



**Taith Sector Stakeholder Higher Education Meeting - Summary**  
**Monday, 9<sup>th</sup> October 2023**  
**9.00– 10.00am**  
**Meeting held via Team**

<b>Attendance List</b>	
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Walter Brooks, Taith (Chair) Alison Braddock, Swansea University Kathleen Griffiths, UWTSD Rowena Kidger, Cardiff Metropolitan University Poppy Hodgkinson, Cardiff University Monika Hennemann, Cardiff University Omer Rana, Cardiff University Sarah Cunningham, Bangor University Catherine Canning, HEFCW Siobhan Williams, Cardiff University Christie Dear, ESN UK Jude Waites, ESN UK Shamima Kuddus-Hussain, Cardiff Metropolitan University Lucy Williams, Swansea University Penny Lauder, Swansea University
<b>Translator</b>	
<b>Apologies:</b>	
<b>Taith Programme Executive (TPE):</b>	Ellie Bevan Sion James
<b>Secretariat support:</b>	Michele Convery

<b>Minutes</b>	
<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Item</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>
1.1	Members were welcomed to the meeting and informed that, although this was not a decision-making group, the discussions and feedback from these meetings would inform any proposals put forward to the ILEP Ltd. Board of Directors.
1.2	Members were informed that the meeting was being recorded to support minute-taking and asked to use the virtual hand when wanting to contribute to discussions.
1.3	Members were informed that they were welcome to ask questions in Welsh and member of the team would reply in Welsh and translate for the other members
<b>2</b>	<b>Minutes and actions of the last meeting</b>
2.1	N/A
<b>3</b>	<b>Topics for discussion</b>
3.1	An overview of the 'Taith updates and Topics for Discussion paper' was presented, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The following feedback was given in relation to the paper:
3.1a	<b>Participants from underrepresented groups:</b> In addition, members were informed that, although not fixed, initial internal discussions are suggesting a minimum target of 20%.
3.1a(i)	It was commented, that although it is a good idea, from a research point of view, it can also pose some problems and it was suggested that there be some kind of hardship allocation.
3.1a(ii)	It was further commented that the concept of hardship is different for research versus education mobilities and research widening participation is a much broader topic. It was suggested that the visibility be increased, i.e., actively encourage ambassadors for those from disadvantaged backgrounds to demonstrate the possibilities.
3.1a(iii)	It was highlighted that there is intersectionality between underrepresented groups.
3.1a(iv)	It was advised that, if there is going to be a percentage target, the difference between research and higher education mobilities should be factored in and how underrepresented groups are classified.

3.1b	<b>Changes to grant rates</b>
3.1b(i)	It was suggested that recipients are allowed to use funds which work best in their individual circumstances.
3.1b(ii)	It was asked if rates/locations be pre-agreed. <b>Taith</b> confirmed restrictions cannot be placed in terms of where participants may want to go. The emphasis is on where they can find the best experience.
3.1c	<b>Sustainability</b>
3.1c(i)	It was highlighted that it is not always practical to use green methods of travel and suggested that a hybrid model may be more beneficial.
3.1c(ii)	It was advised that there is more time needed when using green methods of transport and this impacts on how much can be claimed for the trip.
3.1c(iii)	It was suggested that green top up option has not been heavily taken up within the research mobility sector because of the additional time needed and it doesn't offer that much more funding. Rates could be increased to make it more appealing.
3.1c(iv)	
3.1d	<b>Improving clarity and reducing administrative burden</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HE (Education) and HE (Research)</li> </ul>
3.1d(i)	It was highlighted that research works in phases and there may not be allocations of research of funding in one part of the year but there may be a bigger demand in another part of the year. Therefore, it was suggested that there is flexibility in how the funding is allocated and not merge it with the teaching strand.
3.1d(ii)	It was commented that there are benefits for streamlining but if same person not managing both streams then that could pose a problem.
3.1d(iii)	It was highlighted that research and education are managed quite differently and it was asked if clarity could be provided on how the application would be managed.
3.1d(iv)	It was asked if this proposal is for Further Education as well.
3.1d(v)	<b>Taith</b> clarified that this is just for Higher Education.

3.1d(vi)	<b>Taith</b> advised members, if the proposal was going to go ahead, there would be consultation with the sector on how it could work as easily as possible.
3.1d(vii)	It was commented that this proposal could make things more complicated internally because the way the two strands are run is quite different. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further Education and Vocational Education and Training – language</li> </ul>
3.1d(viii)	It was highlighted that regulation would be changing from April 2024.
<b>4</b>	<b>Updates</b>
4.1	Members were informed of bi-annual all-sector meetings. These will provide an opportunity for shared learning and to address cross-sector issues collaboratively. No date has been set yet, but an email will be sent once decided.
4.2	Members were advised that the recruitment for six new members of the Advisory Board begins in October and were asked to share this through their networks. In addition, members were informed that the potential applicants cannot be in receipt of Taith funding.
<b>5</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>
5.1	Next meeting 4 <sup>th</sup> December 2023