

Minutes (unrestricted)

Meeting title: Senate

Date: Wednesday 5 November 2014

Time: 2.15 pm

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

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (*in the Chair*), Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor Wheeler, Pro Vice-Chancellor Petts, Pro Vice-Chancellor M Spearing, Dr J W Anderson, Ms S d'Angelico*, Mrs M J Baker, Dr F Bishop, Professor G Brambilla, Professor I T Cameron, Dr M Carravetta, Dr T Chown, Dr S Colley, Dr K Deinhardt, Dr A M Drummond, Professor R W Eason, Dr N Evans, Professor J Falkingham, Professor J Frey, Dr J Glenn, Dr M Gobbi, Dr A M Gravell, Professor S Hawkins, Dr A Hickman, Mr A L Hill, Ms J Hjalmarsson, Dr C Holmes, Dr J Holloway, Professor J W Holloway, Professor N Hounsell, Mr G Howard*, Dr C W Jackson, Mr M Johnston, Professor S Keay, Professor T G Leighton, Dr B Lwaleed, Dr J Madsen, Mr D Mendoza-Wolfson*, Dr E Morris, Professor M Niranjani, Professor G Niblo, Dr D Nicole, Ms N Passmore, Dr F Poletti, Professor C Pope, Ms L Richard, Dr A Roghanian, Ms J Savidge, Dr C Skylaris, Dr J Skidmore, Dr S Stevenage, Dr R Tare, Dr J Teeling, Mr R Thomas*, Ms S Verma*, Professor J A Vickers and Dr P White

By invitation Dr G Rider, Chair of Council;
Professor H Davis, Director of the Institute for Learning Innovation and Development;
Ms J Doyle, Director of Student Recruitment and International Relations (for item 10); and
Ms D Galpin, Head of Intellectual Property, Contracts and Policy, Research and Innovation Services (for item 13)

In attendance 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, in particular Dr Gill Rider, the Chair of Council, who had been invited to give a presentation to Senate on the role of Council.

The Vice-Chancellor informed members of the changes to the arrangements for the cycle of presentations on Education, Research and the International agenda. In future, these matters would form part of the formal business of Senate. To allow time for Dr Rider's talk on the role of Council, Pro Vice-Chancellor Neill had agreed to give the Education Strategy presentation at the meeting of Senate on 25 February 2015.

Presentation

Dr Rider gave a talk on the role of the University's governing body which covered:

- Her background and experience serving on, and leading, the Council since August 2012.
- The primary responsibilities of the Council, and the focus of its discussions.
- The diverse backgrounds of the members of Council, and the particular contribution that Senate members were in a position to make to the decision-making process of the governing body because of their knowledge of academia and the institution.

In discussion, a number of former members of Council offered their views on the experience of serving on the governing body. These included:

- An overview of all the issues that had to be taken into account when any strategic matters were presented to Council, and an appreciation of the breadth of academic activities in other Faculties.
- A better understanding of the working relationship between the University and the Students' Union.
- The lay members of Council were invaluable to the institution, bringing their expertise from a wide range of professions and sectors to the table.
- Serving on Council was a rewarding role both professionally and intellectually.
- The role of Senate members on Council was critical because they were the academic voice in the discussions that took place.

The Vice-Chancellor invited questions from the floor:

- One of the proposals before Senate contained in the item on the agenda on constitutional amendments (Agendum 11) was the reduction of Senate members of Council from six to three. Dr Gravell asked the Chair of Council whether the proposed number was appropriate and what the background to the change was. Dr Rider responded that the recommendations had been presented to Council as part of the last effectiveness review of the governing body in 2010, a review that was carried out periodically in line with the guidelines published by the Committee of University Chairs, a body which represented the Chairs of UK higher education institutions, whose role was to promote high standards in governance in universities. The Vice-Chancellor stated that the rationale for a reduction in the size of Council was the smaller the membership, the greater the level of engagement of the individual members with Council business. He drew attention to the fact that the Senate members were part of a University staff representation of six in total, including himself as Vice-Chancellor and the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

Regarding the 2010 report of the review of Council effectiveness, the Vice-Chancellor suggested that a copy of it or a digest of it be made available to members to provide them with the background to the recommendations.

- What steps should the University take to encourage a diversity of membership on the governing body? Dr Rider responded that she firmly believed in the importance of diversity and achieving it on the governing body. She acknowledged that it had not yet been possible to reach the desirable level of diversity in Class 2 membership of Council (lay members) but the committee involved in bringing forward nominations to membership continued to focus on this issue when discussing potential candidates. One of the challenges that presented itself in moving to a smaller governing body was finding an appropriate mix of skills and experience.
- Should the Class of Senate members on Council include those members of Senate who were not academic members? Dr Rider stated that other classes of membership provided for this and referred to the non-teaching staff membership (Class 4) which gave a seat on Council to an individual who was not an academic member of staff.
- When the Senate Nominating Committee started the selection process to find Senators to join Council, would a dialogue with Council about diversity and the possible spread of disciplines sought be helpful? Dr Rider confirmed that she would be happy to be involved in such a discussion at the appropriate time.
- What were the major items that would occupy Council's thinking in the near future? Dr Rider itemized some of the most important ones: the appointment of a new Vice-Chancellor, the capital programme, and adjusting to a changing external environment which included considering questions about the financial model, technological developments and the choices potential students might make, all of which were substantial issues.

On behalf of Senate, the Vice-Chancellor thanked Dr Rider for her presentation which had been greatly appreciated. He commented that he would explore whether it might be possible to hold a regular session in future on Council business to keep Senate informed of the work of the governing body.

Resolved That a copy of the report on the review of Council effectiveness completed in 2010 be made available to members of Senate.

8 Obituaries

The Vice-Chancellor announced with regret the deaths of:

Mr David Williams, Estates and Facilities on 30 August 2014; and
Mr Phil Clarke, Estates and Facilities on 5 October 2014.

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

9 Statement of Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters

Received A report, dated 27 October 2014, drawn up on behalf of the Academic Registrar, on a series of amendments to be made to the Statement of Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters, some of which were highlighted in the accompanying Statement for approval, and others which would be brought forward at the appropriate time after various constitutional changes had been finalized.

The Academic Registrar presented the report which explained which sections of the Statement required amendment following the introduction of new executive arrangements, among other things.

The members raised a number of questions and concerns about the new arrangements, in particular:

- The new set-up of senior executive groups (a University Senior Management Team, a University Academic Executive, supported by three new Executive Groups, a University Professional Services Leadership Team and a University Business Development and Project Delivery Board and a University Strategy Colloquium) appeared to introduce a new layer of management in the current structure which might result in senior staff moving further away from the routine activities of the institution and direct operational leadership. Its introduction also appeared to be at odds with the findings of the recent staff survey which had indicated that levels of management needed to be more closely linked to staff at lower levels in the organization.

The Vice-Chancellor made it clear that the intention had not been to create a new hierarchy. The Strategy objectives in the areas of Education, Research and Enterprise remained unchanged and the Deans would be centrally involved in these matters through their membership of the University Academic Executive. The role of the University Senior Management Team was to oversee the day-to-day operational matters.

- In setting up these new groups, an opportunity had been missed to strengthen the mechanisms for bringing back, or feeding in, to these groups the views from constituencies across the institution. The Senate, for example, should have a central role in discussing strategic issues, and its agendas should be structured to allow for this. The membership of Senate had been reduced as part of the restructuring of the University in 2010/11 and consequently there were some academic disciplines or groups which were not represented on the principal academic body.
- The Vice-Chancellor stated that his interpretation of the new structures differed to the views offered. He considered the setting up of the new groups to be an evolution of the current arrangements. The new groups were not intended to act as barriers between the executive and the 'coal face' and there was no intention to disengage the Deans from critical decision-making. On the contrary, the arrangements were designed to improve the flow of information, and, in particular, the dialogue between the Faculties and Professional Services. One of the starting points for the changes had been the realization that the volume of business brought to the University Executive Group needed to be controlled more effectively to ensure that sufficient time was allocated to the discussion of key strategic issues. The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the Deans of Medicine and Natural and Environmental Sciences all endorsed the view that the introduction of the new executive groups allowed them to concentrate on the important strategic issues.
- The new arrangements had been introduced before Senate had had an opportunity to consider them. Given the nature of the changes, one could conclude that they should have been presented to Senate for its views.

The Vice-Chancellor reiterated his earlier comments about the new groups. He acknowledged that there were other matters which, with hindsight, should have been presented differently to Senate, for example, the presentations during the year of the University Strategy. He referred to the item on the future recruitment of students (Agendum 10) which he believed was a good example of seeking and consulting with Senate on current academic issues. Regarding the role of Senate, the Vice-Chancellor said that he supported efforts to strengthen its voice in

institutional governance and to involve it in all matters that fell under its remit. He reminded Senate of the initiatives he had introduced to encourage debate.

- It was queried when it would be appropriate to assess whether the new arrangements were working well. Responding to a suggestion of holding a review in six months' time, the Vice-Chancellor said that in this might be too early for a thorough review, but instead a discussion could be held with the individuals who were members of the groups to establish whether the set-up was effective; a review should be conducted only after the groups had operated for a sufficient period of time to enable a reasonable judgement on their effectiveness.

The Vice-Chancellor brought the discussion to a close, thanking the members for their views. The points raised by Senate would be taken into account in the planning of agendas and the presentation of items for discussion in future. He urged members of Senate to make use of the existing opportunities to raise matters in advance of a meeting or via Senate question time.

- Resolved** (i) That the amendments set out under point 1 iv) be approved and that the further revisions highlighted in the report under points i) to iii), which would be presented in due course, be noted.
- Noted** (ii) The Vice-Chancellor's undertaking to carry out a review of the new executive group arrangements after a suitable period of operation.
- (iii) The points raised by members on the role and operation of Senate.

10 **Senate membership**

Received A copy of the membership of Senate for the academic year 2014/15.

The Vice-Chancellor invited members of Senate to let the working secretary know after the meeting if there were any errors in the names and titles of the members listed in the document.

Noted The current membership of Senate.

11 **Minutes of meetings**

11.1 **18 June 2014**

The members approved the unrestricted minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2014 for signing by the Vice-Chancellor.

11.2 **25 September 2014**

The members approved the unrestricted minutes of the meeting held on 25 September 2014 for signing by the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

11.3 **15 October 2014**

The members approved the unrestricted minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2014 for signing by the Vice-Chancellor.

12 **Matters arising**

12.1 **18 June 2014**

12.1.1 **A new institution-wide personal tutor system** (Minute 59 (iii))

The Academic Registrar reported on the matters raised at the meeting on 18 June 2014 about writing references for students and the appropriate level of record-keeping in respect of academic appeals and complaints. The information on providing references had been updated to include the circumstances when it would not be appropriate to write a reference, and clear guidance on this matter was available to all Personal Academic Tutors through the newly constructed online Handbook, accessible via SUSSED. Regarding recording-keeping, she reported that participation in a JISC pilot on a relationship management system, designed to support the Personal Academic Tutor system, was under investigation, with the close involvement of the Institute for Learning

Innovation and Development. While personal confidentiality had to be respected in the academic appeals process, there was a need for a policy on access to student data for Personal Academic Tutors, and this would provide an opportunity to include statements on record-keeping. This work would be carried forward by the new Head of Academic Appeals and Student Complaints. Professor Niblo underlined the importance of the Personal Academic Tutor having access to all relevant information about his/her tutees. The Academic Registrar acknowledged the importance of this, and pointed out that the procedures clearly stated that the Personal Academic Tutor and the Senior Tutor should not be involved in the appeals or complaints procedures if it concerned one of their tutees. She would report back to Senate after she had had the opportunity to discuss the ramifications of seeking a balance between protecting an individual's right to confidentiality and the need for disclosure in support of promoting effective pastoral care to enable staff to carry out their responsibilities.

Noted The Academic Registrar's undertaking to report back to Senate on the matter.

12.1.2 **Senate Nominating Committee** (Minute 62)

The Vice-Chancellor referred to the presentation from the Chair of Council which was one of the proposals that had been brought forward by the Senate Nominating Committee at the meeting on 18 June 2014.

12.2 **25 September 2014**

12.2.1 **Standing Orders** (Minute 1)

The Academic Registrar reported that the Standing Orders received at the special meeting of Senate would require further revision to accommodate the changes arising from the new executive arrangements. These would be presented as soon as possible.

12.2.2 **Members of the Senate Nominating Committee** (Minute 3)

The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor confirmed that he had written to all the members of Senate immediately after the meeting of the Senate Nominating Committee on 26 September 2014, informing them of the SNC's deliberations and decisions regarding the selection of individuals to join the Joint Selection Committee. He had nominated Professor Dame Wendy Hall as the senior academic leader and had relayed Senate's recommendation that an external adviser be invited to join the Committee. Council had endorsed the proposal.

In response to a question about the reason why more junior members of staff had not been selected to join the Joint Selection Committee, the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor explained that all those who had put themselves forward were senior members of academic staff. He referred to the discussion at the special meeting about the range of experience of individuals willing to serve on the Senate Nominating Committee and Senate's decision to appoint three additional members to broaden the spread of academic staff, all of whom were relatively junior members.

12.3 **15 October 2014**

Quality Assurance Agency's Higher Education Review: draft Self-Evaluation Document (Minute 6)

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the points and comments made at the special meeting on 15 October 2014 had been taken into account in the final drafting of the Self-Evaluation Document. The Quality Assurance Agency's submission date for the Document was 10 November 2014.

13 **Vice-Chancellor's report**

Received A report, drawn up on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, dated 4 November 2014, on current strategic and operational issues, recent news and events, and international visits, together with an appendix which set out the changes to the arrangements to the senior executive, presented by the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the following items:

Student recruitment for 2014/15

The recruitment of Home/EU undergraduates for 2014/15 had been successful. However, the headline numbers did not reveal the fluctuations in recruitment levels across some Faculties and disciplines. Regarding the recruitment of international undergraduates, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the numbers had fallen again this year. The numbers of postgraduate taught Home/EU students and international postgraduate students had also declined. There were national and local issues which explained this. As far as the particular institutional aspects of this were concerned, work was under way to uncover the reasons for the movement in numbers. The financial implication of this was a fall in the forecast income for the institution. The Vice-Chancellor also highlighted the ways in which the University was learning how best to respond to the changing external environment.

Vision 2020 Strategy

The Vice-Chancellor highlighted:

- The changes to the executive structure and the separation of the role of Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor. The focus of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor's role would be the co-ordination and management of major projects and business development, in addition to acting as the Vice-Chancellor's deputy. The Provost's responsibilities would encompass the line management of the Deans and the delivery of strategy through the Faculties, in addition to managing productive working relationships among the Faculties and Professional Services. The Vice-Chancellor stated that he planned to consult on the appointment of the Provost in due course.
- Following the departure of the Registrar in the summer, the responsibilities of the Academic Registrar had been broadened to include, among other things, acting as secretary to Senate and Council.
- Mr White, appointed as an interim Chief Operating Officer in October 2014, was acting as the head of Professional Services.

University league tables

The University had been placed in the top twenty of the three main league tables this year: *The Complete University Guide*, and the *Guardian's* and *Times' University Guides*.

Staff survey

The Vice-Chancellor outlined the steps that would be taken to respond to the matters highlighted in the survey. He said that, compared with the results two years ago, there had been considerable improvement, but there continued to be some areas where action was needed.

One Book One Southampton

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Professor Petts for a new initiative, One Book One Southampton, whose aim was to encourage engagement with topics explored in *Empire*, written by Jeremy Paxton who had accepted an invitation to give a lecture at the University on the book in the near future.

Noted The information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's report.

14 **President of the Students' Union's report**

Received A report, prepared by the President of the Students' Union, on recent activities, initiatives and collaborative projects organized by the Union.

Mr Mendoza-Wolfson presented his report, summarizing the main activities under way since the summer. He highlighted the success of Freshers' Week, particularly the new approach to welcoming students, and the training of Faculty Officers and Academic Presidents across the institution who would represent the Union's members.

Turning to the list of collaborative projects, Mr Mendoza-Wolfson singled out the Student Written Submission which had been drafted for the University's Higher Education Review. The work had been led by the Vice-President (Education), Ms d'Angelico.

Noted The report from the President of the Students' Union.

15 **Senate question time**

The Vice-Chancellor reported that he had received one question which concerned a specific issue regarding a student and therefore was not considered appropriate for discussion as part of Senate question time which was reserved for unrestricted matters that fell within Senate's remit. He had asked colleagues in Professional Services to look into the matter and to respond directly to the member of Senate who had posted the question.

The Vice-Chancellor invited questions, including any that arose from the presentation of his earlier report or the report from the President of the Students' Union.

- Regarding the University's Higher Education Review, had the Student Written Submission been finalized? Ms d'Angelico confirmed that it had been prepared in parallel to the University's Self-Evaluation Document (SED). It was ready for submission with the SED.
- Attention was drawn to a minor error in the Vice-Chancellor's report which should be corrected: the results of the staff survey (paragraph 17) had been presented to the Trades' Unions on 3 October 2014. The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the staff engagement action plan (paragraph 20) would be presented to Senate at its meeting on 25 February 2015. In the event that this was not achievable, an interim report would be presented.
- Under the heading 'Recruitment of the new Vice-Chancellor', the title of Professor Dame Wendy Hall was incorrect (paragraph 29). The report would be rectified for the record.
- Responding to a question about building a community across the different groups and cohorts of students, Mr Mendoza-Wolfson stated that the aim was to move away from structuring Freshers' events to appeal to what one might consider to be a stereotype of a first-year undergraduate. Ms d'Angelico commented that 200 course representatives had been trained over the summer. Their role was to work within the academic units, reporting to the Academic Presidents and Faculty Officers, to help students make the most of the academic environment.
- A question was asked about the capacity of the European Office to process bids for funding available under Horizon 2020. An example was given of a grant application which, despite having been prepared around six months before the deadline, the European Office had not been able to process in time. Given the level of European Union funding that was available, would investment in the European Office be considered worthwhile? Pro Vice-Chancellor Petts said that she was aware of the problems which were a result of staff vacancies. Recruitment was under way and she expected that the Office would be operating at full strength soon. The feasibility of setting up an office in Brussels to support the work of the European Office at the University was currently being investigated.
- On the subject of student recruitment, a question was posed about the figures which were set during the planning round, in particular the levels of recruitment expected in markets which were well-established. The Vice-Chancellor pointed out that the targets set for the Faculty of Business and Law had followed consultation with the Faculty and individual Schools. There had been a decline in applications for the Winchester School of Art and the Law School which had been unanticipated. Regarding the Southampton Business School, it was possible that the growth over the last five years had plateaued out. The Provost added that a review would be undertaken in the Faculty. He reiterated earlier comments made about the volatility of the recruitment environment and how the institution was learning how to adapt to it.
- Vision 2020 Strategy projected growth in student numbers by approximately 6,000. What were the plans to accommodate the increase? The Vice-Chancellor reminded members that growth was also linked to the University's internationalization ambitions, and the numbers included those students who were or would be studying in China and Malaysia. The plans to accommodate increases in student numbers would have to be reflected in the capital development programme which would take into account the physical limitations of the existing campuses.

Noted The questions and responses during Senate question time and the Vice-Chancellor's intention to present to Senate the staff engagement action plan or an interim report if the full action plan was not finalized at the meeting on 25 February 2015.

16 Student recruitment when the cap on student numbers is lifted: discussion paper

Received A report entitled 'Undergraduate Home/EU student recruitment in the post-Student Number Control world', presented by the Director of Student Recruitment and International Relations.

Following Ms Doyle's presentation, the Vice-Chancellor invited views on:

- ways in which the University could best assess student potential at entry; and
- ways in which the best applicants could be encouraged to study at the University.

In discussion, members offered comments and observations:

General

After the general election in May 2015, other legislative changes might be introduced which might affect the number of potential students in future or impose a limit on the period of recruitment without student number controls.

Entry tariffs, league tables and employability

The links between high entry tariffs and the position of HEIs in the sector's league tables and high entry tariffs and employability rates among graduates were highlighted. Lowering entry tariffs had the potential to destroy a University's 'brand'. A sophisticated analysis should be undertaken because the relationships between entry tariffs, recruitment and subsequent employment were different across the disciplines.

University's profile/Open Days

The University might consider:

- Holding Open Days on a Sunday to attract greater numbers of interested families. Open Days held during the working/school week were difficult for some prospective students to attend.
- Introducing sessions during Open Days that were more targeted. An example was quoted from Boston University which held sessions for parents which covered security on campus and included reassurances from the staff that their students' welfare and wellbeing were paramount to the institution. Organising visits to areas that showed the practical application of subjects studied, for example, a visit to the Clinical Skills area in the hospital during an open day visit had improved recruitment in Health Sciences by 50%.
- Initiatives to raise the University's profile in the media, particularly via local television and radio, and nationally, for example, in broadcast science programmes.

Recruitment/Admissions/fees

Initiatives and suggestions made included:

- The lifting of student number control should be seen as an opportunity to take bold steps in the approach to recruitment.
- Support a more granular approach to admissions given that 'A' level scores were not a good predictor of successful degree-level study. The Recognition of Prior Learning policy, which identified equivalencies to 'A' levels, had been introduced and would help achieve this. The views of the Admissions Officers were invaluable because of their experience in this area.
- Consider financial incentives such as introductory offers on fees or free Foundation Year programmes.
- Was the University playing to its strengths? Could more be done to reach feeder schools and colleges? Could alumni be invited to return to their schools/sixth-form colleges to talk about studying at Southampton? Should recruitment efforts in the North of the UK and in continental Europe be strengthened?

Foundation Years/Programmes of study

A number of statements and suggestions were made, including:

- Find more routes into the University. Expanding the current Foundation Years might be a way to do this. Consider ways which would appeal to a greater diversity of markets.
- Develop programme routes into named degrees but do so in a way that protected the University's standing.
- Introduce a common year for Biosciences and Medicine which would help students move on to Bachelor's degrees in disciplines where demand for places was high.
- There was an untapped market for more general degrees, for example, in Science. There was scope in the areas of Engineering, Physics and Mathematics.
- Introduce four-year liberal arts/liberal sciences programmes which allowed students to develop intellectually more broadly. This might be particularly attractive to prospective EU students. Reservations were expressed about the potential attractiveness of four-year programmes of study because of the tuition costs and the fact that other institutions might run three-year programmes in similar subjects. However, if employability rates were high for Southampton graduates on four-year programmes that might persuade prospective students that a longer programme would be worthwhile despite the additional cost.
- Proposals had been drawn up for a multi-disciplinary Bachelor's degree which would be discussed in due course.
- Introduce small changes to the admissions process such as early offers, sending reminders to applicants about their applications, or speaking directly to them about their plans.
- A more creative approach to recruitment was more likely to be possible at a Faculty or an academic group level than it was at an institutional level.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked members for their comments. He read out the key points from an email received from a member of Senate who had not been able to attend the meeting:

- on the question of lifting the control on numbers, if the University chose to expand intake, it should do so in a carefully planned manner.
- It would be important to: secure good staff-student ratios in any discipline where numbers increased; ensure that income followed students at discipline level; and invest in resources to match expansion, including teaching space.

He invited Senators to forward any further ideas or suggestions they might have to their Faculty before 18 November 2014 when the University Academic Executive would discuss recruitment.

Noted The intention to convey the views of Senate to a meeting of the University Academic Executive on 18 November 2014 when in addition to the members of the group (the Vice-Chancellor, the Pro Vice-Chancellors, the Deans and the Chief Operating Officer) the Associate Deans (Education and Student Experience)/Admissions Controllers and colleagues in Professional Services would be invited to discuss the priorities for recruitment and conversion in 2015/16 and beyond.

17 **Amendments to the University's Charter, Statutes and Ordinances**

Received A covering report, prepared on behalf of the Academic Registrar, on proposed amendments to the University's Charter, Statutes and Ordinances, together with the specific sections of the constitutional documents attached as Appendices prefaced with summaries which itemized each amendment.

The Academic Registrar drew attention to two errors in her covering report: the reference in paragraph 2.1 to Article 19 should read Article 17 of the Charter which would be renumbered Article 16; and in paragraph 4.1, the first bullet point, the date of Senate's endorsement of the timetable for abolishing Court should read 18 June 2014 and not 25 June 2014.

The Academic Registrar presented the documentation, explaining that the proposals were submitted to Senate for endorsement in accordance with the requirements of Articles 16, 18 and 19 of the University's Charter which stipulated that all changes to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances must be approved by Council on the recommendation of, or after consultation with, the Senate. Amendments to the Charter and Statutes required a Special Resolution – agreed at one meeting of Council and confirmed at a subsequent meeting – before the revisions could be submitted to the Privy Council for approval. She stated that the proposed amendments fell into two main categories:

- Revisions that were linked to the abolition of Court and the reduction in the membership of Council; and the
- Updating of titles and amendments which were required following the introduction of the new executive arrangements.

In discussion, the following points were raised about the drafts presented:

Charter

- Attention was drawn to the proposed amendment to Article 8 which would allow for the appointment of up to five Pro Vice-Chancellors. Were there plans to appoint a fifth? The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that there were no plans to do so at this stage. The new role of Provost would be one of the Pro Vice-Chancellors.

Statute 3: The Council

Section 1: Class 2

- The members of Senate believed that of the eight members in Class 2, two not one should be appointed from among the University's graduates in order to retain the links between, and the valuable contributions of, alumni and the work of Council.

Section 1: Class 3

- The members of Senate were uncomfortable about reducing the size of Class 3 (Members appointed by Senate) from six to three as this small group offered little scope to provide the diversity and range of academic perspectives that was desirable on the governing body. Members proposed that four members should be retained in this Class as this was considered to be a more proportionate reduction from the original number when comparing it with the proposal for Class 2 which was to move from 12 to eight members. Including one extra Senate member in Class 3 would not affect the requirement for a lay majority in the composition of the governing body.

Ordinances

Part 3: Dismissal, Discipline, Grievance Procedures and related matters pursuant to Statute 7

- It was queried whether in a community of academics the line manager of the Deans should be the Provost rather than the Vice-Chancellor. (Part 3, 3.3 (2) (vi) (b) currently stated that the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor was the line manager and the intention was to replace that with the Provost.) The Vice-Chancellor responded that the suggestion that he should take on the role had been considered when the amendments were first drafted but he had concluded that, managerially, it would be impracticable. Professor Hawkins commented that under the current and the revised arrangement the Vice-Chancellor was in a position to act as it were as a 'backstop' in the event that there were disagreements between the Provost and a Dean.
- It was suggested that the reference to the Provost under Part 3, 3.3 (2) (vi) (b) should be amended to read 'the Pro Vice-Chancellor designated as the Provost'. This amendment would ensure that the revisions made in the Charter to the role of the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor would be reflected in that part of the Ordinances. The text would also be self-explanatory: there would be no need to refer to the Charter in order to identify the Provost. (It was noted that this clarificatory statement had been inserted in Part 1 (1.7 paragraph 4).)

The amendment would need to be made throughout Part 3, where appropriate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he would present Senate's recommendations to Council at its meeting on 12 November 2014.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the amendments to the Charter and Statutes, set out in Appendix 1, which would be forwarded to Council for two readings before the documents were submitted to the Privy Council for approval, be endorsed subject to the proposal in respect of Class 2 and Class 3 of Council membership being presented to Council for consideration.
 - (ii) That the amendments to the Ordinances, excluding Part 3, for submission to Council for approval, be endorsed.
 - (iii) That the amendments to Part 3 of the Ordinances be endorsed, subject to the inclusion of the amendment in respect of a reference to the Provost in section Part 3, 3.3 (2) (vi) (b) to read 'the Pro Vice-Chancellor designated as the Provost' being presented to Council for consideration.

18 **Proposal for a Doctoral College**

Received A paper entitled 'Proposal for a Doctoral College', dated 27 October 2014, drawn up by Pro Vice-Chancellor Petts and Professor Vickers, University Director of Graduate Studies.

Professor Vickers presented the paper which proposed the development of the Researcher Development and Graduate Centre into a Doctoral College. The background to the proposal was the Research Councils' increasing focus on the professional development of doctoral researchers and the growth of Centres of Doctoral Training and other interdisciplinary research, all of which strengthened the case for a single centre which coordinated the range of activities in this area across the University.

Professor Vickers summarized the sections in the paper which outlined the current role of the Researcher Development and Graduate Centre and its Advisory Group, the external environment and the possible scope of the activities of a Doctoral College. The name 'Doctoral College' clearly signalled that doctoral researchers would be at the centre of the College's activities which would be run in conjunction with the Faculty Graduate Schools and other local structures. Furthermore, a strong link would be maintained developing Early Career Researchers as part of their transition from postgraduate researcher.

Professor Vickers stated that the plans needed to be worked out in greater detail. The intention was to present a developed proposal to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee first for discussion before bringing the document to Senate in the spring of 2015.

The Vice-Chancellor invited the members of Senate to approve in principle the development of a Doctoral College.

Resolved That the development of a Doctoral College to be established with responsibilities in line with the ones described in the paper from the academic year 2015/16 be approved in principle.

Noted The undertaking of Professor Vickers to present a further report to Senate at its meeting on 17 June 2015 on the setting up of a Doctoral College.

19 **Evolution of research governance**

Received A report, dated 29 October 2014, drawn up on behalf of Pro Vice-Chancellor Petts by the Head of Intellectual Property, Contracts and Policy in Research and Innovation Services on establishing a Research Integrity and Governance Committee.

Ms Galpin presented the report which explained the reasons for setting up a new committee of Council which would be responsible for, and have oversight of, promoting a culture of research integrity across the institution. It would work in concert with the University Ethics Committee, the Animal Welfare Ethical Review Board and the Genetic Modification and Biosafety Subcommittee, and would report to the University Academic Executive in the new set up, and Council, when appropriate.

Ms Galpin drew attention to the sections in the report on the Committee's remit and membership. The terms of reference would be drawn up in due course in time for the group to start its work in January 2015. It was suggested that a representative of the Doctoral College should be included as a

member of the Committee as this would provide a link between the group and the activities of the new College when set up.

Resolved That a representative of the new Doctoral College should be included in the membership of the Research Integrity and Governance Committee.

Noted The content of the report and the intention to establish a Research Integrity and Governance Committee by January 2015.

20 **Senate elections: process**

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

[At this point in the proceedings, the number of members of Senate present was lower than the quoracy requirement of 30.]

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the meeting of Senate was not quorate. The item would be presented to the next meeting of Senate on 25 February 2015.

21 **Academic Quality and Standards Committee**

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the meeting of Senate was not quorate. The items would be presented to the next meeting of Senate on 25 February 2015.

21.1 **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.

21.2 **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.

21.3 **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.

22 **Vice-Chancellor's actions as Chair of Senate**

Received A report from the Vice-Chancellor on actions he had taken as Chair of Senate since Senate's meeting on 18 June 2014.

[The report would be presented to the next meeting of Senate.]

23 **Selection of Senate Nominating Committee members for 2014/15**

The Vice-Senate stated that he would arrange for a reminder to be sent to members of Senate about the setting up of a Nominating Committee for the year.

24 **Date of next meeting**

The Vice-Chancellor confirmed that the next meeting of Senate would take place on 25 February 2015.

+++++

Ref CS3/3

J:\Secretariat\Senate\SENATE (Do Not Move)\Senate 2014-15\5 November 2014\Senate unrestricted confirmed minutes-5nov2014.docx