

# Minutes (unrestricted)

**Meeting title:** Senate

**Date:** Wednesday 11 March 2015

**Time:** 2.15 pm

**Location:** The Senate Room, George Thomas Building, Highfield campus

**Present:** The Vice-Chancellor (*in the Chair*), Pro Vice-Chancellor A Neill, Pro Vice-Chancellor M Spearing, Dr M Abdollahi, Dr J W Anderson, Professor A Barney, Dr P di Bari, Professor G Brambilla, Dr H Bui, Professor M Butler, Dr T Chown, Professor Dame Jessica Corner, Professor M Cornwall, Professor S Cox, Dr S Curtis, Dr A M Drummond (*Academic Registrar*), Dr N Evans, Professor J Falkingham, Professor K Fox, Professor M French, Professor J Frey, Dr J Gammon, Dr A M Gravell, Dr R Hempel, Dr A Hickman, Ms J Hjalmarsson, Dr C Holmes, Professor N Hounsell, Mr G Howard\*, Dr C W Jackson, Dr W Lawrence, Professor T Leighton, Ms P Libberton, Dr B Lwaleed, Mr M Luczak-Roesch, Professor D P McGhee, Dr J Madsen, Dr N Maguire, Professor K Martinez, Mr D Mendoza-Wolfson\*, Professor R Mills, Professor G Niblo, Dr D Nicole, Professor M Niranjana, Ms N Passmore, Dr C Petley, Dr K Poore, Professor C Pope, Ms L Richard, Dr A Roghanian, Dr J Skidmore, Ms I Stark, Dr A Steele, Professor C Stephens, Dr R Tare, Mr R Thomas\*, Ms S Verma\*, Professor J A Vickers, Dr J Watson and Professor R J K Wood

**By invitation** Dr R Bentley, Assistant Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) for item 9; Ms B Halliday, Director of Corporate Services, for item 12; Mr G Costigan, Director of the Vice-Chancellor's Office (observer); and Dr V Korzeniowska, Assistant Director (Quality and Standards), Student and Academic Administration (observer)

**In attendance** Mr S White, Chief Operating Officer, and Ms C J Gamble

\* Members of Senate not present for the discussion of items on the restricted agenda.

## Welcome

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed everyone to the meeting. He reminded members of Senate that the order of business included items from the last meeting on 5 November 2014 which had not been discussed because attendance had fallen below the quoracy requirement during the course of the meeting. Those items were highlighted on the unrestricted and restricted agenda sheets.

## 33 Obituaries

The Vice-Chancellor announced with regret the deaths of:

George Chiverton (BScSoc Politics, third-year undergraduate): 4 January 2015; and

Chi Yeung Fung (BSc Geology with Physical Geography, third-year undergraduate): 8 January 2015.

He asked members of Senate to stand for a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

## 34 Minutes of meeting held on 5 November 2014

The members approved the unrestricted minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2014 for signing by the Vice-Chancellor.

35 **Matters arising**

35.1 **A new institution-wide personal tutor system** (Minute 12.1.1)

The Academic Registrar stated that she had discussed the matter that had been raised at the last meeting about the potential tension between, on the one hand, protecting an individual's right to confidentiality in the appeals and complaints process, and, on the other, the need for disclosure in order to promote effective pastoral care with the Director of Corporate Services and the Head of Academic Appeals and Student Complaints. She reported that the documentation for the appeals and complaints process would be revised to include a section which invited the student to indicate that the information could be shared with his/her Personal Academic Tutor. This addition to the forms would take account of data protection while allowing information to be made available to those who needed to have access to it.

35.2 **Senate question time** (Minute 15)

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the update on the Staff Engagement Plan which was given in his report (Agendum 4, paragraphs 19 and 20). He wished to add a number of comments about the Plan and would do so when the item came up for discussion later.

35.3 **Student recruitment when the cap on student numbers is lifted** (Minute 16)

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the Director of Recruitment and International Relations had confirmed that action was being taken in respect of the majority of the suggestions that had been made at the last meeting of Senate, specifically: the timing of Open Days; developing a strategy for confirmation and clearing; the strengthening of outreach activities and the involvement of alumni; and changes to the admissions process. He added that Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill was taking forward the curriculum issues that had been raised.

35.4 **Amendments to the University's Charter, Statutes and Ordinances** (Minute 17)

The Academic Registrar announced that the University had received confirmation on 23 February 2015 from the Privy Council that the amendments which had been put forward to the University's Charter and Statutes had been granted. The amendments included one of the two proposals agreed at Senate's meeting in November 2014 that four Senate members should serve in Class 3 membership on the Council instead of the three suggested. Regarding the other proposal to include two alumni rather than one in the eight lay members in Class 2 membership, Council had felt that there should be some flexibility built in to the requirement and had agreed that the wording of the relevant Statute (Statute 3 section 1) should read:

'Eight members to be appointed by the Council being neither employees nor officers of the University, of whom at least *one (two desirably)* shall be appointed from among the Graduates of the University.'

(The Vice-Chancellor had informed members of Senate of the outcome of Council's discussions on 24 November 2014.)

The necessary changes to the Statement of Senate's Primary Responsibilities and Standing Orders would be presented at the next meeting of Senate.

**Noted** The Academic Registrar's undertaking to present the revisions to the Statement of the Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters and the Standing Orders to the meeting on 17 June 2015.

36 **Vice-Chancellor's report and summary of University Academic Executive and Senior Management Team discussions**

**Received** A report, drawn up on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, dated 11 March 2015, on current strategic and operational issues, recent news and events, international visits, and an outline of the discussions and decisions of the University Senior Management Team and the University Academic Executive, among other matters, together with two appendices: a summary of the results of the Research Excellence Framework for the University per unit of assessment (Annex A); and a copy of the executive summary of the Government's new Science and Innovation Strategy (Annex B).

The Vice-Chancellor highlighted:

- The topics of debate in the run up to the general election in May 2015 that affected the higher education sector: research funding, and membership of the European Union; the level of undergraduate fees and the system of financial support; immigration and international students; and the future regulatory framework. It was important for the University community – staff and students – to be well-informed about the political parties’ manifestos and to understand the implications of the parties’ plans for the sector.

Regarding the support for postgraduate students which had been announced in the Autumn Statement, the Vice-Chancellor commented that the University had worked together with the Students’ Union to argue for financial help to be made available to this group.

- On the Staff Engagement Plan, the Vice-Chancellor explained that, although the intention had been to present the plan at this meeting, it had become clear during the work carried out since November that what would be more effective was a set of localized plans at Faculty and Professional Service level. These were being drawn up. The Vice-Chancellor encouraged members of Senate to become involved in the work that was under way across the University. He would provide an overview of the local plans at the next meeting in addition to outlining progress in respect of the number of institution-wide initiatives that were included in the report.
- The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the independent report, commissioned by the University, on the economic and social impact of the institution’s activities which had been presented in February 2015 to Members of Parliament. The report concluded that the University supported more than 26,000 jobs in the UK and contributed gross value added of over £2 b to the economy.
- Monthly summaries of the discussions at meetings of the University Senior Leadership Team and the University Academic Executive were available to members of staff online at <https://intranet.soton.ac.uk/sites/strategy/SitePages/Decisions.aspx>. The Vice-Chancellor stated that he would welcome feedback on the site’s design and the information it contained. It was set up to improve the speed with which decisions taken by the senior executive groups were communicated to staff.

- Noted**
- (i) The Vice-Chancellor’s intention to present an update on the local Staff Engagement Plans and the institution-wide initiatives at the next meeting of Senate.
  - (ii) The information contained in the Vice-Chancellor’s report.

### 37 **President of the Students’ Union’s report**

**Received** An oral report from the President of the Students’ Union on four projects undertaken by the Union in recent months: the setting up of a Student Association at the University of Southampton Malaysia Campus; proposals for a student recruitment agency; a project to encourage voting in the 2015 General Election; and the Student Enterprise initiative. (A copy of the written report was available on the SUSSED Senate group site.)

Mr Mendoza-Wolfson presented an overview of the four projects which were covered in detail in his written report. Regarding the Student Association, Mr Mendoza-Wolfson outlined the recommendations that had been drawn up for establishing an Association by the start of the 2015/16 academic year. Turning to the subject of the student recruitment agency, the President drew attention to the Union Council’s resolution in 2014 to create a ‘job shop’ whose purpose was to help those students in need of financial support to find part-time work offered by responsible employers. It was planned that it would work alongside Career Destinations in Student Services to offer a comprehensive recruitment service. The ambition set out for the Student Enterprise project was to provide students with entrepreneurial ideas with financial support, expertise from mentors and office accommodation.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Mr Mendoza-Wolfson for his presentation.

**Noted** The report from the President of the Students’ Union.

38 **Senate question time**

The Vice-Chancellor reported that he had received three questions, two of which did not fall within Senate's remit because they were matters which should be considered and resolved through the management structure. He had replied to the member of Senate who had submitted those particular questions and had relayed the matter to the Dean concerned who had responded and explained how the issues raised would be addressed.

Referring to the third question, the Vice-Chancellor invited Pro Vice-Chancellor Mark Spearing to respond to the question that had been received about the University of Southampton Malaysia Campus (USMC):

'I understand that the situation at USMC was discussed at UAE [University Academic Executive] this week, and an action plan proposed. I would like to see a summary of the status of USMC, and the action plan, presented to Senate for discussion. There are many areas of concern with regard to USMC, in particular that last year we saw five EEE students at USMC, and this year the applications are down further.'

Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing stated that the action plan was not yet finalized. A status report would be presented to Council on 18 March 2015 which contained details that were commercially confidential. He would be in a position to share information with Senate at its next meeting on 17 June 2015. However, he was able to summarize the two principal points that were under consideration: the building leased by the University and the Halls of Residence which were not of the standard that had been expected; and the levels of recruitment. A foundation year had been introduced this year and it was anticipated that this would improve the recruitment prospects. Notwithstanding the current difficulties, Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing wished to commend the performance of the academic staff teaching on the campus and the achievements of the students currently enrolled which were excellent.

In response to a question about the consideration of conditions that might lead to the University exiting from USMC, Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing stated that the University had undertaken a ten-year commitment to the initiative. He observed that establishing any strategic initiative overseas required a considerable investment in terms of the time that was required to build up a successful venture. All of the University's current international partnerships had taken longer to develop than had initially been anticipated. This was a relatively new area of activity for the institution and the University was gaining valuable experience in the field.

The Vice-Chancellor invited questions on his report:

- Dr Nicole raised a matter linked to an item in the Vice-Chancellor's report on the Counter Terrorism and Security Act. The Southampton Law School was organizing a conference on aspects of legitimacy in international law. He had been made aware that members of the Jewish community had expressed concern about the holding of the conference. Dr Nicole asked how the University would manage to balance its legal responsibilities while protecting its staff, students and reputation.

The Vice-Chancellor referred to the discussion item on the agenda on ensuring freedom of speech within the law (Agendum 12) when this question would be discussed in full. He stated that the University had a legal obligation to uphold freedom of speech within the law. A balance had to be found between ensuring that the requirements of the law were followed and having due regard to the impact of an event on the safety of the community. The new legislation would introduce a duty on institutions of higher education to prevent individuals from being drawn into terrorism. With regard to academic freedom, the University's Statutes (Statute 7 Part I (2) (1) (i)) stated that academic staff had freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom with due regard for the need to respect others and promote the best interests of the University. Regarding the conference organized by the Southampton Law School, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the University had to ensure that the event complied with the legal requirements in force as well as addressing the practical issues which arose such as safety and security, matters which the Chief Operating Officer was in charge of. The University was neither obliged to ensure that the conference – or any conference – offered balanced views of the topic(s) under discussion nor did it have an institutional view on the subject of the conference.

- The Vice-Chancellor was asked whether the decision to develop individual sets of plans for the Faculties under the Staff Engagement Plan was at odds with the work that was undertaken under the rebranding exercise which had sought to promote the University's reputation over those that had been established over the years in academic units. The Vice-Chancellor stated that he

did not see a direct link between brand management and the Staff Engagement Plan. During the discussions on the Staff Engagement Plan, the Faculties and the Professional Services had supported the development of local plans. There were institution-wide initiatives which brought all of the work together, for example, the 'no agenda' meetings led by members of the senior executive. Regarding the 'visibility' of the senior executive members, he underlined that he, along with the other members, regularly met groups of academic staff in the Faculties, for example, he had recently met professorial staff in Law and in Physics and Astronomy. He would contest the view that the senior executive did not engage with staff, whether academic or support.

- Professor Pope stated that she had followed the link provided in the Vice-Chancellor's Report to the SharePoint site which held information on the discussions at meetings of the University Senior Management Team (USMT) and the University Academic Executive. The most up-to-date document the USMT page was dated January 2015. It was entitled 'Leadership conversations'. She questioned whether this was an appropriate format for informing members of Senate, and expressed concern that there were fewer opportunities for the principal academic body to be fully involved in the decisions about academic matters. Professor Vickers reiterated the point and reminded members of the discussions about the role of Senate at the November meeting and the need for Senate to be more actively engaged in academic strategy and policy decisions.

The Vice-Chancellor acknowledged that Senate agendas in the past had not always achieved an appropriate level of discussion on those matters, but he was taking steps to address this by ensuring that strategy and policy items were presented in detail, and by seeking views on other topical education matters.

Members of Senate made a number of suggestions about adjustments which might enhance Senate's engagement with policy issues, for example, revising the membership to include the Heads of academic units as ex-officio members or replacing the Associate Deans with the Heads of academic units, and considering introducing an induction session for new members of Senate at the start of the academic year.

- Dr Chown highlighted a number of challenges ahead for the University and the senior leadership: the aim of increasing the number of students over the next five years and the financial support available to achieve that; the IT systems that needed upgrading; the need for social space, particularly for staff; and the effect of international partnerships on the work load of Faculty.
- Dr Gravell drew attention to the item on the Massive Online Open Course (MOOC) in Understanding Language and how it had supported recruitment to an online Master's course. This suggested that further development of MOOCs would lead to an increase in income generation in this area. The Vice-Chancellor said that one of the objectives of the introduction of MOOCs was to showcase the University's academic expertise and thus attract interest in undergraduate or postgraduate programmes of study. The certification process for the MOOCs was under discussion and once set up would increase the revenue which would support the development of such courses.

- Noted**
- (i) The undertaking of Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing to report to Senate at its meeting on 17 June 2015 on the plans for USMC.
  - (ii) The comments and suggestions made about the membership of Senate and the introduction of an induction session for new members.
  - (iii) The questions and responses during Senate question time.

### 39 **Quality Assurance Agency's (QAA) Higher Education Review: key findings update**

Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill reminded members of Senate of the announcement that had been circulated on 20 February 2015 about the initial outcome of the University's Higher Education Review.

He wished to acknowledge the role that Senate had played in the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Document. He thanked all those who had been involved in the interviews which had been held during the review week.

The University could expect to receive the draft review report on 19 March 2015 with an invitation to the institution and the lead student representative to submit within three weeks any factual corrections that

were necessary. The review report would remain confidential until the QAA had published the document, approximately 12 weeks after the review visit.

The Vice-Chancellor extended his thanks to the members of Senate, in particular to Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill, the Academic Registrar and Dr Korzeniowska who had worked tirelessly on the preparations.

- Resolved**
- (i) That Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill's thanks to the members of Senate be recorded.
  - (ii) That the Vice-Chancellor's thanks to Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill, the Academic Registrar and Dr Korzeniowska be recorded.

#### 40 **Education Strategy: presentation**

**Received** A presentation, given by Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill, on the Education Strategy which focused on the major activities under way in 2014-15.

(The detailed strategic plan was available on the SharePoint site:  
[https://intranet.soton.ac.uk/sites/strategy/.](https://intranet.soton.ac.uk/sites/strategy/))

Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill highlighted a number of areas that were under consideration by the Education and Student Experience Executive Group:

##### 1 *Embedding 'employability' in the curriculum*

There were a range of initiatives in progress: a pilot to increase the number of placements that could be offered to students; rethinking the ways available to students to record their experiences at University using e-portfolio, a tool to reflect on the activities undertaken and to help students develop their skills set.

Dr Bui drew attention to the arrangements at another higher education institution where final-year students, after completing their placement year, could choose from different forms of assessment which gave them scope to select the type of assessment that was most appropriate for their career choices. Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill extended an invitation to Dr Bui to join a working group he was setting up with the Director of Student Services to consider a range of initiatives.

##### 2 *Assessment design, moving from module to programme level perspective*

Currently, assessment was largely designed at the module level rather than it being considered from the perspective of the programme as a whole.

Responding to an observation from Ms Hjalmarsson, about moving from running modules once a year to each semester in the Southampton Law School, the consequent increase in the number of examinations and the apparent contradiction between sets of initiatives, Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill pointed out that there were options to consider in respect of assessment without necessarily doubling the examination load. The Associate Dean (Education and Student Experience) in the Faculty of Business and Law had raised this particular matter with him, and it would need to be discussed further.

##### 3 *Continue curriculum innovation (CI): major/minor, UoSM modules, and broadening our offer*

Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill acknowledged that there were tensions between broadening the offer of programmes that could be taken as a major with a minor and the goal to offer students more meaningful choice.

Dr Maguire drew attention to the steps that would help the process of innovation, namely the need to make information available on the risks and on the evaluation of the programmes introduced, tying efficacy to particular actions. The data should be made available to support innovation across the University.

##### 4 *Joint honours programmes*

This was an area that would be looked at closely with a view to understanding better why joint honours programmes received less favourable feedback from students than single honours programmes.

5 *Conversion activity*

There had been improvement in the process for considering applications and making offers. However, there was still work to be undertaken in respect of moving more quickly to making firm offers.

6 *Development of first-year teaching and support*

The design of the curriculum would be examined, along with the academic support arrangements. This would be done within Faculties and at programme level.

7 *Implementation of contextualized admissions process*

The contextualized admissions process had been introduced for the first time this year. Analysis would be needed to determine whether it had achieved what had been planned in all areas.

8 *Operational Excellence: minimum module size*

The number of modules that could be taken in a variety of combinations could limit the choice on offer because of timetabling constraints. Different approaches to increasing flexibility in the timetable needed to be considered.

It was pointed out that a distinction should be made between modules at undergraduate level and those at postgraduate level where specialized teaching in particular subjects, which only attracted small numbers of students, might be lost if a minimum number of students was stipulated for a module to run.

Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill commented that it had to be recognized that there were financial constraints on providing any teaching. Responding to a suggestion about harmonizing the structure of postgraduate taught programmes, he stated that it had been considered in the past but had not been progressed because of the different credit structures. However, it could be considered again if that might help developments in this area of work.

**Resolved** That the plans of Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill to form a working group, whose membership would include Dr Bui and Ms Passmore, to take forward initiatives in respect of employability and the curriculum be noted.

**Noted** The presentation given by Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill, and the points raised in discussion.

41 **Senate elections: process** [The item had been held over from the meeting of Senate on 5 November 2014.]

**Received** A report, drawn up on behalf of the Academic Registrar, on the Senate election process, dated 27 October 2014.

In summarizing the main points of the paper on the Senate election process, the Academic Register drew attention to the reference under section 2 to 'this [calendar] year' which should now read 'last year'.

The Academic Registrar sought Senate's views on whether, in the annual elections to the membership of Senate in category (e) – Representatives of the academic staff from each Faculty – the level of the academic staff voting should determine the level of the candidates who could be voted for. If the proposal, explained in the paper, was supported, minor changes to the wording of Ordinance 2.12.4 and 2.12.6 would be required, and would need to be endorsed by Senate and thereafter presented to Council for approval.

Professor Leighton expressed the view that the academics in a Faculty were voting as a group to elect individuals to serve on Senate and therefore it was appropriate for the members to be able to vote for those who were willing to stand irrespective of their level. Dr Nicole spoke in support of the proposal, stating that the more junior members of a Faculty might feel a greater sense of being part of the academic body if they knew that they had been selected by their peers.

The Vice-Chancellor invited members to vote on the proposal. The majority of Senators voted to leave the Ordinances unchanged; eight members voted to amend Ordinances 2.12.4 paragraph 3 and 2.12.6

paragraph 3 to specify that academic staff may vote only for staff at the same level; and there were no abstentions.

- Resolved** (i) That the proposal to amend the eligibility criteria in respect of voting for Faculty representatives on Senate be rejected and that the Ordinances 2.12.4 and 2.12.6 should remain unchanged.
- Noted** (ii) The undertaking of the Academic Registrar to bring forward proposals on the revisions that might need to be made to take account of the new pathways and titles within the ERE job family as soon as possible.
- (iii) The Academic Registrar's intention to arrange for guidance to be circulated to Faculties on the election process this year.

#### 42 **Senate Nominating Committee members: proposals**

**Received** A report on establishing a Senate Nominating Committee to recommend the appointment of Senate members to serve on Council, prepared on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor and dated 27 February 2015.

The members of Senate endorsed the recommendations set out in the report.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked all the members of Senate who had put themselves forward to join the Nominating Committee.

- Resolved** (i) That Professor Frey, Professor Lowe, Professor McGhee and Dr O'Kelly be invited to form the Senate Nominating Committee for the year.
- (ii) That the Committee undertake its work as soon as possible with a call for expressions of interest to serve on the governing body, sent out no later than 31 March 2015, to be received by the beginning of May 2015.
- Noted** (iii) The timetable for the Nominating Committee to present its recommendations to Senate at its meeting on 17 June 2015.

#### 43 **Ensuring freedom of speech within the law**

**Received** A discussion paper, prepared by the Director of the Vice-Chancellor's Office, entitled, 'Ensuring freedom of speech within the law', together with a covering note dated 4 March 2015, an extract from the General Regulations on the Freedom of Speech, and a copy of the Code of Practice to Secure Freedom of Speech Within the Law.

A presentation given by the Vice-Chancellor on the new Counterterrorism and Security Act 2015, the legal obligations on the University in respect of freedom of speech already articulated in its Code of Practice to Ensure Freedom of Speech within the Law, and an overview of health and safety responsibilities.

The Vice-Chancellor invited members of Senate to offer views on the following:

- How do we balance our different legal obligations?
  - Are the procedures in the Code of Practice appropriate?
  - How do we judge "... *due regard for the need to respect others and promote the best interests of the University and academic learning*"?
- Dr Nicole gave an example of an event on campus which had attracted interest from a far right group which had held of a demonstration, in the light of which the speaker had withdrawn from giving his talk. Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing explained that insufficient notice had been given

---

<sup>1</sup> This is an extract from the University's Statutes (Statute 7, Part 1, section (2) paragraph (1) (i) which reads:

'(i) to ensure that those members of staff identified in the Ordinance prescribed by clause 1(2) above have freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, with due regard for the need to respect others and promote the best interests of the University and academic learning, without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges;'



about the event which, had it been received in advance, would have allowed the University to take the necessary precautions and safety measures.

Ms Halliday commented that the University had a good track record of holding events that fell under the Code of Practice. The Code was circulated as widely as possible. The automated system of booking rooms directed those wishing to find a venue for an event to a copy of the Code and the need to inform the Responsible Officer of events that might be regarded as controversial or objectionable.

- Regarding the Code of Practice and the role of the Responsible Officer for ensuring compliance with the Code, Professor Niblo suggested that the decision making might be better shared by a group of individuals, possibly by a committee. The Vice-Chancellor added that given that there might not be sufficient time to convene a committee meeting a panel of members could be established who could be relied on to bring forward a collective view.
- Dr Chown queried whether online publications or student web sites fell under the Code. Ms Passmore confirmed that any statements made by students which were deemed to bring the University into disrepute would be dealt with via the Student Discipline Regulations.
- The question was raised how the University could ensure that events held by academic units were organized in accordance with the Code of Practice.
- Concerns were expressed about the possible financial cost of allowing events to go ahead if doing so required a police presence.
- The Students' Union provided training for members of student societies on all aspects of event organization. The societies were obliged to inform the Union if they were planning to invite speakers to attend an event.

The Vice-Chancellor concluded the discussion, stating that he would bring the matter back to Senate if it was necessary to do so in the light of the formal guidance from the Home Secretary on the Counterterrorism and Security Act which had not yet been published. Once the guidance had been received, he would arrange for a call to be circulated to members of Senate to invite them to join a panel who could be called upon to assist the Responsible Officer in making decisions about designated activities. In respect of the conference planned by the Southampton Law School, he invited Senators, if asked, to explain the points that had been discussed about the legal obligations of the University.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the Vice-Chancellor arrange for an invitation to be circulated to members of Senate to join a panel to assist the Responsible Officer, when necessary, with his/her role after the expected guidance from the Home Secretary had been received.
  - (ii) That Ms Halliday be invited to consider whether the Code of Practice to Ensure Freedom of Speech within the Law should be revised to reflect the introduction of a panel of Senators to assist the Responsible Officer.
- Noted**
- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor's intention to return to Senate for a further discussion on the subject of the Counterterrorism and Security Act if it was considered necessary after having considered the guidance from the Home Secretary.

44 **Academic Quality and Standards Committee** [The item included minutes of the meetings held in July and September 2014 which had been presented to the Senate meeting on 5 November 2014.]

**Received** A covering note which summarized the key matters discussed by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee during the period July 2014 to January 2015 and listed the recommendations to Senate.

Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill reminded members of Senate that the items that had been discussed by the Committee which had required Senate's approval were also listed in the Vice-Chancellor's report of actions taken as Chair of Senate (Agendum 17).

#### 44.1 **Minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2014**

**Received** A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 2 July 2014.

44.2 **Minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2014**

**Received** A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 15 July 2014.

44.3 **Minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2014**

**Received** A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 September 2014.

44.4 **Minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2014**

**Received** A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 22 October 2014.

44.5 **Minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2014**

**Received** A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 November 2014.

44.6 **Minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2014**

**Received** A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10 December 2014.

44.7 **Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2015**

**Received** A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 28 January 2015.

The Academic Registrar highlighted the work that had been done in respect of revising the Missing Marks Guidelines. This was set out in Annex 2, part of Appendix 1, to the minutes of the meeting. The revised Guidelines had replaced the set currently in the Quality Handbook.

The Academic Registrar drew attention to the report which had been presented to the Committee on the measures that had been taken to anticipate and to mitigate the possible impact of proposed industrial action earlier in the year. She invited members of Senate to consider what the appropriate composition should be of the body which would need to be convened in the event of significant disruption to the assessment and examination processes. She referred to paragraphs 6.2 and 6.3 which explained the arrangements that had been made for the convening of an extraordinary University Examinations Board in 2006, and posed the question whether, in the event of similar circumstances arising in this academic session, the same arrangements should be made or whether the role should be delegated to the Committee.

Members of Senate agreed that Senate itself should be the body that might need to be convened in the event of disruption to the assessment and examination processes and should not delegate the responsibility to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee. This would ensure that there was scope for Senate to consider the particular circumstances at the time.

The Vice-Chancellor summed up what action would need to be taken in the event of disruption: an extraordinary meeting of Senate would be called whose function would be to act as a University Examinations Board; it would be presented with clear recommendations about the decisions it was being asked to take; and it should receive reports from any Faculty which had had to take mitigating action in respect of examinations held.

- Resolved**
- (i) That Senate should act as University Examinations Board with the task of approving awards in the event of significant disruption to the assessment and examination processes.
  - (ii) That the content of the Missing Guidelines be noted.
  - (iii) That the discussions, and decisions, recorded in the reports from the meetings of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee held on 2 July 2015, 15 July 2015, 17 September 2014, 22 October 2014, 19 November 2014, 10 December 2014 and 28 January 2015 be noted.

45 **Student discipline: annual report**

**Received** The annual report on student discipline for the 2013/14 academic year, dated February 2015, presented by Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing.

Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing introduced the report, highlighting the main points which were listed in the executive summary. He thanked Dr Partington, Ms Woodward, Professor Curry and Professor Dame Jessica Corner for their involvement with the work of the Committee of Discipline. He was pleased to report that the total number of disciplinary cases remained very small; the majority of the University's student population was well-behaved.

In discussion, a number of comments and observations were made:

- Expressing small numbers as percentages was unnecessary.
- Was there a case to be made for using more CCTV given the number of incidents which took place in the Halls of Residence, and the related health and safety issues? The Vice-Chancellor suggested that the matter be discussed outside the meeting.

**Resolved** That Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing discuss the matter raised by Dr Nicole outside the meeting.

**Noted** The contents of the annual report on student discipline for the academic year 2013/14.

46 **Vice-Chancellor's actions as Chair of Senate** [The report included items that had been presented to the meeting of Senate on 5 November 2014.]

**Received** A report from the Vice-Chancellor on actions he had taken as Chair of Senate since Senate's meeting on 18 June 2014, together with copies of extracts from the Ordinances: Part 5 (Affiliated and Accredited Institutions) and Part 7 (Admission, Examinations and Awards).

[Note: The references in the report to Agenda items should be amended under section 1 as follows: Agendum 16.1 should read Agendum 14.1; Agendum 16.3 should read 14.3; and Agendum 163 should read 14.3 under 2 i).]

The Vice-Chancellor stated that his report had been updated to include the items he had approved since the November 2014 meeting, all of which were listed in section 3. He invited members of Senators to note the content of the report which explained all the decisions he had taken outside meetings of Senate. The matters concerned amendments to the Regulations and minor amendments to the Ordinances, Part 7 and Part 5, which had been approved by the Chair of Council on behalf of the governing body.

**Noted** The report from the Vice-Chancellor listing action he had taken on behalf of Senate.

47 **Date of next meeting**

The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the next meeting of Senate would take place on 17 June 2015.

+++++

Ref CS3/3

J:\Secretariat\Senate and committees\SENATE\SENATE (Do Not Move)\Senate 2014-15\25 February 2015-Resched 11 March 2015\Senate confirmed unrestricted mins-11march2015.docx