven’t attained the required grades they will struggle at University. This is damaging to their mental health and self-esteem. University isn’t and shouldn’t be for everyone otherwise a degree has no more value.

I think the emphasis on the importance of our PEOPLE needs to be strengthened. I appreciate there are positive elements but, in the nicest possible way many of our staff (and students) are solid and reliable, trustworthy, hard working and so on, but don’t necessarily match the descriptors and aspirations for the brightest and the best (to paraphrase). We need all our staff, not just the superstars. Staff wellbeing is critical and the long hours, overload culture sends a message to staff that says we don’t really value you and as long as you put work first, we aren’t actually bothered whether you feel valued or happy or even healthy. The elephant in this room is (from clear workload evidence based on what is a minimal model that doesn’t include time for filing in forms or email or walking across campus, or even very accurate estimates of how long things actually take) we are requiring staff to work well over 36.25 hours a week and in many cases well over 48 hours a week. Until we acknowledge that this requires additional staff to complete the required work or reductions in the work we expect staff to complete in a set period, we continue to reinforce the message that the strategy is only words, because none of the changes give people their evenings and weekends back (or not without compromising their career development). In point of fact there is manifest evidence that people function better if they get 8 hours of quality sleep a night, are not stressed and pressured and are able to enjoy time away from work activities. Our productivity would increase if we really committed to putting people and wellbeing first, but it needs a strategy and aspiration that includes having the happiest, healthiest, most fulfilled, well rested and valued staff at the forefront. That won’t happen unless we truly value everyone and have enough people to deliver the things that need to be delivered.

My other point is that any strategy to facilitate excellent teaching doesn’t really stand out at all. Most of our income comes from student fees and there is pressure to increase student numbers, but (and it links with the priorities above) staff are particularly overwhelmed during term-time. This impacts negatively on the student experience (as evidenced by poor NSS scores, which cannot all be blamed on timetabling). Staff frequently cannot deliver the best possible teaching, assessment, feedback and support, because it takes all their time and energy simply to deliver the lectures/practicals/workshops/tutorials not to mention marking, without being able to take the extra time it needs to improve this, to personalise it, to make the students feel valued and special. I WISH I could do that, I KNOW I am able to do better, but there simply isn’t time to fit it in. Again this would deliver substantially better student outcomes, satisfaction and enhance reputation, but we have to invest in the staff first, to enable lower workloads and hence healthier staff who have the energy and a genuine opportunity to deliver more than the bare essentials.

The issue with decision making stems from poor communication, with many middle managers who do not understand the EDI goals and focus of the University, failing to disseminate or understand the details and vital changes and emphasis of our strategies and policies. This frequently leads to continued dysfunctional decisions and damage to staff morale and engagement.

I think the goal of being a zero-carbon university is a hugely positive one, and if we were the first to do it I think it would make us very attractive to prospect students and staff as well. Regarding the target date, which has not yet been chosen: I broadly agree that it is important to have 'a

proper understanding of what will be needed' when choosing this date. But I also think that 'what can be done' is variable depending what we are willing to do, and it is vital to choose a date which reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. With this in mind, I think it would also be worthwhile to look at creating a dedicated team who are responsible for achieving this.

I think the goals including "review our curriculum content and our research narratives to ensure they are free of colonial attitudes and assumptions", "international mind", "quality control", "Fairness, transparency, integrity" are really inspiring for me here, in UNNC, China. I fully support them as a staff. The questions from me are 1. What are the detailed implementation plans? How to control the standards and quality of modules across the three campus, particular in UNNC? How to ensure transparency in management? Are there any channels so that the voices can be heard from non-management staff and students? Thank you very much for the initiative. Great plans!

I think the ideas are ambitious enough but perhaps the idea of offering every student a paid placement is a huge undertaking and comes with some risk - is this all UGs? all PGTs? all research students? There are good reasons why some students either don't wish to or shouldn't do a placement. There is already a huge amount of work experience on offer through UoN initiatives and externally so making sure those are sustainable and scalable is perhaps the thing to focus on. I just feel that we would be setting ourselves up to fail on this promise to all students.

Whether the strategy will support clear decision making depends on to what extent the strategy is communicated to all staff (and subscribed to).

I think the plans are impressive, although I suspect not so easy to implement. The only thing I'd like to add is a way to make it easier for staff perhaps on APM grades, to undertake academic courses on a part-time basis. Not all Schools offer part-time postgraduate taught courses (some are full-time only), although many do (which is good). Another idea is to encourage staff to undertake further training, although I'm not saying this doesn't happen to an extent already.

I think the proposals put forward are right and good and exactly the way we should be going. But they're not ambitious enough. Other universities have already done many of the things that are being put forward. In order to remain competitive we need to make some radical changes that will really make us stand out.

I think the strategy needs to be brave & bold with its aims & ways to achieve this. As a university we are fortunate to have the opportunity to utilise ambitious minds & scope to try different ideas.

I think the strategy should also focus on the mental health about students ,not only hardware design,which could make the campus better.

I think the University - especially the campus in China (UNNC) - should look to make the campus more 'green' I see so much plastic waste generated by the school (whether this is due to cultural differences or not) on an enormous scale. This problem also occurs with water waste. I feel like the campus needs to make more of a change in its sustainability policies to advance and promote a greener lifestyle indeed.

I think there is an opportunity to be more ambitious for UoN in this strategy that will really bring everyone together. Something along the lines of the vision that "we will be recognised globally as an excellent teaching and research intensive university, with the capability to solve and improve key world challenges" I think part of the new strategy's job is to fully inspire students and staff so that they feel being a part of UoN could make a difference in a world, which can feel pretty grim at times.

I think there needs to be an initiative to support PhD students directly into paid research roles with financial stability. A lot of talented people get lost from academia because post-doc positions are competitive and often require relocation which is too disruptive for people with families, caring responsibilities, disabilities etc. We could have stable post-doc positions for UoN graduating PhD students to keep talented PhDs in the university. This would retain talent and stop the loss of

great minds from research. We could offer these as paid jobs to either research key important problems, or to set up their own research projects/groups in an area of research that is very important but perhaps underserved. The programme could be about retaining talented people and great minds at UoN to address the world's important problems, but offering stable employment in a way that is inclusive of diversity (i.e. accommodates parents, disabled researchers, researchers from underrepresented backgrounds who have important perspective, talent and knowledge to offer in addressing these problems). It's often extremely difficult to compete for post-doc positions, and if you are a parent, disabled, from a minority background etc. you can't compete fairly against young, healthy, unmarried/no children white male PhD graduates who are able to relocate and work 70 hours a week. So valuable talent and diverse perspectives are lost from the research community who could bring really valuable insight to address global research problems. So I think we should set up an employment programme for these graduates at the university, to retain them here in an inclusive environment, and support them to apply their talent and perspective to important global issues.

I think we really need to practice what we preach - there's no point in having a compulsory module about sustainability when the cafe on campus gives almost all drink out in single use plastic cups with single use straws, there is no discount for using a keep cup and you can't buy a single banana from a shop on campus without being given a plastic bag. More training is needed for the shops/restaurants on campus about reducing plastic - we could possibly run an activity on campus where staff/students suggest ways to make the campus more sustainable and then the best of these are put into practice.

I understand that it's a strategic view and thus high level but I once again feel that teaching and more importantly learning is conspicuously absent. For example, why suggest sabbatical leave for research when research leave is already the norm. What about teaching leaves? What about nurturing and promoting teaching focused staff? What about rewarding excellent teaching other than through 1 yearly award.

I also like the fact that EDI is mentioned but again teaching accessibility is not at the fore-front. All teaching material should be made accessible by default (by law) but we're very far from it and the conversation is not even happening.

I understand the strategy document is supposed to give a high level overview of the proposed strategy, but it seems to be primarily comprised of generic management speak rather than anything bold of any substance. It's also discouraging to see zero mention of mental health, despite it consistently appearing across the green paper consultation documents. Disappointing but not surprising from a university that seems to prioritise its external image over all else.

I want go abroad for further study

I want to be a independent man

I want to do my utmost to improve my academic study and make many friends. It's important to build a good relationship with each other and concentrate on study more.

I want to improve my English fully and I really appreciate this chance.

I want to master many English skills

I wanted to express my views around widening participation at UoN. When I was at the University, I rarely met another person who possessed a similar background to me in terms of societal, economic and regional senses. Although this enabled me to grow as a person and I recognise the benefits of this, I feel those from the mass majority of the university did not have the chance I did to develop interpersonal skills with people from different life backgrounds as there were so very little diverse students (in terms of upbringing). As someone who now works for a different university, I work closely with the widening participation and first generation schemes and see the close benefits of having a university strategy that strongly supports, welcomes and actively encourages students from more working class/first gen families. I would say that UoN supported me such a great deal financially whilst studying which I am eternally grateful for, and I felt my

lecturers were from diverse backgrounds and brought that to their roles which enhanced them. However I do feel that giving more students the opportunities I had would be extremely beneficial to the university and it's community in every way. Thank you.

I was deeply shocked at the lack of mention of any sport or physical activity within the strategy. With the global obesity crisis, focus on mental health and recent reports about university counselling targets it is paramount that this should be reflected in our own strategy. Sports and well being go hand in hand and sport has also been proven to shape students in a positive way. It gives them a wider network, a better university experience, enables them to try new things and challenges, a massive help in retention figures and is proven to improve their degree outcome. To ignore the value that sport or other extra curricular activities provides is a dangerous step.

Imagine life at university, right now, without these things. Tell me it would be a better place!

I was particularly inspired by the proposed commitment to contextualised admissions and the "free final year" for those students entering university via the Foundation route. If we really wish to be an inclusive institution, then reducing the barriers for disadvantaged students with potential should be a top priority. One key barrier is the addition of a years' worth of fees for those who don't quite make the grade. We should be helping, not hindering.

I will do my best to help UNNC develop better.

I wish after my studying in UNNC, I will become so confident that I can communicate with my foreign friends fluently. Furthermore, I can become a student with a global sight and an international thinking

I work for UoN Sport and there is no specific reference to investing in sports across campus and the proven links to mental health, wellbeing, social inclusion, motivation, ambition that including sports within student life can promote

I work in Careers in a role focused on work placement activity. In the proposed ideas I am drawn to the suggestion of 'offering every student a paid placement with...'. I feel the University currently has a varied and sophisticated offer for placement activity that has grown in line with the needs of our students and the faculties. In some areas we have been slow off the mark compared to our peers but on the whole I think the provision is now good. I do feel more needs to be done to continue to grow the levels of student engagement, sell the offer more to prospective students and very importantly ensure internal collaboration and a joined-up-ness in how we offer this but I don't feel sweeping statements such as 'offer every student' is either do-able or in line with the needs of all students. Many students for example do not wish to engage in placement activity and would look to develop skills, competencies and experience in a range of other ways e.g. SU, volunteering, NAA activity. I hope this helps and I am very happy to discuss placements in more detail. Best wishes, [text redacted], Placement Consultant

I work in the sports department, and there is no mention of active lifestyles and how this can massively impact on the wellbeing of our community. There is also very little (if anything) mentioned about support/professional services - it is all about teaching and research primarily.

I work within extra curricular activity, sport to be specific. I don't believe the strategy acknowledges that extra curricular engagement is a huge part of student life and that without it, academic drop out and health and well-being would be much greater issues for the university.

I would like to have a swimming pool!very much!!!

I would like to include a sabbatical leave entitlement for teaching scholarship, curriculum/assessment development etc.

I would like to see more emphasis on personalised learning, inclusive curricula, innovative assessment methods, the role of the Digital Learning Directors, the importance of Professional Competencies.

I would like to see more on pastoral support and mental health/well-being for students.

There still seems to be a prioritisation of research excellence over teaching excellence - need to

ensure that teaching innovation and excellence is rewarded and put at the forefront of strategy. A more student focused approach would be welcome - not least given the contribution made by student fee income.

I would like to question why there is no mention of sport or physical activity within the strategy? I strongly believe in the importance of sport and physical activity and the role it can play in so many different aspects of University life, whether that be student mental health, physical well-being of the University community, promoting social integration and preventing social isolation, reducing sick leave, developing life skills, improving career prospects, building university affinity, helping address equality, diversity and inclusion issues or improving academic performance. It would be great to see sport/physical activity play a vital role within the new strategy.

I would like to see a greater emphasis placed on sport and physical activity. The benefits for the staff, individual student and the student collective are irrefutable and indisputable. Sport and physical activity are vital in my opinion to students' physical and mental well-being, and personal development. S&PA improve mental and physical health, promote social interaction, cohesion and inclusion, develop life skills, independence and responsibility, help address equality and diversity issues, promote academic performance, enhance career prospects, to name but a few.... Given the University of Nottingham's proud and prestigious sporting heritage and exceptional sports facilities, I would hope there would be mention of the role of sport and the future of sport in the University future strategy.

I would like to see a stronger emphasis on recruiting able students from poorer backgrounds. As your goal says "highest potential" and I really like the idea of a foundation year with a free fourth year. Is there any way we can do more about bursary systems?

This cannot be achieved merely by setting of targets and would require careful thought about how potential was measured but I imagine you have done some thinking in that area.

My interest in achieving social mobility is that I attended Christ's Hospital whose main goal is to attract able students from less well off backgrounds.

I would like to see a stronger mention of the importance of both physical and mental wellbeing being of importance for both the staff and student community. a healthy body and mind is crucial as a preventative tool to avoid increasing sickness absences, stress in the workplace, mental health crisis for students and so forth. I think it needs to be more evident as a core value and element to enable the workforce and student community to have a positive experience.

I would like to see an increase in cross-Faculty collaboration. e.g Medicine and Health Sciences students undertaking language studies, a core understanding of engineering and housing and global and UK social policy studies. Possibly as non-academic activities?? Health and social care needs are becoming increasingly complex. My aim would be to create a band of entrepreneurs who will become 'match-fit' to tackle a range of issues. Our learner groups are employed in areas where variables such as poverty and displacement are rife and where additional skill sets are crucial to the survival of Communities. Similarly a reciprocal situation where students from other Faculties can come to us in the FMHS to learn core health activities such as Basic Life Support and First Aid.

I would like to see more focus on university sport within the strategy. There is a small bit about health and wellbeing, but I think there needs to be more specific focus on sport, both at a participation levels and also a performance level. Sport is a big part of university life and is something that many students will look for when choosing a university, so its importance should not be overlooked.

I would like to see sport, physical activity and the well-being agenda embedded at the heart of the strategy to ensure the university is actively committed to ensuring both students and staff are healthy and well emotionally, mentally and physically.

I would like to see the values include 'sustainability' in the same way they include EDI. These values are important and underpin the priorities for the University in all that it does. Some really ambitious and quantitative targets with clear KPIs are needed to focus our efforts as a whole University and not silo those objectives to a few service areas - we need to take collective responsibility for achieving these. Universities that do this achieve far more by collaborating on these shared objectives (e.g. carbon reduction, getting in shape, EDI, Engagement, etc).

I would welcome further explanation of the content of the strategy, especially in terms of how this might affect and be influenced by the technical community. For instance. It seems like there could be opportunities for the technical community to influence and be involved in any proposals for an innovation hub in the centre of Nottingham, as I'm sure some skills that we possess would be required for such a venture. I would welcome the opportunity to 'Promote shared professional development across all staff groups, including developing a shadowing/mentoring approach which would partner academics with professional services and technical staff and bring together staff based in different countries.' Both as a learner and hopefully someone that could provide some knowledge, skills and expertise to others.

I'd like to ask if the "free" final year will apply to me if I am graduating in 2020.

I'd like to make a plea at this early stage that before any plans are implemented, the University considers the fact that international students in the UK on Tier 4 visas have limitations/restrictions on the activity they can do as part of their course which Home students don't have. Proper thought needs to be given at an early stage as to how we can facilitate the inclusion of this group in any new initiatives, whilst ensuring they remain compliant with the requirements of their visas.

Two examples below of ideas in the document where Tier 4 limitations would come into play:

- 1) 'Offer all students access to support and training for setting up their own businesses' – Tier 4 students cannot be self-employed or engage in business activity. They can develop plans but not actually start the business.
- 2) 'Offer every University of Nottingham student an international opportunity – perhaps a module studied together with students in another international location, or a study abroad option' Study abroad is possible on a Tier 4 visa in limited circumstances, which I won't go into here - just wanted to flag that there are implications for Tier 4 students who take time away from studying in the UK.

In addition to Tier 4, we need to consider that future EU students may be subject to similar restrictions, depending on what the new immigration system post-Brexit will look like. We'd therefore ask that the Visa and Immigration team be involved at an early stage of the planning process for any new initiatives which are likely to be offered to all students, so we can make sure that our international student community will be able to fully participate.

I'd like to see "efficiency" included in terms of running our admin processes. These are not very efficient at present - we do the same stuff every year with teaching admin and make the same sort of mistakes every year, it is frustrating. Today's example is teaching time-tables not being available to students, which does not look very good and this falls back on academic staff to sort out rather than time-tabling who should be responsible. This is just one example. Something about electric car and bicycle charging points would be good to see as well, as part of a strategy of cutting down on use of fossil fuels by the work-force. Doing our bit for air quality in the Trent Valley might be a good strategy that would capture this.

I'd like to see more information about the specific staff/student wellbeing goals that the University is proposing. In the past, the goals in this area have been very theoretical, but they should be defined in more practical terms. For example, will we be moving to universal flexible working (flexitime), rather than retaining the current management controlled approach? And are we going to stop cramming staff into tiny offices? Also, how are we going to measure achievement of goals?

If Nottingham Malaysia aims to achieve a world-class status, we do not only need elite academia but also good campus facilities and services. If students cannot be provided the basic convenience and comfort in terms of school facilities such as sufficient study spaces, friendly and responsible campus staff, clean school compound etc., we simply cannot talk about excellent student performance because the environment that is not conducive is simply wasting more time when it comes to dealing with administrative stuff with the university such as acquiring documents, handling club & societies matters, renting university items etc. We need a more responsive team of campus service that actually communicates students but not wasting time and money like setting up a student council or SA council and hardly attempting to communicate effectively in every first rounds of discussions by finding excuses like not enough number of students answering surveys.

If the university is to be truly international and connected across its campuses, this needs to include connections within the campuses. However, comparing the quality of the infrastructure and ability to work seamlessly across the UK campuses alone, this just isn't the case. There's no content in the strategy about how the university will/has or plans to direct capital investments to support these goals. Clearly they require a large investment of money in buildings, transport links, accommodation and on-costs for staff/students. With the best will in the world, if we can't get on a hopper bus to SB campus or use video conferencing without it breaking, how can we be international. Equally, how does this desire to be global sit with the aim to minimise environmental impact? Surely this requires us to be more locally focused and require less travel and distance.

I'm aware that my response runs the risk of suggesting lack of engagement with the process that is being attempted here. At the moment, all of this feels like window-dressing. Basic systems for keeping the University operating are failing: automated timetabling is producing clashes and extra teaching hours rather than making things more efficient; new students are being sent incorrect or no information; module enrolment for returning students was a mess; ... In the wake of Project Transform, the phrase "disruption is seen as an opportunity" feels like a rather nasty joke. My own career trajectory has been derailed by constant changes in focus resulting from repeated curriculum reviews, and by the inability to pursue substantial long-term research projects due to the need to meet changing requirements for the REF; obviously the latter problem originates outside the University, but University procedures introduced to deal with the REF tend to exacerbate the problem rather than taking steps to protect staff from it. Can I believe that any published "university strategy" resulting from the current consultation will lead to my "potential to succeed" being "supported" any better than it has in the last ten years? Difficult...

I have therefore put "Neutral" in response to the first question, because while a lot of this sounds very good, I'm not convinced it will create "the right direction" in practice.

I have answered "Disagree" to the second question because I feel the ambition to actually KEEP THINGS RUNNING is not sufficiently addressed, as indicated above. That may not seem like a very high ambition, but its absence risks rendering all the rest somewhat pointless. How can it be phrased in a way that doesn't just sound banal? Something about investment in infrastructure, including in terms of high quality IT systems and enough personnel to get the best results out of them?

In relation to the third question, I cannot see how most of this will affect decisions that matter to me, e.g. about which degree programmes to keep open, how much choice to offer the students, contact hours, class-sizes, the amount of teaching experience we can offer to our postgrads, etc.; it just doesn't feel relevant.

And I think all of what I have written should explain my response to the last question. At the moment so many of us are focused on day-to-day survival and damage-control, that the high-sounding stuff in the white paper just feels rather hollow.

I'm concerned there isn't the link to how alumni could be part of the development of the university. When talking about staff and students it needs to be remembered that alumni are also

part of the University of Nottingham community and can contribute in many ways, be it through the Alumni Relations team in volunteering, advocacy or money - or through links with research or through their companies. They are some of our biggest advocates across the world and the importance of this network is not coming through.

I'm happy here. And I don't have any suggestions yet, thank you!

I'm not convinced the suggested Vision is really a Vision, in the sense that it should be a statement of intent against which we decide what we do and don't do. It doesn't really excite me that 'disruption is seen as opportunity and where ambitious people and a creative culture will enable us to thrive' - is that not more about approach/values? The consultation had a good list of what might go in the Vision in the section on describing what we do - a word cloud of that suggests the top words should be research, students, knowledge, education/teaching, world/global, quality and community, so maybe something that brings those together with the word excellent?

Values seem fine (obviously with wordsmithing)

Goals: I think the third box is the most important, and with a bit of tweaking happy with all five boxes although the first one seems a weak and maybe could be combined with the second one? I'm not sure about phrases like 'future proof' - not least because I'm not convinced that it's a future proof piece of jargon and not sure what it really means. Does 'contribution to society' not include 'excelling in the working world' (ie the latter is merely one way of achieving the former)? I'm also not sure we can ever be carbon neutral (although appreciate there are different ways of measuring it) but sustainability (environmentally and financially) is very very important. How about, 'Pursue environmental sustainability in everything we do; in our teaching, our research and our behaviour as an organisation. We will achieve net carbon neutrality by 20XX'?

I'd like to see KE explicitly mentioned (and in the context of its breadth and relevance to a large civic university that has programmes covering most of the professions, not just impact from research). I think H7S is covered by risk management - having both lines makes us look very risk averse, which contradicts entrepreneurialism, facing up to global challenges etc.

On the examples page I just have a few minor comments. We do already have foundation courses in the University. I remain to be convinced anonymised applications work with academic staff unless we don't think publications and research fit matter. Not 'all' programmes can be part time and flexible - especially vocational courses with a large practical component. I think we should be thinking regionally not just locally and globally (ie not just Nottingham but the East Midlands). Is carbon offset purchase not just dumping our problems on somebody else? I think insisting all programmes include 'critical thinking, sustainability, ...and business skills' is more useful than a one size fits all module. There's no reason why several disciplines/schools couldn't share modules but a single module, for all its interdisciplinary advantages, would contain a large proportion of repetition for programmes that already teach that. Surely all programmes already include something on research?

improve myself

In general, I very much applaud the ambitious nature of the strategy, with key focuses on international students, sustainability, innovation and sections such as the 'we could' that highlights 'an opportunity to review the curriculum to ensure it is 'free of colonial attitudes and assumptions'. However, there are a few focuses I would hope to see fleshed out more, for example: welfare and wellbeing is highlighted as a value but not a goal and yet some of the most pressing issues for both staff and students are things like stress and mental health. It feels like viewing Nottingham as an international and future-proofed institution should mean there is a focus on elements such as health and support through transitions, especially with the work being done to look at International Students' Mental Health currently, so it would be great to see more

of a focus and a 'we could' section to ensure students are well supported should be added. Furthermore, EDI is mentioned in the first goal as a 'we are already' but I feel like more focus and support could be shown for EDI and liberation groups of students. For example, ensuring campus is a safe and welcoming environment. There is a lot of work to be done to push this and there is still not a basic level of support in some ways, for example Gender Neutral toilets are only put into new buildings and I struggle to see how this hasn't been considered: if an 'innovation hub' is to be created, then first things first there needs to be a safe and welcoming environment in the existing buildings on campus and there is still hate crime on campus. Additionally, I appreciate the collaboration with SACA, however we have hundreds of Academic Representatives on campus and student feedback and consultation should be at the forefront of changes (I know this strategy is out for consultation but for future enacting and changes) and they aren't mentioned in the plan, despite being those leading with ideas on innovation and teaching and learning- this is a key example of individuals that need supporting and nurturing as student campaigners and volunteers who work each day to improve things academically. I would urge the University to reassess the value of representation and support for student feedback, rather than having just SACA feeding into that. Leading on from this, it would be good to see more SU support or collaboration across the board to enact the goals, for example: Global Buddies is a brilliant project run by the SU and things like that really help with University Integration, so I would urge those producing the strategy, and putting changes into motion, to use the expertise held for many of the goals as this would be vital in the process in my opinion.

To conclude, there are a few key areas which I feel are omitted and as a student-facing role, feel are left out but of key importance but I very much agree with the vision and mission and appreciate the direction of 'disruption is seen as an opportunity', so hope the ambition remains in any changes to the proposal.

In my opinion, it would be a mistake to promise all students paid work experience during their studies. Because the University does not have the capacity to deliver on this promise, it would end up devolving responsibility for finding the work experience back to students (there are plenty of examples of this happening across the H.E. sector right now). This is false advertising.

Most students at UNUK already have the opportunity to self-source a paid placement year (and have it accredited) via the optional Placement Year scheme. The scheme is currently being held below the waterline by a lack of awareness amongst staff and students and the infuriatingly convoluted process for creating variant course codes. This would be a good place to start.

I would like to see the University develop an internal paid internship/placement scheme (similar to the existing Nottingham Internship Scheme). If it is serious about generating more paid work experience opportunities, it should put its money where its mouth is.

The absolute best thing that the University could do in the short term is commission research into:

- a) the impact of different types of work experience on students'/graduates' academic and employment outcomes (in general)
- b) the relative impact of these activities on groups within the student population (encompassing multiple indicators of disadvantage/deprivation)

Armed with this data, we would be well-placed to design new work experience programmes for specific cohorts of Nottingham students. We could also make informed decisions about how we recruit students to existing programmes (i.e. contextualised recruitment). In short, I'm advocating the design of a few thoughtful, high-impact interventions over the introduction of a sweeping policy/promise which may sound good in the prospectus, but is doomed to failure.

In order for the University to measure its performance against goals they need to be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable/Realistic and Time based). and we need to know where we are now. All of the goals set (as presented) are qualitative rather than quantitative.

In order to embed the work we are starting as part of Getting in Shape, an overt commitment to continuous improvement (or similar) in our operations would be welcome.

In relation to Environmental Sustainability this goal lacks direction, ambition or content. People and Planet (2019) ranked the University of Nottingham 75th in their league tables for sustainability and awarded us 0% on our Environmental Policy and Strategy. No wonder, as the current Sustainability Strategy 2015-2020 is more a PR document presenting a set of fairly minor projects, rather than a target driven set of detailed measurable university wide strategies. Latte levies and carbon offsetting simply do not reflect the seriousness of the climate emergency, nor the level of ambitious targets required to play our part in avoiding climate catastrophe. The IPCC (2018) report requires reduction of Carbon Pollution by 45% by 2030 and to zero by 2050 to avoid global warming above 1.5C of pre-industrial levels - they have given us just one decade to achieve this. The university should be taking its lead from this grave assessment and urgent timescale. At present our Carbon Management Plan and Carbon Reports are focussed on estates with little ambition or consideration around behaviour change, travel or consumption. To take just one example 'According to a study of air travel at the University of British Columbia in Canada in 2017, staff from just five departments made 709 air trips over 18 months. The resulting emissions were more than 200 times the building emissions for the whole of the geography department' (Nabors, N, 2017, Emissions from UBC Air Travel). A study at Lancaster University found that 13% of Carbon emissions were due to business travel and a further 16% due to commuting. A huge proportion 24% were due to purchases. Current strategy including the proposed White Paper lack detail on measurable, transparent and whole systems approaches. For example our Carbon Reports fail to take into account embodied CO2 emissions from new build on campus and therefore considerable additional emissions are simply eliminated from the record. Travel and purchases by university and staff are similarly absent, as are any targets. There is little mention or attention to reducing emissions from commuting to the university by staff and students. The Corporate Travel Plans and Business Travel Policy is not easily available to staff or students and aspects of the Concur system actually promotes air travel over rail travel. In relation to sustainability in our education - outside of specialist modules, this only amounts to the Perspectives on Sustainability NOOC. But other universities have reduced their carbon emissions and have ambitious future targets by embarking on holistic education initiatives of staff and students eg. the carbon literacy scheme at Manchester Metropolitan University and the Green Academy at Nottingham Trent University. It would be a good start if sustainability related strategy documents actually comprised of detailed, transparent and measurable strategies that can be operationalised. I think we owe our students - who will live out the consequences of what we do over the next decade - a more ambitious targeted holistic approach to carbon reduction with clear governance structures alongside oversight powers to ensure implementation.

In terms of sustainability, the goals are not ambitious enough. Requiring carbon offset purchase for all business travel ultimately puts the responsibility to carbon-offset the travel to external organisations. Given that UoN in itself is a large and powerful organisation, I suggest that we create our own carbon offsetting projects, locally, nationally and internationally. The money (added to travel bookings?) could thus fund research+impact projects. Make sure these are "free of colonial attitudes and assumptions."

This point can be extended to business travel behaviours (travel less, use trains more, stay in sustainable accommodation) - and regular travel, e.g. commuting. The Campus is not a very safe place to walk and cycle and there is a lot of potential for infrastructure to restrict the speed of cars. UoN could cooperate with public transport providers to reduce travel costs for students and staff (as a comparison, German Universities usually provide a 6-month public transport ticket for

at least the entire federal state to all students, which is included in the admin fee.) Plus, please STOP re-purposing cycle lanes on Campus for parking etc. on open days - these are the days when drivers are most chaotic, and this sets the wrong example to visitors.

I also suggest to "Include relevant learning on sustainability as part of all our undergraduate and graduate programmes."

In the goal:

Prioritise environmental sustainability in the focus of our research and teaching as well as in our own behaviour as an organisation. To this end we will ensure that we achieve net carbon neutrality by 20XX

Should an example of this also be to move away from research into fossil fuels unless it's related to carbon emissions reductions and have a carbon neutral investment portfolio by a certain date?

In the values it states Health and wellbeing - part of this should be to encourage all staff and students to adopt an 'active' lifestyle through sport, fitness and recreational activities. We are currently facing a student mental health crisis and participation sport is a great way to de-stress. We are also facing a national obesity crisis - more emphasis should be placed on active lifestyle - getting people off their backsides and away from their desks!!

Increasing our investment in support for equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI), with dedicated Pro-Vice-Chancellor leadership - i am not sure that this can be seen as part of Nurture potential by recruiting, and supporting individuals with the highest potential to succeed as students and staff. The installment of PVC in this respect alone doesn't mean a thing, what is more useful is the programs e.g. mentorship for BAME, LGBT; enforcing quota ratio for BAME or LGBT for managerial level etc.

Anonymised application doesn't necessarily help achieving EDI, making recruiters that represent BAME or LGBT might be more useful.

Reducing our reliance on single use plastics and promoting waste reduction through nudges like our 'latte levy': why not providing lifetime mugs for all staff with logos on it?

Innovation is key, but there is no innovation process (except for FIF which isn't really). There is no reward for innovation by individual or Department/School/PS.

Investment in technology to enhance our offering (across front and back office services) is key to keep up with the rest of the world (such as AI)

Is this it? 4 very general questions??! This is not a consultation if so.

It doesn't reflect the Nottingham feature and seems applicable to all universities

It feels so high level that it doesn't give much detail as to how some of these things will practically be achieved.

It is a really good strategy. But it can be more associated with students.

It is disappointing to see that sport receives no specific acknowledgement in the proposed strategy. Over a 10 year period of my involvement I have seen the department move forward on a number of different levels from participation through to performance with the past year being its most successful. Involvement in sport provides so much "added value" to the student experience that is measurable and specific as well contributing much to the mental well being of so many of our students. If we are to acknowledge that participation in sport can be "lifelong" with all the resultant health benefits it is important that university bridges the gap between school and work.

It is incredibly disappointing to read that Sport has no place within the new strategy. The benefits sport and physical activity has on our community is well known, thus I would have expected it to

feature. This omission seems very outdated and it is concerning that the University doesn't recognise the importance of sport and physical activity in everyday life.
It is very positive that this strategy has addressed themes of social justice, social mobility and widening access, which were all missing from the last plan.
It looks like a good balance of the ambitious and the attainable.
It seems to me that there is insufficient emphasis on measurements to determine whether the broad aims are being achieved within the target timescale . For example I should like to see a commitment to providing every student with a minimum of three hours per week of direct tutorial experience either one on one or in small groups no greater than five . Another requirements should be that before every lecture each student is provided with a summary of the main points to be covered plus suggestions for suggestions for advance and follow up reading .
It would be good if the students of the Preliminary Year in Ningbo were offered the possibility to repeat the year if they do not achieve the necessary IELTS score for the relevant degrees. We are creating mental issues due to a sense of lack of competence and graduating students with poor command of the English. This can affect the Nottingham brand in the long term.
It would be good to add stewardship for our planet and communities as a value.
It would be great on the formatting of the strategy (in digital form) to have embedded links to case studies of the examples, so that if staff are interested in developing partnerships or employability or sustainability, they can get more info and find out the key contacts. It should be as easy as possible to find out all the great stuff we are doing.
It's a great start, much more meaningful than GS2020 - a genuine example of less is more. I get a real sense of what we're about, where we want to be, what we want to do. Thank you. There's a caveat however. I could answer 'agree' rather than 'strongly agree' to qu 1 to 4 because I am a little confused about the meaning of the "prioritising environmental sustainability in the focus of our r & t [...] organisation" goal. It's quite an important goal and I'm struggling to understand it. Are we prioritising research and teaching focusing on sustainability? If so it should be explicit e.g. "we're prioritising env sustainability r & t" but then this has such a major impact on non-env sustainability r & t in terms of resources and decision-making and in my mind wouldn't be taking the University in the right direction - hence strongly rather than very strongly. I may be the only one confused by this goal, if so sorry. I'm hoping it means we're aiming to focus on sustainability in the way we r & t. That is the right direction for us but I didn't want to assume the meaning.
It's a great strategy in its design, boldness and direction, and I like realistic comments such as developing a 'culture of experimenting which recognises that experiments do not always succeed'. The strategy is also very academically-focused (which it obviously needs to be), but sometimes I feel professional services could do with more representation. i.e. UNUK have been voted as the number one sports university in the country. Sport plays such an integral part in student and staff wellbeing, and is a major factor in students' choosing which institution to study at - so why can't we embed something in the strategy that mentions sport? Not just a 'brief' passing mention of a very generic 'Health & Wellbeing'?
It's just soft words; almost zero actual strategy.
I think our lunch should be more delicious and cheap.
Linked in with student well being it seems very strange there is no mention of recreational activity (Arts, Sport, Drama etc) and how important this is to the students wider than education and dealing with wellbeing crisis cases.
Love the idea of providing a foundation course to keep students. Derby already do this and my son has gone down this route. He really wanted to go to Nottm Uni but when he left school he didn't know what he wanted to do so went to work first, then when decided struggled due to not having enough exam results/points to attend straight away.
Love these ideas in particular: * placements for all students

- * international module options
- * cross-degree common modules on e.g. sustainability (and could these be available for staff to attend to? Delivered on the big screen on Portland hill?)
- * Environmental impact assessment on large investments (why don't we already do this)?

Maybe there could be more in here somehow about 'home from home' or community or something that really nurtures mental health wellbeing?

I noticed that Beacons were referenced twice - just wondering what thought there is around beacon sustainability / embedding and at what points it is useful to review where we are focusing our people and cash resource (how often are global research questions updated)?

Noticed the comment about civic agenda planning with NTU. Wonder whether we've also considered things like teaching and research subject expertise across the 2 Nottingham Unis to reduce any direct competition between ourselves for any funds or students?

Finally - in all the great things we do already and aspire to do how do we get the message out there to celebrate all this (internally and externally).

Many of the aims are business as usual or not specific enough. The strategy appears disconnected from the functional issues on the ground e.g. there is research funding support in R and I, but the issue has been historical underfunding, meaning that the team is only now approaching vaguely normal levels of staffing for an institution of its size. If the proposal was to create another research funding support unit that sits within the R and I umbrella (currently unclear if this is the plan?) this will create a silo and business risk, when reforming and adding new roles in existing teams would be immediately beneficial. Academics commonly request support with bid writing that APM staff are capable and happy to do, but we lack the staff time to provide. Project Transform has left research staff feeling more disconnected than ever from APM and what APM staff can support with and I'm concerned that they increasingly don't bother to talk to us.

Crucial assumptions around the time that academic staff have available to research have been breached, meaning that academic staff are commonly working over 100% of their time. This is concerning from an EDI perspective, especially because some academics and postdocs report that the burden is shifted on to postdoctoral researchers who may find their personal development compromised.

Beacons and IRCs have and can be a positive force, but it must be key to their construction that nepotism will not be tolerated and there need to be objective and open reviews of whether researchers are being excluded from them on a systematic basis.

We have a value of transparency but whether research staff are allowed to fail depends on Faculty and School, with some reporting that trying and failing is worse than not trying, and others being more protected by the local ruling of their School.

Funding continues to be ring fenced within the UK (usually due to funder requirements) but outside of travel funding there is no good way to encourage parallel research at the other campuses meaning that research folds because of funding issues. The goals proposed will also struggle in the face of a probable Brexit.

We continue to lack adequate training for university systems because we don't have the training support in HR that other universities commonly have. I have personally received: terrible training from people with no teaching experience, teaching from externals who didn't understand (or even

have access to) the UoN bespoke system, elearning that inaccurately described legal requirements, training that was someone handing me slides and giving me financial control. This is not normal or OK.

We have a culture where staff do not dare to question senior staff because we are all aware of how precarious, and frequently unwritten, our rights and responsibilities are. This means that we let senior staff make decisions that are actively stupid, and we don't save them from these mistakes because it feels as though technical experts are not allowed to overrule, even in cases of legal compliance. The majority of senior staff would happily be corrected I'm sure, but they will not be corrected, because staff are too afraid.

The strategy as written reflects an institution that I do not work in, the institution that I think senior staff see and others don't. The vision and mission are apt but the values will at best receive a bitter laugh from most academics. What we currently have as a white paper smacks of the underpinning mistakes of Project Transform, not because this process is the same at all, but because we haven't fixed the underlying cultural norms that could allow Project Transform in the first place. I would like to see us have less aims, that are more specific, have a named individual in senior staff responsible for them, and see those aims realised before I think the institution can reasonably set such an overarching strategy that will necessarily determine our focus and funding for several years.

Many of the goals feel like they are a continuation of things we set out under the old strategy and would be doing anyway. This could be because we feel they are still the right things to do or because we haven't identified novel new disruptive opportunities and challenges that take the University out of its comfort zone.

master new skills, read more books, try what I want

Maybe more tryouts concerning the topic of "making every student have the opportunity to study abroad or in an international environment", because of that many students who are studying in business school in unnc are relavently harder to get the opportunity to study abroad.

More communication more better

More communication programs for research students among campuses

More integration between different campuses will add value to the future of UoN as a truly international university

More purposeful engagement with alumni in a genuinely two-way relationship is an excellent idea. Tackling these huge global challenges will require many partnerships and alumni are one mechanism to develop these. Creating ways to engage such as through life-long learning is a very good idea.

The international mind-set is vital too, particularly at a time when borders and boundaries are becoming more visible. It is very important that we deliver meaningfully on this and show that we are doing so. It is too easy to say things at strategic level and then not follow-through. To that end offering students and staff a module on what it means to be a global citizen would be worth exploring.

A carbon neutral goal chimes with many organisations but is only one element of being environmentally sustainable. We need to ensure that whatever we commit to is more than smoke and mirrors though. Perhaps developing our own offsetting programme through projects that we can support across our campuses is something to consider. Just paying into someone else's programme may look half-hearted. If it works well we could even aim to become carbon positive! This might be something that our partners in the Nottingham Business Partnership would join us in doing.

Most of the proposed content seems to be focusing on the UK Campus (like the proposed Innovation Hub in Nottingham). What I believe it should be is fair distribution of development to other campuses as well.
My first observation is that distilling the strategy to a short document is an excellent idea. When reading through the Mission and Vision, the statements are anodyne and lack specificity and could have been written by a very large number of large organisations. It is unclear what is unique in these descriptions (as is the case with most Mission and Visions. I would suggest a structure that says "what we are about" and "how we do it" instead of the well-worn and mostly meaningless M&V language adopted by the majority of large organisations. I would also suggest using more deadlines for the Goals, otherwise they communicate no sense of urgency or commitment. For the university to stand out to prospective students it would seem that using language that more directly relates to them is the obvious way to go. I would even suggest using student forums to ask them what they would like to see in a Strategy that would appeal to them and how it would be phrased - ie Corporate speak or every day, meaningful language.
My main comment as the SU International Students' Engagement Coordinator would be that, alongside the stated examples for what we could do to achieve the goal to 'Bring an international mindset to all our activities...', we should include more practical activities focusing on bringing together Home and International students, social and pastoral support and integration. I currently manage Global Buddies, the SU's peer mentoring scheme for new International/EU students , which has this aim. However we are only reaching around 500 students in total (mentors and mentees combined) with the scheme, and I feel that provision needs to be much greater. This could come from University departments (as long as there was a clear strategy that was applied to all of them) or continue to come from the SU but would need more staff to run it (currently there is only me). Thank you for your consideration.
My only feedback would be to recommend well funded infrastructure of services that ensure meaningful, face-to-face contact and conversation with students. This is how we ensure that students are heard, understood and supported. It is also the critical practice that can help UoN quickly climb any university league tables and set us apart from our rivals.
My sincere hope is the effective implementation and monitoring of the proposed strategies.
NA
Need to make them real
Needs to also address issues of diversity
NIL
no
No
No
no
no
no
no
no
No
No
no
No comments
no explanation
none
none
none
None.Everything is fine.

Not immediately obvious by what routes effective KE would be realised: commercialisation, student placements, maximising value from property including Innovation Park
Not sure the layout of the White Paper makes much sense. In shrinking it back down to 2 pages - the wording has become so tight as to become meaningless again... and the structure of the Green Paper has been lost. The examples don't map onto the aims - and it's all a bit amorphous and vague, which is a shame - as the Green Paper was genuinely different and had clarity.
What are the points of distinction and direction that this document is trying to highlight? It doesn't need to be a USP - but if this was a cake, and you were describing its flavour to someone that hadn't tasted it - what would you say?
nothing
Nothing
noting
Nurture potential by recruiting, and supporting individuals with the highest potential to succeed as students and staff.
This goal should be focused on ensuring all student and staff are given the support they need to achieve their potential - not just those with the highest potential.
It reads as if only those with the highest potential will be supported.
Offer international experience (short stints) for staff members - APM and academics, and not just offering students these international experience (Offer every University of Nottingham student an international opportunity – perhaps a module studied together with students in another international location, or a study abroad option)
Offering in excess of 10,000 paid placements every year is nothing if not ambitious. Contextual admissions is a good thing but we need to remember that there are cases where the offer should go up as well as down.
Offering part-time, flexible versions of all programmes would be extremely time-consuming (both in terms of the initial planning to put the systems in place, and to deliver it each year. Also, there is a very low number of part-time students at UK universities which implies there might not be a demand for part-time provision. Regarding the foundation year for students who aren't ready for a UG course, as we offer a huge range of courses, it would need many different strand of the foundation year in order to prepare students for all the different courses. This means it would be expensive to run because it would require a lot of course administration and the student numbers on each strand would be very small. Those students would still have to pay their living costs for the extra year, so they would pay more overall.
On China's campus, the allocation of internal research resources including lab space, equipment and manpower has never been transparent and fair. Clearly someone attached to a well established group/big professor can deliver more as he/she can have such an advantage in terms of the above-mentioned resources.
One of the critical outcomes of the University may include the human development of the student or member. University offers experience which home life through school years may never provide: e.g participation in high quality music and art. Education in drawing out the skills and experiences of the community is every bit important as the achievement of excellence in a specialist subject.
One thing that strikes me is that a great many decisions are taken in the university for purely financial reasons - e.g. setting up new courses purely to make money (regardless of whether or not they are academically coherent) or immediately promoting staff just because they are successful in obtaining a large grant/fellowship (so there is a financial incentive for the university

to retain them and their grant) even if they have no other grounds for promotion. The fundamental idea that a university is an academic institution (as opposed to a money-making venture) seems to be taking a back seat both in reality and in the strategy statement.

Opportunity for Sabbatical need to be clearly communicated and the guidelines are transparent

Overall the focus on our educational and research mission, and the impact this has on the world, feels diluted.

I agree with the additional focus on elements such as EDI but I think that it could be clearer that this is in order to better achieve our education and research mission.

Quite a lot of the language feels inwardly focussed. E.g. for me the following is the most powerful of the 4 sentences in the Vision/Mission box because it talks to our impact on the world; but it isn't the sentence that is designated as the vision

We empower and support talented people – students and staff - to collaborate in learning, scholarship and discovery across the full breadth of human experience, solving problems and improving lives.

A simple re-ordering to put the educational and research elements first in each section would in my view strengthen the strategy

The examples don't feel very ambitious at the moment- e.g. the nurturing session could include student attainment and employability as well as access. Hopefully once the strategy is finalised, the approach of broad engagement can continue to generate more creative ideas

In terms of guiding decision making, its not obvious which activities would be de-prioritised as a result of the strategy (which would be helpful for Getting in Shape)- perhaps some examples could be offered

Overall, I love the content and find pride in however small a part I add

Personally I would like to see EDI more prominent in the values and goals. It is there but I'm not sure that the goals are challenging enough - the University is full of privileged people and it will take ambition and action to make rapid change in this area.

Please digitalized our learning experience in UNNC, at least, the video record of lectures and seminars.

Please do not forget who fund the university, and whose interest you should value. As for China campus, our QS ranking decrease rapidly this year, and after carefully viewed your plan, I have not seen any direct action to solve this problem. The Gaokao scores are still vital to assess a university in China. And I can ensure that, if we are no longer the top 100, our Gaokao score must decrease. EQUALITY AND INTEGRITY? WHERE IS THEM? When you do promotion during the period student selecting university. You have never said NUBS China student can only have 1 semester exchange. I find you focus on environment. That is good. But do you really care students' well-being? The access to healthy food in China campus is really rare. The logistics company in China campus in China is really not professional and quality. They do not care about students well-being and equality. Why international and Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan students can live in single room, but most mainland students have no choice and can only live in four people room? Why a restaurant can survive in this campus after major safety accident.

Please don't leave it too broad as targets need to be clear to avoid endless debate on meaning over the years to come

Please don't mandate carbon offsetting

Please increase the free access to academic resource including magazine, newspapers and archived video for all schools students in all campus. I had trouble accessing academic resource only open for business school students (i.e. Financial Time) or students from British campus all the time (i.e. Taylor & Francis ebooks). It is frustrating as sometimes I spent more time searching

papers using UNNC account with limited access rather than writing it.

Plus, some of the e-resource on library database list is either obsolete or invalid. Please have it re-examined.

Please increase your QS World University Ranking. Don't drop out of top 100. :|

Promote shared professional development across all staff groups, including developing a shadowing/mentoring approach which would partner academics with professional services and technical staff and bring together staff based in different countries - I have seen this tried elsewhere and I think it does not work, i.e. it's a good idea in principle but does not work in practice

Set up a research funding support unit to deliver a step change in the external financing of our research activities including major facilities - I think this is an excellent idea, providing it is one unit across all aspects of the University. At present there are various un-coordinated efforts in this space going on (e.g. EU office, e.g. my School) which are not joined up or sustainable. I suggest to model on the very strongest Ivy League universities, which provide two types of support not currently available - (a) support from very experienced grant-writers who know the specific target funding scheme well and actually write text (i.e. not just mentoring the PI) and (b) reduced waste by having an updated and very polished boiler-plate text for various aspects of the University's many achievements (I recently submitted a large bid and can't tell you the time I wasted trawling through the University website and liaising with different bits of the university to pull together a strong story about the host organisation

Further ideas:

Reducing waste from trying to manage finances - other universities have in place a personal research account structure in which money is not swept at the end of each financial year - this would make the job of research group leaders like me much simpler by taking away the need to spend the time I do just trying to manage finances across financial years

Increasing international outlook - Implementation of a sabbatical process consistently across the University with an expectation that time is spent with other groups (of course taking account of personal circumstances but ideally in other countries) would enhance the global reach of the university (and the research performance of individual staff)

Proposed strategies were sufficiently ambitious to the extent that I doubt they would be exercised and implemented -- based on past experience of the University. Would love to be proven wrong.

Quality of academic achievement should be as significant as equality and diversity.

Rather an additional thought - there is much emphasis on change, new ideas, etc which is fine, but any change proposed should have a form of risk assessment included (more than just the normal environmental impact statement mentioned) carried out by totally independent groups & to include very long term effects. The aim would be to try to avoid or at least foresee such things as, for example the present disasters we face with the use of plastics (I believe this was foreseeable, but nobody looked) or the over-use of fossil fuels (maybe not foreseeable in early developments with the limited knowledge at the time but could have been foreseen earlier than it has been). Such assessments should apply to all proposals, social changes included, not just physical developments. Results could be "all fine," "good for the short term but limit the time or extent of use," "go ahead but monitor effects carefully," etc through to "don't even think about it!" (Maybe a preliminary assessment needs to be done early in the piece).

Realistically I see very little opportunity for this to be realised for staff in APM roles as we are very much constrained in what we do. The limitations of Campus Solutions and the poor expertise support provided by Infosys means that we aren't able to make many of the improvements that we would wish to. Although this is a specific is it so fundamental to our work that this limitation will stop us doing a lot of the work we want to do. We can't recruit the best students if we don't have the resources we need to attract them. I also feel that as an APM member of staff I am much

more siloed and detached from academics and the broader university community now than at any other time in the 20 years I have worked at the university.

Regarding sustainability, the pursuit of international collaboration should be balanced with the need to reduce carbon emissions from overseas travel. There should be more resources devoted to developing closer European links, time allowed for the use of more carbon-neutral travel options, and much greater investment in technology for virtual collaborative workspaces. The School of Computer Science has been trialing these technologies for 20 years but they've never been properly implemented.

Reporting views of CLAS School Management Committee (not necessarily my views; they only partly overlap - N McLelland)

1. "The proposed content for our new Strategy sets the right direction for the University." - DISAGREE because the direction is not clear enough - not enough about the basic job of a university: teaching and teaching quality, research, e.g. one wry comment "we look back on the phrase 'world-leading research' with affection". (References to teaching were eventually spotted, but were not front and centre as expected.) "It's not obvious this is a university".
2. The ideas proposed for our new Strategy are sufficiently ambitious. NEUTRAL - some of the ideas under "What ideas have been suggested" were welcomed but felt to be over-ambitious because of fear there would not be resource to back them, specifically a paid placement for every student, carbon off-setting for travel. "Don't overpromise". But these concrete ideas were well-received ...
3. The proposed content for our new Strategy will support clear decision making across the University. - DISAGREE because it doesn't articulate the core function of the university clearly. We seem to be promising everything - "be careful it doesn't sound like 'and we also offer candle-making'". Another comment: Not clear who decides what [though I would not expect that in a strategy NMCL]
4. As a member of the University community, the content for our new Strategy seems relevant to me. STRONGLY DISAGREE for same reason as under 3. and 1.

OTHER POINTS AGREED ON AS FEEDBACK:

Beautiful campuses should not be the top line. Is that really the main point?

The international dimension is welcome (some query as to whether repeated too often)

Firmly instructed not to get bogged down in wording, the group nevertheless objected forcefully to "disruption seen as opportunity" as management guff.

Research seems under-represented. Lack of appreciation of environmental factors (internal and external) that will/may affect delivery of goals. Some borders are beyond our control.

Simplify the language; avoid management jargon and excise ugly neologisms such as "future-proof".

Otherwise, I suppose, it is in the nature of publically available higher education strategy statements to support

fashionable causes such as anti-colonialism however misguided they may be. I hope you are drafting another

strategy with feasible targets for internal use.

Some of the goals seem potentially too ambitious:

- a foundation year for all courses
- offer all students a paid internship
- offer every student an international opportunity.

If these options would be available still based on application and merit, I think it is feasible, but to say all students will be able to regardless seems financially unviable and complex.

<p>Sorry to say i feel they are just a lot of soundbites. What is written is nothing like working here unfortunately, it is a good place to work, but the threat of redundancy overpowers the vision mission and values. Sorry!</p>
<p>Sport is becoming increasingly a more important factor in the decision making for students in terms of their destination of study in the UK and sport regularly provides a significant contribution to a student's positive experience during their tenure at a university. Furthermore, research recently produced demonstrates students involved in sport have greater prospects after they graduate than students who don't. Therefore, I believe Sport should be mentioned directly in the strategy.</p>
<p>Sport should feature more heavily in the new strategy as 'health & wellbeing' is becoming more and more important in everyday life and thus the work life balance of students and staff of the University. Sport has a huge impact and influence in everyone's life, i.e. student mental health, physical wellbeing of the University community, promoting social integration and preventing social isolation, reducing sick leave, developing life skills, improving career prospects, building university affinity, helping address equality, diversity and inclusion issues or improving academic performance. More specific and detailed outcomes and aims should be included in the strategy to help achieve the right balance for student/campus life in the future. Thanks for your consideration.</p>
<p>strongly agree</p>
<p>Strongly support</p>
<p>Sustainability in all aspects, including environmental and social needs to be at the centre of the future of the university. All programmes need to have both sustainability-focused courses as well as make sure many courses show the links to sustainability.</p>
<p>Thanks</p>
<p>The "strategy" seems largely student focused and includes things we "could do" on the "research side" that already exist- e.g. RGS already supports externally funded research, sabbaticals already exist and are used to promote international collaboration. From a research perspective the "strategy" seems woefully lacking, from a student perspective there are allot of positives. I particularly like the increased focus on engagement with alumni.</p>
<p>The "we could" ideas don't live up to "a pioneering and entrepreneurial tradition of creativity and innovation". More ambition, more daring please! Some "we could" ideas overlap substantially with "we are already" activities (e.g. "We are ... investing in shared learning, teaching and laboratory spaces which bring together ..." / "we could ... create spaces designed to promote collaboration").</p>
<p>I strongly support "Recruit all UK undergraduate students via contextualised offers".</p>
<p>The 2 page document is understandably generic and allows many departments to see how they connect with it as a positive. However, i think the health and wellbeing aspect of the strategy should more explicitly recognise how the university will take a proactive approach to improving the health and wellbeing of its student and staff population. Being positive and referencing sport and physical activity in this regard will help with a clear message around this. I think this action will ensure the university is taking its civic responsibility seriously in this area, in the same way as it does in the area of environmental sustainability.</p>
<p>In terms of specific other feedback: Values:</p>

The value of "quality in all that we do" seems to be better explained as Excellence - which can be broken down into "quality in all that we do" and also to include "developing and achieving potential"

Goals/Enablers:

The goals section seems to be very devoid of reference to the student experience and the commitment to delivering an outstanding student experience. This also stands for the enablers, which should include a focus on providing opportunities for students to broaden their experience and develop/excel in a range of areas outside of their course.

In general the student experience is not as prioritised as i believe it should be in this draft.

The ambition for business engagement and industrial partnership development comes through in the Strategy Green Paper Consultation Report, but the document outlining the proposed content for the University strategy makes little reference to this at all. It seems so key to helping us to achieve our research excellence ambitions as well as enhancing student employability. As such, it feels like it needs to be more explicit in the strategy itself.

The BREEAM requirements have changed in 2018 and what was Outstanding is now classed as Excellent. The BRE have been challenged by external organisations about their lack of ability to futureproof the BREEAM standards. We should not tie ourselves to this one output as there are many other standards available and different projects may suit different standards.

The content is relevant to me from the area of offering life-long learning resources for alumnis, that found me very intrigued and looking forward to see this practice to be implemented in the near future.

The courses should be more effective and deep.

The document is full of the meaningless babble of management-speak that illustrates the useless incompetence of the management of the University. A prime example is

"To be a university without borders, where disruption is seen as opportunity..."

I have no idea what either of those statements mean.

I hope you will regard my disruptive comment as an opportunity.

The environmental section is a welcome inclusion, the existing suggested steps there are welcome, but could be more ambitious. The naming of a carbon neutral date is a good idea - we should make this to be as ambitious as possible: let's say 2025.

Two other specific suggestions:

- encourage staff to reduce their carbon footprint by flying less; travel-booking systems should make non-flying the default (i.e. travelling within Europe should be done by train/coach) and reward staff who attend conferences by videolink rather than flying in. Senior staff could send a strong signal to the university body here by pledging to fly less or not at all (e.g. taking the #FlightFree2020 pledge).

- ban all non-recyclable coffee cups and plastic bottles from campus (or better: all single-use plastics); send every new student a reusable cup and water bottle in their welcome pack so that they know to expect this.

- retrofit existing buildings with solar panels and insulation wherever practicable (even if the economics of doing so are marginal - the point is the message it sends).

On a different note, there doesn't seem to be anything here about mental health of students or staff - I would like to see the university set out a goal to foster a supportive environment of wellbeing and mutual care.

The focus on change and creativity/innovation is very welcome. It will be important that the University is set up to support its people through this change and achieve real engagement. One key challenge will be effective prioritisation, which means saying no to things and trying to do less than we tried to do in the 2015-2020 strategy cycle, but being much more focused about how we work.

To comment properly on ambition, the community needs to see the 'we could' boxes turned into 'we will' do X, Y, Z. If this is included in the next stage, it will show how this strategy can be taken forward.

Effective planning/management at functional and portfolio will be key to success. Some additional overview visualisations of how the strategy will become a plan would be very helpful.

The goal: 'Nurture potential by recruiting, and supporting individuals with the highest potential to succeed as students and staff' appears a little vague. The strategy boasts that we offer target development (which is debateable) and the suggestions do not really add anything which would develop staff further. Although I do agree with all of the goals - this particular one does feel like it is tokenism, where the university is patting itself on its back but is not really delivering currently.

I do think the suggestion about having shared resources/learning is a good one, but am concerned that by 'genericising' a core topic, it may compromise the epistemology of the subject matter. For instance, if research is a theme, certain subjects might require more weighting to the theory of experimental design (e.g. physics), whereas others might require deeper understanding of feminist theories (e.g. midwifery).

The goals and values set out in the new university strategy seem obvious and uninspired. It will be apparent to all long standing representatives of the University of Nottingham that the intended We Could

The goals are ambitious and well drafted, they should be applied across the three campuses. UNNC is still very focused on teaching from the recruitment and teaching load points of view. In order to truly be a global university that carries out world class research, the correct research culture should be applied to UNNC as well.

The Goals seem quite generic ... which other Universities wouldn't agree and include something similar to 80% of these in their own Goals? What is UoN's real differentiator? The specific carbon neutrality might be 'unique', but how feasible (depending on the agreed date) if UNNC electricity from coal based power stations? So will it end up being a fudge using carbon off-setting? 'Beautiful campuses'. Yes agree they are, or at least UP is, but is this really the leading point on our 'mission'. It's a current given. Finally, are we asking the right people ... i.e. internal feedback. Aren't we potentially too close and don't really have an outlook on what a 21st University needs to be.

The goals set out are uninspired... the values simply common sense... Originality is lacking. With the scale of the university being what it is, having the ineptitude and arrogance to think that 6 goals and 6 values is enough for such an institution is ludicrous.

Furthermore, there is no mention of health and wellbeing through physical activity. Endless numbers of studies showing the benefits of physical activity in relation to various aspects of life yet the university seems to overlook them. Countless achievements by student athletes yet this, apparently, is still not enough. A £40 million sports facility that should be incorporated into the university's strategy is also ignored.

If you wish to truly "future proof" your students then you would set targets relating to sport and exercise. Preparing them for "working world" is one thing, but your role as an institute of higher education does not stop there. By ignoring sport and exercise, you have impressed upon all those connected to UoN that being physically inactive is acceptable and that their ability to make money in the future is paramount. This university has chosen to ignore something that it should consider as vital. Health and wellbeing through physical activity MUST be a part of this university's strategy.

The idea to give contextualised offers to all UK students seems to risk diminishing entry standards.

The strategy overall seems good but has little to no strategy to ensure the rankings of the university remain high. The recent QS rankings fall leaves Nottingham barely within the top 100. This should be addressed, the quality of the university standing with employer's and public is important to graduates.

The strategy doesn't seem to focus on postgraduates at all. One of the reason's despite doing my undergraduate at Nottingham, but plan to move on for my master's. I feel that other universities put more care into what they offer at master's level especially from a marketing standpoint. However, perception is important in services. The university is after all a service provider.

Finally, foundation shouldn't be offered for free as the quality of especially home students who don't succeed on access course's might not be suited for a university like Nottingham. The workload is quite heavy at times and expectations are high. If anything provide more information to those who are doing access courses or BTECs then risking resources by bringing on high risk pupils. Also how could this be financially viable in the long term and what added value would it offer..student loans aren't real debt, the university shouldn't risk it.

The impact of sport within the university is undervalued and the new strategy doesn't include the positive role sport plays for students and staff. I'm privileged to see first hand the benefit of sport in a wide range of areas such as:

- physical well-being
- mental health
- sportsmanship
- developing life skills
- improving career opportunities
- building a sense of belonging

It would be great to see the positive impact of sport reflected in the strategy.

The Knowledge Exchange function is not well represented in the internationalisation part of the whole strategy.

The lack of specifics about high quality teaching in the Values section, but many statements about research and environmental sustainability shows that this university really is not understanding the way higher education in this country is going to go.

The mission does not emphasise enough the ambition for excellence in research. It is very shy in terms of the Russell Group's goal of producing world-class research and informing our teaching with cutting-edge research. .Many of us do more than "solving problems", we move the frontier of knowledge. Research generated at Nottingham deserved the Nobel prize (twice). This level of research ambition is not present in the current version of the Mission. I really hope this will change in the final version.

The new strategy can not distinguish the University with peers

The paper sets some excellent goals and vision; the university will need to follow through on ideas of being 'without borders' and having a 'creative culture' (as well as supporting 'ambitious people' in pursuit of these goals) in terms of resource allocation, which has been weak in the past.

The post research grant delivery office and the sabbatical proposal are to be welcomed here, Thank you.

Otherwise though there is dilution of words about research and research led teaching from previous strategy. Research is very hard to achieve at a high level and UoN is in danger of slipping unless we support our research staff especially. However there is little emphasis in the wording on supporting staff to deliver world leading research. It is of course fair that staff in all job families are treated fairly and have great careers with plenty of opportunities in non R & T work.

However Universities are about faculty creating and sharing knowledge for students and for society. Nottingham's academic workloads are excessive and not reducing. Working weeks of 55-60 hours regularly are commonplace and documented by official workload measures. Tired people aren't effective and NSS may reflect this. We need to reduce workload at UoN and put leaders back in touch with their T & R staff and students, in addition to administrative staff whom they see more of these days. This is mission critical yet it can feel that its heretical at UoN to suggest this. Of course we must make good working homes for our support staff in a nice environment-where they are valued- i totally agree- but we need to keep the R & T on point. We need to support and manage our research talent - the people who are asked to deliver ambitious research that changes the world- and who teach and inspire students. Increasingly they are asked to participate in more and more internal engagement or management committees or events . However at the same time their basic ability to do research, and have it recognised in a challenging outside world is diminished by- a new ordering system that fails, or new computer compliance that acts against some research machines, or a physical building that is past its lifetime and leaks or floods. There are facilities for wellbeing but do the R & T staff have time to use them? Stress levels and aggression rise in academic staff and then more of their colleagues have to take part in investigating or in finding new homes for their research students. HR needs expanding to help with this as they are struggling and understaffed. The ability of R & T staff to inspire the next generation has also been diluted by the distance between students and academics created by Student Services Centres. When Schools had Student offices with staff who knew the academics, their was a partnership in caring for students and them knowing the researchers that taught them. This separation of academics makes people give up trying and the mission of the university is weakened. We need to improve in those areas to ensure that a University of R & T continues and fuels the success of UoN and so the whole ecosystem thrives.

The proposal seems to vague. I think whilst the general goals are good datum's more specific targets would be useful.

For example being to vague:

' Bring an international mind-set to all our activities, acting as a force for international understanding and collaboration, and ensuring that every student and staff member has a global experience, to foster a world without borders ' .

I already think 'we' do an excellent job at this but this statement and what it means for the future isn't clear as to what day to decisions will be made.

I think more measurable targets would be useful. ie

- 'at the next REF place top 7'

- 'progress in QS rankings top 50 by 2023'

- 'average UCAS entry tariff equivalent to AAB in every faculty'.

- '### amount of international cross-collaborative research programs'

(and then have prescribed actions on how the University plans to achieve these goals).

I think the current list is just a nice list of concepts all large Universities should aim for, but what makes Nottingham excellent within these goals needs to be more specific, this might just be as the plan is in the early stages however more clarity would be helpful.

The strategic goals are well thought out and worth working towards, for a truly global university. My wonder is whether Values such as: "Fairness, transparency, integrity – a covenant between all members of our community" will be monitored to avoid sections of the community unknowingly and Knowingly actions that undermine these values.

The strategic goals look good on paper, but the actual actions of the university still look like the university is more concern about making money than improving quality. When I did MSc in UNUK,

it was 74 in QS and now it is 96! It would be a shame to see Nottingham out of GS 100. Please address this risk by real action not just on paper.

The strategy doc is at too high a level to see how it might apply to individuals (see above response)

The strategy does not seem to identify how Nottingham can differentiate itself from other Universities in a crowded market place. The goals are very broad and as such, I do not feel provide sufficient direction or a framework for decision making. Perhaps the strategic delivery plans will help in this respect. Content-wise - everything seems relevant but it would be nice to see more differentiation.

The strategy fails to take into account the catastrophic climate breakdown we are currently experiencing. This is largely due to the damage inflicted on the planet by uncontrolled capitalism, as exemplified by the burning of the Amazon and the rampant forest fires in the artic. By encouraging more travel and growth and no date for when the University will become carbon neutral it is just compounding these problems. We only have one planet and a very short time in which to respond to the rise in temperature and carbon dioxide, so as such this is a missed opportunity, that will inflict further suffering on future generations.

The strategy is deeply misguided. The University has already made multiple, mostly unsuccessful, changes in the last few years and its reputation is sliding. What it desperately needs is a simple strategy that will, as far as possible, empower all academics to research and teach as they see fit. The constant intervention by setting overarching research strategies is a threat to academic freedom.

Efforts should be designed to support academics as individuals, rather than to impose even more "strategies" from above. The University must appoint the best scholars it can afford. It must trust them and back them with all the support it can offer, not constantly try and persuade them to bend to some centralised will. The positive results will surprise everyone. The strategy as it stands will simply introduce even more bureaucracy that will strangle individual initiative even further.

An approach centred on scholarship will require differentiation between how academics and others are appointed. Since the middle ages scholarly writing has been the main currency of academics. One cannot make applications anonymous and still read what the candidate has written. The suggestion to "Recruit to all staff posts using anonymised applications" should be rejected.

The strategy is missing a definition of the University; The University IS its people staff, students etc.

The University intends to hear and take account of all of its people.

In my view it is not sufficient to "solve problems and improve lives". Even a minor university does that. We need to be tackling substantial problems and making important improvements. Also, we should be shaping thinking. Teaching a generation how properly to view a piece of science or politics or business is really worthwhile.

Whilst I think it is laudable that we should make explicit mention of going "carbon neutral", there are two key problems with that: (1) how will we measure it? and (2) why are we mentioning this one ethical commitment.

To explain (1), I suspect that our target here will be to generate as much electricity as we consume. This is NOT sufficient for us to be playing our full part in carbon-neutrality. As renewables penetrate more, this will become more obvious. Regarding (2), we are not making any explicit commitments about accessibility, discrimination, widening participation, ethical investments, fair trade, exploitation, antibiotics and steroids, etc. etc. I think we should generalise this one.

[text redacted]

The strategy is very good at the level of vision but some of the claims made about what we are already doing are highly dubious (e.g., 2 claims about Beacons- they are not a sufficiently ambitious response either to the SDGs or to interdisciplinarity) However, beyond that detailed concern lies a real worry that comments like this are too complacent. The vision requires RADICAL change in University ways of working not tinkering - we need both big externally-facing vision AND big internally-facing vision if this is not to be yet another corporate greenwashing.

The strategy outlined could effectively apply to any UK University, there seemed little to address a unique selling point for Nottingham, overall I thought it was pretty bland. will this really drive change?

The strategy seems making all the senses, but the challenges always comes from implementation.

The sustainability goals and examples are very narrow, and make no mention of systems level thinking or life cycle analysis. Reducing single use plastics, for example, should be elevated only if the net result across the system (including off label uses and total environmental cost of replacements) is significant, and greater than competing initiatives that could be achieved with the same resources. "Review our curriculum content and our research narratives to ensure they are free of colonial attitudes and assumptions" sounds uncomfortably like censorship. I am not exactly sure what "colonial attitudes" are, but as long as they don't encourage or condone illegal behaviors, universities should not be banning perspectives, but instead debating them, and preparing students for life outside of the academic bubble, where they will face difficult, sometimes uncomfortable perspectives and ideas

The sustainability goals could be stronger - it is now possible to build carbon negative buildings, that actually feed the grid. Go beyond what is currently easily achievable.
Perhaps more about breaking down silos between various disciplines - eg. architecture and engineering.
There does not seem to be much mention of the humanities - it is so important to have student learning include the humanities - its not just about finding a job and money at the end. Need to build real critical thinkers.

The teaching quality of UNNC is dropping now, we need to do everything we can to increase teaching quality.

The University community has a great deal of expertise. It is a pity that time and again this expertise has been wasted and not listened to. Too many 'initiatives' founder because they were always unworkable and any reference to the relevant in-house experts would have immediately revealed this. Too many 'consultations' are simply a sham for a policy already decided. Senior management needs to listen. Proposed policy changes need to be evidence based with a clear and pre-defined evaluation route with agreed acceptance criteria that must be passed in trials before anything is foisted on the wider community. This is straightforward project management. At the same time the role of Council needs to be evaluated and changes made to make sure this important body does not repeat the utter failure of oversight that accompanied Project Transform.

The University Strategy can be a lot more ambitious with regards to its goals for environmental sustainability.

The proposal document currently states that 'We could...

§ Require carbon offset purchase
for all business travel

§ Conduct an environmental
impact assessment for all
significant proposed investments

§ Include relevant learning on

sustainability as part of all our undergraduate programmes.'

In view of the university's commitment to achieving net carbon neutrality, we can come up with far more ambitious goals. For instance, considering the severe contribution of air travel to the climate crisis, we can:

- Support staff choosing not to fly in 2020 - see <https://westayontheground.blogspot.com/p/flight-free-2020.html>. I would love to see the University offer a financial incentive to academics who choose to travel to conferences by land, or who choose to give their paper by Skype. This would also level the playing field for academic colleagues who are parents or have caring responsibilities, and who feel they miss out on representing their university at events. In line with the University's current success with 'nudges', please encourage staff not to fly by offering incentives such as extra annual leave for anyone who chooses to travel by train or by coach, and/or a financial incentive (eg. cash equivalent to the cost of a budget flight/ budget accommodation) for anyone who chooses to give a paper by Skype rather than travel (which could arguably work out cheaper than covering the full cost of their travel). At the moment, no incentive exists for members of staff who choose not to travel, while travel is seen as a 'perk'.

- To this end, please update the Concur website as a matter of urgency to make it easier for staff to book international travel via train or coach. At the moment, booking a flight is the simplest option, whereas to book a train journey to a conference in eg. Italy requires staff to book a Eurostar to Paris and then 'contact American Express GBT 02037883735 who will forward your request to their continental rail desk'. Please note that a number of members of staff have in recent months struggled to book travel through Concur while trying to avoid flights (you may be aware that some of their enquiries were forwarded to members of the sustainability team).

Furthermore, in line with Nottingham's 'Waste Nott' campaign, we can:

- Ban single-use plastic water bottles from campus except, for example, from Boots pharmacies (thus sending out the message that bottled water is an emergency purchase rather than an everyday one), instead offering reasonably-priced reusable drinking cups in campus shops, and signposting water fountains. I would like to see each fresher being offered a portable reusable cup in their freshers' pack. (Recently, I have seen bottled water handed out to participants at the September Open Days. While this is arguably a nice gesture, I think many prospective and current students and members of staff were dismayed at this; it would be more environmentally friendly to guide participants to water fountains instead.)

- Financially incentivise staff and students bringing their own tupperware and cutlery to further reduce waste on campus (this is a suggestion by one of our researchers working on microplastics).

- Make all our conferences and events plastic-free - an example of good practice can be found here: <http://theconversation.com/we-organised-a-conference-for-570-people-without-using-plastic-heres-how-it-went-120157>

As regards shaping future decisions, we can:

- Invite students to join any focus groups and committees on environmental sustainability, thus encouraging greater age-representation and giving the younger generation a clear say in decision-making which affects their future.

The strategy document also suggests that 'we will ensure that we achieve net carbon neutrality by 20XX.'

I think a reasonably ambitious target would be 2025.

Many thanks for reading my suggestions!

The University strategy seems to completely miss the big issues that mankind and society face so is not ambitious enough and risks making the University irrelevant. For example on climate change whilst addressing University Operations is positive only a commitment to major Research will make a real difference to Society. Disappointingly bland overall that could apply to any University with little Unique Selling Points for Nottingham.

the unnc has a perfect campus, I do not think any more things can add in our school .

the values and goals are fine - they are what we would expect from a University. What is lacking is a statement of what is particularly distinctive about Nottingham - what makes us stand out. And how is the strategy delivered - it would be helpful to understand the action plans and governance that enable us to implement the goals. Who is responsible for what?

The vision could be more ambitious: why not go after the important questions, and set our sights on the stars?

The vision for "disruption" is dangerous. 1. The KPMG report into Project Transform/Student Services indicates clearly that we do not have the calibre of senior management/governance to make a success of complicated projects, so we should either have a vision to improve the calibre of senior management/governance or limit ourselves to more manageable step-by-step ("on the shoulders of giants") projects. 2. "Disruption" causes considerable mental health anguish to staff. Project Transform and the way in which the Student Services model was imposed top-down has demonstrated this. Why is it actively the goal of the University to continue to ***cause*** mental health problems in its staff. I know "disruption" is (or at least was) a trendy idea, but it damages staff mental health.

The vision highlights a unified approach, which is great; however, often in reality this is inhibited at very local levels by fractionation of budgets and targets to defined clusters (eg school or specific business units). This fractionation, particularly of financial resource, leads to unnecessary and unhelpful competition between units, who lose focus on their real roles. Success of this venture needs to be measured as whole and not by targets supplied to each unit or to each individual. Diversity means that each unit and or individual brings different aspects to the whole and to achieve this successfully we need (as an institution) to more clearly and very simply identify and articulate our "product" in its most basic form (eg world leading research, effective dissemination of knowledge and preparing graduates with comprehensive skills for the 21st Century) and then challenge units and individuals to make a daily, weekly and monthly contribution to these ambitions.

Just a thought.

The white paper is quite useless. It is just a set of vague platitudes about what the university, and every organisation, is already doing. It is not specific, it is not unique to Nottingham and says nothing about excellence and supporting research, beyond international work. Quite frankly as a professor who has been at UofN for 15 years I find the entire exercise a joke and appears to be done just so upper admin can say its done. No real thought seems to have gone into this. 17,000 pieces of advice and this is what came out? I'm amazed.

If the university was serious it would set some goals -- why not support staff more to ensure they are compensated appropriately and supported appropriately to allow us to carry out the highest quality research and teaching possible? How about some ambition to increase research output or at least to have a better reputation and increase our place in league tables (although these are

more or less meaningless, having an ambition to get into the top 50 would be meaningful).

The university's mission is so vague and spread out over all the modern trendy topics it spreads itself out too thin. The international campuses are a joke for pure research in anything other than engineering and a few others and let's not pretend otherwise. The staff there have huge teaching loads and are not very happy overall.

Support the staff to do their best work and everything else will come together.

There appears to be a conflict on the first goal - to recruit and support individuals with the highest potential.

The statement itself can be bad for EDI, since all staff and students should be nurtured, not just those with the highest potential. Moreover, for example, some disabilities may mean a limit on the 'potential' for a staff member. e.g. someone with partial sight is having doing well at some things but their potential in some areas is severely limited by their eyesight issues, meaning that they will not have the 'highest potential' - I believe that we should be nurturing these people too! I would prefer that the University aims to support all individuals to succeed rather than the current focus upon a few with highest obvious potential.

There is a lot of emphasis on headline grabbing research, cross-disciplinary, etc etc, and that has a place, but it seems to exclude solid and important research that doesn't have the same superficial appeal or can't be spun to have this - but it is naïve to suppose that such research is not as important or valuable.

You need to think carefully about the tensions that arise in this strategy. For instance, global, no borders, international research - how is that to be squared with the desire to be better on climate issues? On a more minimal scale, in P DPR I'm encouraged to give more talks and travel abroad etc, this has limited value to me or my research (much more valuable is discussions with colleagues over email, sharing work, rigour and scrutiny in that context). But I get the impression that it serves the promotion of brand UoN. But how is that going to help with the environment? Flying me out to places to give papers which doesn't help my research more than alternatives very minimally promotes the brand, but damages the environment. So you need to think about what colleagues are being asked to do in P DPR, the real value of that and rationale for it, and how it squares with (admirable) climate ambitions.

There is a massive disconnect between the values set out and where the university currently is. UEB can be classed as ambitious and having an international mindset - (values 2& 5) which is good.

However, 'quality in all we do' (value 6) is laughable given the state of project transform/campus solutions/timetabling; the fact that a strategy document does not even mention any of these problems shows a lack of 'transparency/integrity' (value 3), and shows again that the 'health and well-being' (value 4) of staff is being ignored, with the continual emphasis on improving SET scores, NSS scores, grant income, whilst ignoring the stress caused by PT/CS etc.

There is a mention of technology in terms of accessibility but not much else in terms of problem solving, innovation and employability skills. Is this less of a priority? Does more need to be said?

There is no clear mention on how the university intends to promote inclusion and diversity in the goals or mission statement i.e. To bridge the divide by being an inclusive hub for knowledge sharing, freedom to learn and contribute to humanity leveraging on the power of diversity. Also as a vision statement, stating that we have 3 beautiful campuses is kind of self limiting and aggrandising. Vision statements should be like to propogate knowledge and lead collaboration between communities to effect profound and meaningful change to humanity in a sustainable manner. Also to mention jobs of the future. To prepare the communities for jobs of the future which focuses on sustainability and care towards the environment and its people.

There is nothing for the time being.

There needs to be a reference to physical activity, the community you can build through physical activity and sport can help with wellbeing, collaboration, create a sense of home and create many opportunities for both our students and staff.

There needs to be a strong focus on the fundamental issue of better communication across the Schools and other departments and more joined up thinking. Also, dialogue with those who will be affected by the changes and proper consideration before changes are implemented, with appropriate communication detailing changes to all relevant parties, once these are agreed. This is not happening at the moment.

There needs to be one main objective ABOVE all others - "To educate and teach students"

There seems to be a complete and total absence of ambition in the document. It says nothing about where we want the University to be in a measurable way. There are no targets or even definable vision statements. For me this vision lacks any clarity of purpose and direction.

There seems to be little proposed content that targets the cyber university community, in particular online students.

These are the concepts which all universities use, ones which do not really say anything, and bear little relation to the activities of a university. At the specific level, there is inappropriate wording:

- the campuses don't inspire a global outlook, with one in the UK and two in the Far East
- many members of staff would not agree that the university empowers and supports people, it cravenly conforms to whatever nonsense is coming out of Government instead of standing up for academic freedom
- disruption is not opportunity, it generally damages lives, so that is an appalling phrase
- 'culture of experimenting', experimentation is a small part of what a few schools do, it is one method of study among many.
- decision making is not transparent!

These proposals seem to be far removed from the actual business of teaching and research, which should be university's very reason for being. My overriding concern is that there are not enough resources dedicated to teaching and research and more and more time and money is being diverted to projects that do not actually help achieve these goals. Teaching and research would be best improved by a) allowing departments and schools more autonomy to set their own strategies, b) cutting the administrative burden to allow more time for teaching and research and c) providing more staff and resources in individual departments to allow us to improve research and teaching quality.

There are two proposals here with which I strongly disagree.

1) In general, I do not believe that modules shared between departments and faculties that lack subject-specific content are valuable for students. I have had much experience of them, both as a postgraduate student at this university and as a teacher (particularly on the Faculty of Arts Placement Module). I and many of my colleagues have found that these courses are a) lacking in content that is in any way relevant to students' degrees and b) superficial and not in any way intellectually stimulating. There is a danger that we are trying to teach 'critical thinking' and the like without subject specific knowledge, but if you have no deep knowledge of the subject how can you think critically? On what will you exercise your critical faculties? These courses involve a great deal of mind-mapping and group discussion and little actual learning or teaching.

2) The suggestion that there should be 'contextualised offers' seems tantamount to advocating discrimination in the admissions process. Offers should be awarded on merit only as the only fair way to admit students. This is also the only way to ensure that all students have the qualities and qualifications necessary to undertake a degree at a Russell Group university such as Nottingham. 'Contextualised offers' are thus not only discriminatory but also have the potential to lower academic standards.

They seem too high level to relate to my work

this is a quick answer, it could say more but it gives the essence of what I think

I agree with the values.

There are some great ideas in the concrete boxes at the end of the document, esp. re EDI, recruitment and sustainability. I'm not entirely sure the small changes (e.g. lifetime access for alumni) will make us more attractive. Maybe this has been checked but I wonder if all these concrete actions and even goals shouldn't be carefully checked on a cost/benefit analysis esp. in this very volatile context.

I think being international for the sake of being international is not useful but I agree that having this as an important aspect is obvious in view of our 3 campuses and our diverse student and staff body in the UK anyway. That does not mean everything we do should become international/have an international angle. Everything within reason.

Re "Nurture potential by recruiting, and supporting individuals with the highest potential to succeed as students and staff." I don't see how only the best staff should be supported. Staff's motivation and outputs can fluctuate over their career owing to UoN/government pressures and change in circumstances (e.g. project transform). I think the wording, if it was not the intention, could be changed to reflect this. It is also not inclusive and so conflicts with the EDI goals.

Re "Offer every student a paid placement with an employer, in one of our research teams or with an international partner" I don't think we should guarantee this, as phrased it is too ambitious. What if there is an economic crisis e.g. because of no-deal or a bad deal with the EU?

This is ambitious – "Offer all students access to support and training for setting up their own businesses and Develop an innovation hub in the centre of Nottingham" But where will we find the money for this?

Re this: "Promote shared professional development across all staff groups, including developing a shadowing/mentoring approach which would partner academics with professional services and technical staff and bring together staff based in different countries " why, what is the rationale?

We could aim to get higher in the rankings even if we know they are to be taken with a pinch of salt.

Linked with this latter point, I think if the UoN fights to keep the staff pensions decent, fights any governmental increasing pressures on staff, fixes Campus Solutions once and for all, and nurtures its staff more generally, all of which it has done and does in some ways (but much could be improved in some areas) then all staff (apm, academic staff etc) will flourish which will have a direct beneficial impact on students (inc. teaching) and research income. And then we will go up in the rankings. That + sustainability and EDI are the major goals the UoN should have in my view.

This is a submission from the Research Leaders Network in Engineering.

The proposed content for our new Strategy will support clear decision making across the University - Nothing in the document relates to decision making.

As a member of the University community, the content for our new Strategy seems relevant to me. - knowledge is missing in the center; it needs to be present in values and goals. The first goal should include 'attract the best'

The ideas proposed for our new Strategy are sufficiently ambitious - There does not seem to be a balance between environmental sustainability and the international mindset. Remote

collaboration for example, why are we not at the cutting edge of this? co-supervision for example should be much easier

it is good

To me, the content is still not student centred enough. We are here mostly to educate students and to assist them in developing into rounded, well adjusted, employable adults. I think that could be more at the forefront of our strategy.

Too little is said about justice and equality issues - for both students and staff. We need to do more to support students from less affluent backgrounds, particularly those who live locally and feel excluded by UoN's reputation and the high proportion of privately-educated students that it attracts. We must commit to paying the living wage to all staff. We need to do more to eradicate short term and/or hourly paid contracts in the administrative, teaching and research workforce as these contracts not only ruin individual lives but result in poor outcomes for the university as a whole.

Too much too soon, you need to get back to basics and take a look at what you already have first.

Transport and travel only covers air travel. Where environment is concerned it would be important to consider daily transport to and from campus and ensuring every campus (while discouraging driving when unnecessary) also has sufficient public transport options to allow practical travel during business hours (and beyond).

Two concerns:

1. "...and ensuring that every student and staff member has a global experience..." I am concerned that students (prospective) may take this to mean that they will travel as part of their educational experience. I think that we need to be more explicit in making it clear that a global experience does not mean this - personally I would miss this out. My experience of students at open days etc is that whilst few would not aspire to being part of a University "acting as a force for international understanding and collaboration", there are very many (perhaps even a majority) who would not want to travel for study - it's a big enough deal coming to Nottingham in the first place!

2. "Prioritise environmental sustainability in the focus of our research and teaching..." It would be good to know how this prioritisation (and the associated deprioritisation) will be made. Will it mean that research where environmental sustainability is not a key issue will be deprioritised (e.g. in terms of staff recruitment etc)? Will certain Schools be deprioritised if they do not have a strong "environmental sustainability" agenda? Or certain courses? If this is one of our six goals, then I would expect it to be a key issue in all academic staff recruitment, in all course design, in all support for research.

Two points:

a) I would delete the reference to 'disruption as opportunity' in the main vision. It sounds hackneyed and may give the impression that the University actively wants to disrupt others. Do you mean 'experimentation' or something similar?

b) The expression 'a world without borders' also sounds hackneyed and doesn't really have much sense, to my ear. What does it mean concretely?

Under.....Give all alumni lifetime access to our online learning resources.... I agree but can this not include academic staff who have retired? Part of lifelong learning. So it could say... all alumni and staff lifetime access

Offer every student a paid placement.....I think this should be 'Seek to offer....' as stated this is a commitment which I am not sure can be delivered in all economic conditions and could make the university open to legal challenge.

unnc should be equipped with sufficient sharing-bikes
unnc should have more convenient stores which are opening for 24 hours
our supermarket can sell many food such as baozi and some fried food

Values

Our values should also encompass Leadership, particularly recognising the role we could have in setting and achieving ambitious environmental and social targets, recognising the size of our organisation in the East Midlands context. Without a value encompassing sustainability at the highest level, it is at risk of being diminished.

Goals

By narrowly focusing on "environmental sustainability" (as we have done in the past), we are resigning sustainability to being an Operational issue, and neglecting its economic and social elements. As a truly held value and goal, we need to ensure sustainability is everyone's responsibility, and is embedded in decision making at every level.

'Net' carbon neutrality is also a tricky term, we must ensure we are not exporting our carbon emissions or our offsetting projects to countries in the global south.

We need to ensure we are better at setting ambitious goals and targets that speak to sustainability, but do not necessarily relate to carbon reduction. An example could be ensuring our supply chains are slavery free by 20xx - encompassing social and economic sustainability.

Vision should include a clear commitment to academic freedom/freedom of speech on campus

Detailed plans should include consideration of a train station at Jubilee - this would help with our environmental ambitions as well as helping the University's connectivity with places like Birmingham, Sheffield etc.

Finally, there should be the ambition for more dedicated outdoor sports facilities on University Park & Jubilee, e.g. artificial cricket wicket at Jubilee to encourage intra-mural sport.

we dont have enough place to practice instruments in UNNC, which make us feel a little terrible. And the library dont have drinking fountain on every floor.

We face a dilemma in that there is a desirable aim to extend the opportunities offered by top-class Universities to a wider constituency whilst we also face the fact that 40% of the UK's young people going on to further education means that we no longer have the same degree of selectivity that was true when, say, only 4% of people attended. I see evidence of this in all the Universities to which I try to contribute - the best students are excellent, regardless of their former background, but the "tail" of less able students is inevitably longer. Somehow, we need to ensure that Nottingham University Graduates maintain our reputation for excellence without suffering the financial headwind of being more selective than others. This is a hard choice, but our reputation must be maintained. Secondly, in terms of common modules, I would suggest adding "problem solving" (as per Prof [text redacted] at Michigan) as another area worth consideration.

We have lost the sense of being embedded in our local community....in the case of UNUK, working with and for the people of Nottingham and the Midlands, and in the case of the other campuses working with their communities.

We should aim for carbon neutrality by 2030

We should be more ambitious to get the best students and nurture them instead of teaching to the not so good students and thus not challenging the good students enough.

We should be more ambitious to only hire and retain the best members of staff and do world leading research instead of focusing on EDI or similar secondary criteria.

Research and Teaching are our core activities and if we want to be a world leading university, we should focus on these - nothing else!

We should try to build a sound university in China, to compete with those top Chinese university vis-a-vis.

We could offer 2-year taught postgraduate programmes, which enable students to learn more from the university.

Postgraduate (taught) should be given opportunity to travel across all our campus to broaden their experience.

what should I do now to fight for the scholarship

where is the bit about treating technicians with the respect and inclusion they have asked for in all the questionnaires? can't imagine we have been ignored AGAIN have we

While I agree with the overall vision, the specific examples of how to achieve goals, and plans in the future range between being vague, and not having a clear pathway to definite achievements (such as increasing University investment in EDI is not a goal that achieves anything concrete) or too ambitious (such as offering all students paid employment). I think more concrete commitments are essential in many of these goals. For example:

1. Outline what kind of support will be provided to enhance EDI for staff and student body, beyond a commitment to investment. Currently, some University policies discriminate against international archival research (in Humanities), it is unclear what support international exchange students, particularly from China, and international post-graduates have to ensure that they can be valued equally, and flourish equally, despite unequal grasp over academic English, it is unclear how recruitment can be fair and inclusive or accessible when the University does not pay for visa fees, or the NHS health surcharge. The university also has no commitment to a maximum response time when students with disabilities or mental health email for help. They are expected to wait for weeks, while all students can expect to get a response to academic queries within three working days. If these basics are not reviewed and fixed, then ambitious goals are being built on shaky foundations.
2. Regarding promoting ambition and creativity and cross-disciplinary learning: Currently, University rules state that students have to pay for any extra credits they might take beyond the mandated 120. BUT these will not show up in their transcripts. This regulation actively discourages intellectual curiosity and exploration. There is also no culture of high profile academic events that students are encouraged to attend or organize, nor is there a culture of letting ambitious students audit courses.
3. Sustainability and Carbon Neutrality: This is a great venture that actually attempts to provide concrete goals. The banning of single use plastic can also be encouraged by replacing water bottles in vending machines with water coolers. Currently, in many locations, access to drinking water is dependant on single use plastic.

While the White paper has admirable goals, here are a couple of important points which I feel are left out:

Under "Nurture potential... students and staff", I believe that an even more important thing to do would be to provide additional support, such as bridge funding, for staff on fixed-term contracts. This would be the least the university could do as a signatory of the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers.

Under "Bring an international mindset... to foster a world without borders", I note that the University has offered support and assistance recently to European staff due to Brexit uncertainty, which is laudable. However, even before that, non-EU staff have suffered under increasingly draconian regulations and exorbitant fees for work visas, settlement, etc. This has been neglected by the University and I hope you will seek to address that as part of this ambitious White Paper.

Whilst the strategy is all very reasonable it would be easy to justify most actions as being strategic as it is pretty vague. What will change as a result of this - not sure anything will so what is the point?

Why are knowledge and understanding not included anywhere in the Mission and Goals?
I thought this was one of the most important values that we and other universities should stand for.
You might say that's generic, but so are all the other values and mission statements.

wish better UNNC !

wish for more activities to know more about UNNC for newers.

wish more public courses from other university

with a changing direction towards the importance of welfare and wellbeing, I believe the strategy needs to place more of an emphasis on the activities we offer that help to promote this. Rather than a caring community, I think the value could focus on the importance of sport, physical activity and the vast diverse range of extra curricular activities offered at the University of Nottingham. Sport and physical activity has been key to the history and development of the university, and I believe its importance should be noted in the new strategy as it is something that can only enhance student experience in the future, particularly as we begin to see an obesity crisis and deeper issues of mental health within young people in the UK.

Without understanding the implications of implementation fully some of the things we could do feel a little unambitious and things we should already be doing. It might be helpful to include cost estimates and timescales in further details. This would help me to better understand the scale and impact of our ambition.

Work environment for staff need to improve.

would be interesting to know more about the 'one University, three countries' strategies.

Writing these inclusive and ambitious strategies is challenging - on the one hand avoiding the morass of meaningless business-speak yet not tying oneself up with over-specific goals that cannot be met. I would try and bring out more about what is unique about UoN (so that it stands out when you do an analysis of other UK University strategies most of which say similar things). So things like the three beautiful campuses was good, and our very international outlook and pastoral approach to students and staff. One of the biggest problems is attracting new big hitting senior staff to Nottingham. Most want to go to London or Oxford and stay there, but we have had some successes. Rather than muddle through, why not develop a head-hunting team that can support such appointments?

You clearly haven't listened to your own consultation, and made your own strategy regardless.

Sustainability is great, sure - but what about mental health?

Listen to your own words! From YOUR green paper consultation report - "By far the highest number of comments in this category were related to student mental health and a perceived lack of capacity and resources in this area."

How true! You haven't included mental health ONCE in your Strategy. What a disgrace.

The UK campus has 13 counsellors for over 34,000 students (UoN's 2018/19 statistics). That is around one counsellor for 2615 people.

People are struggling, not getting the support they need - and hating their time here as a result. I know people who can't wait to leave, and people who have already left as a result.

If you want to retain talent, and therefore increase revenues - listen to your own report. Mental

health. It's not being handled well. You know it. YOU have the data. Listen.

I am so disappointed by the Strategy - I'm sorry for the Trump-esque capital letters but clearly no-one is listening, and this is a top-down process. I myself cannot wait to leave Nottingham, considering how management treat their students + staff, as cash cow pawns in their architectural paradise.

You have the value of 'health and wellbeing' however this isn't reflected in any goals and it seems to be in the current higher education climate that this is a priority for students and should be mentioned more in this new strategy.