

Minutes (unrestricted)

Meeting title: Senate

Date: Wednesday, 29 February 2012

Time: 2.15 pm

Location: Senate Room, George Thomas Building, Highfield campus

Present: The Vice-Chancellor (*in the Chair*), Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor Wheeler, Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris, Pro Vice-Chancellor Nelson, Pro Vice-Chancellor Spearing, Dr S Alam, Mr R Bailey*, Mrs M J Baker, Dr S A Beers, Dr V Benson, Dr J Blaydes, Dr M L Brown, Dr J Byrne, Dr F Cagampang, Ms J Calvert, Professor I T Cameron, Dr M Carravetta, Dr T Chown, Mr S Cooper, Ms C Court, Professor A Curry, Mrs J Davis, Dr S Demain, Professor D Eccles, Professor M E Everist, Professor J Falkingham, Mr P Gibbs, Dr M Gobbi, Dr I Golosnoy, Dr A M Gravell, Dr L Green, Professor P de Groot, Ms T Harrison (*Registrar*), Professor J Hart, Dr N Harvey, Dr C Holmes, Professor J Howells, Dr T Irvine, Dr C W Jackson, Dr E James, Dr N Jarrett, Dr G Kinchin, Professor N Lee, Dr R Lewis, Mr S Ling*, Dr M Luke, Dr T Maccarone, Professor N J Madise, Professor R A Mills, Professor T Minshull, Ms R Moore, Dr A D Neill, Dr T Newman, Professor M Niranjan, Dr J Parker, Professor C Pope, Professor J Preston, Dr R Primorac, Dr J Ransley, Dr S Sharkh, Dr W B Sloan, Dr C Smith, Dr P Smith, Professor P G R Smith, Ms L Stobseth-Brown, Dr M Tan, Dr A Tavassoli, Dr J Tumblety, Ms P Usher, Professor J Vickers, Ms K Walker, Mr S Watson*, Dr M Weal, Professor N White, Dr Y Xiong and Mr E Zaluska

In attendance The Chief Operating Officer, Director of Communications and Marketing, Director of Human Resources and Ms C J Gamble

(* Member of Senate not present for the restricted items.)

Welcome

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly the new members of Senate who had joined since the start of the academic session.

Obituary

The Vice-Chancellor announced with regret the deaths of two students:

Mr Raymond Start, MPhil/PhD student in the Southampton Education School in November 2011; and Ms Amanda Armstrong who was studying for an Advanced Diploma in Nursing Mental Health in the Faculty of Health Sciences on 5 December 2011.

The Vice-Chancellor asked members of Senate to stand as a mark of respect.

Presentation

Pro Vice-Chancellor Nelson gave a presentation on the preparations for the forthcoming Research Excellence Framework (REF) exercise. He outlined the background to the REF and its forerunner, the Research Assessment Exercise and summarized the assessment framework that had been established for 2014. Pro Vice-Chancellor Nelson explained the funding formula and funding levels for each category of assessment, and set out the target profile that the University was planning to achieve in order to secure a ranking in the top ten of institutions in the sector. He described the committee structure that had been set up at Faculty and University level to oversee the selection process for the exercise, and highlighted the equality and diversity considerations that would be taken into account throughout. He was pleased to report that twenty-two members of the

academic staff had been invited to serve on the REF panels which would assess institutions' submissions during 2014. The publication of the outcomes was scheduled for December 2014.

Concluding the presentation, Pro Vice-Chancellor Nelson thanked all those who were working on the REF, in particular the Associate Deans (Research), and the Head of Research Performance, Mr Staniczenko.

The Vice-Chancellor invited questions on the presentation. The following matters were raised:

- What was the cost to the University of preparing for the REF? Pro Vice-Chancellor Nelson said that the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), which coordinated the exercise on behalf of the sector, had calculated the cost of the REF as a very small percentage of its overall running costs. The University had not estimated the cost of participating in the REF. A debate about the money involved could be regarded as academic because participation in the exercise was not optional for the University.
- The definition of an early career researcher was based on the amount of time the individual had spent in an academic post. Periods spent in post-doctoral positions were not included.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Pro Vice-Chancellor Nelson for a very informative overview of the work under way.

[Post-meeting note: A copy of the presentation is available on the SUSSED group site for Senate members. The REF SharePoint site can be found at <https://sharepoint.soton.ac.uk/sites/ref2014/default.aspx>.]

Starring of agenda items

The Vice-Chancellor stated that Agendum 14 should be double starred as it was an item for discussion.

22 Minutes

The members approved the minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2011 for signing by the Vice-Chancellor.

23 Matters arising

23.1 Senate membership (Minute 2)

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the vacancies that existed in two categories: Representatives of the academic staff from each Faculty (category (e)) and Representatives of the research staff of the University (category (f)). He encouraged those Faculties which were holding vacancies to find candidates to fill them.

23.2 Annual report from Senate to Council (Minute 12)

The Registrar stated that at its meeting on 24 November 2011 Council had welcomed the annual report which had been drawn up to give the governing body a more detailed view of the work of Senate. The effectiveness review of Senate, planned for the next academic session, would examine the relationship between the two bodies, in particular how Senate assured Council that it was fulfilling its role as the principal academic body.

24 Statement of Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters

Received An extract from the document entitled 'Statement of Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters'.

The Registrar presented the section on the delegated powers of Senate, explaining that one amendment was proposed while information on preferred nominees, reporting routes, and record keeping had been added to the table. The consideration of external examiners' reports for taught programmes would be delegated to the Faculty Programme Committee instead of the Dean or nominee. The document had been endorsed by the University Programme Committee.

Resolved That the proposed revisions and additions to the schedule of delegated powers, part of the Statement of the Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters be approved.

25 Vice-Chancellor's report and University Executive Group (UEG) decision log

Received The Vice-Chancellor's report, together with a list of actions and decisions taken after consultation with UEG since the meeting of Senate in June 2011.

The Vice-Chancellor presented his report, highlighting the following items:

- The Queen's Anniversary prize for Higher and Further Education for the University's innovation and world-leading expertise in performance sports engineering.
- Professor Petts, the Dean of the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, who had been awarded a CBE in the New Year's Honours list for her services to science, and her contribution to the work of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution.
- The setting up of an Open Data Institute in London which would be co-directed by Professor Berners-Lee and Professor Shadbolt.
- The University's Diamond Jubilee campaign which would celebrate (some of) the achievements over the last sixty years.
- The consultation on the future of the Social Work Studies programmes, and the decision recorded in the appendix to the report to proceed with the closure of the postgraduate programmes in 2013. There would be no intake of students for 2012/13.
- The University of Southampton Malaysia Campus, and the visit to Malaysia by a small group of senior members of the University to consolidate working relationships with the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysian University and business partners, and to raise the profile of the campus and its facilities.
- The appointment of the University Secretary to the position of Director of Strategy, Planning and Change at the University of Sheffield in March 2012. The Vice-Chancellor thanked Dr Strike for his many and varied contributions to the University.

The Vice-Chancellor also stated that, following feedback he had received, he intended to consider how to improve the decision log to give members a clearer picture of the matters discussed by the University Executive Group.

Noted The Vice-Chancellor's report and the decisions taken after consultation with the University Executive Group.

26 Senate question time

Received A report, dated 27 February 2012, from the Vice-Chancellor on the questions he had received from Senators, together with his responses.

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the written response to the question he had received about the Transition Project, indicating that it had achieved the objectives set for 2010-11, including making significant savings on administrative costs that were now being reinvested in academic staff appointments. He reminded the members of Senate of the rationale for the changes to the academic structure of the University and the process which had been adopted to introduce those changes. Senate had discussed in February 2010 the underlying arguments for change and had considered a set of proposals for a restructuring which had emerged after some six months of consultation with the constituent parts of the University. The Vice-Chancellor stated that when he had arrived to take up his post he had received strong feedback that the former Schools, and research centres, were disconnected from the administrative centre of the institution and, overall, there was a lack of organizational cohesion. The proposals for the structural changes had been designed to strengthen, and make clearer, the academic voice within the senior executive group. Furthermore, some of the administrative systems, dispersed across the various academic groups, had not functioned as well as they should. One of the aims of the restructuring had been to provide central standardized services that were delivered in a locally responsive way. Progress had been made in this element of the reorganisation, but there was still work to be done to improve the locally responsive support provided. The Vice-Chancellor reiterated his comments made at the meeting in November 2011, that, in his view, it was too early in the process of implementation to assess the Transition Project.

Dr Holmes thanked the Vice-Chancellor for his response. His concern was the monitoring of the implementation of the project, and keeping staff informed of the progress made and explaining what was being done to address any short-term difficulties. Regarding, one of the key areas highlighted in the question - the monitoring of staff workloads - Dr Holmes stated that the separate reviews for academic staff and support staff did not provide an assessment of the work completed through the interplay of the different roles.

The Vice-Chancellor acknowledged that both Senate and the academic community should be kept well informed of developments, indicating that it was possible that greater attention had been paid to communicating the various stages of the transition to the support staff whereas the academic community might not have received enough information. He also drew attention to the new staff survey, discussed in his report, the results of which would be provided to all staff.

It was suggested that the communication with students had been poor. What were the lessons for potential future change? The Vice-Chancellor disagreed with that view. The feedback from the Students' Union about the effect of the 2010-11 transition on the student experience had been broadly neutral. He recognized that there were some issues arising with various elements of student and academic administration services in some parts of the University during the current academic session. The Vice-Chancellor also recognised that there were challenges in communicating with 23,000 students. Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris and the Registrar were working with the Students' Union's President to establish which were the most effective media to use when communicating with a diverse group of students.

One member of Senate suggested that administrative staff had been 'decimated' through the reorganisation. The Vice-Chancellor did not agree with this representation of the transition process, making the point that the University administration had been streamlined and, as a result, fewer staff were required to manage support services. Staff reductions had been achieved without redundancies.

A member of Senate pointed out that the restructuring had affected groups of students in different ways, depending on their academic discipline.

Social Work Studies programmes

Mr Watson relayed the views of the students enrolled on the Social Work Studies programmes which would be affected by the outcome of the consultation. They had been strongly disappointed about the timing of the process which had given them little opportunity to respond. It raised questions about the commitment made to those enrolled on the Foundation programme that they would be able to continue on the Master's course.

The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor emphasized that the consultation period had been extended to give the students affected extra time to submit their views. He stated that the Dean and her academic colleagues had made every effort to engage with the cohort of students and communicate with them effectively. Professor Falkingham said that at the outset of the consultation there had been a temporary setback in communication because of the structure of the course: first-year MSc students were leaving on placements, while second year students were returning. Meetings had been held with staff who had requested that the consultation process be delayed during the change-over period. As a consequence, the consultation period had been extended and over 96 students had submitted their views. Professor Falkingham pointed out that the timing of consultations of this nature cut across the academic year in that a three-month period of review, starting in October, would finish in December when students were starting to leave the University during the Christmas vacation. That was a matter that would have to be borne in mind for any future consultation.

Noted The questions and answers during Senate question time.

27 **Education and the student experience**

27.1 **Managing student numbers**

Received A report from the Admissions Manager in the Student and Academic Administration on the home/EU and international undergraduate and postgraduate applications for 2012/13 and a comparison with the sector, dated 23 February 2012.

Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris presented the report, drawing attention to the headline figures at this stage in the application cycle. In common with the majority of institutions, the University

had received fewer applications overall for the next academic session, although it appeared to be faring better than many of its comparators. The reduction in the level of applications, particularly for undergraduate programmes, was attributed to the recent changes in respect of the funding arrangements. There was also evidence of a greater variation in the numbers of applications across the disciplines. The Senate would be kept informed of the position as the cycle progressed.

The Vice-Chancellor commented that the volatility of the situation had intensified compared with previous years. The position would be closely monitored. He restated the observations made at the last meeting of Senate on the length of time it would take before the full impact of the Government's higher education policy decisions would be felt. Current applicants had decided some time ago to continue their education whereas future, potential students were likely to question whether studying full-time at university was the appropriate route for them. It was important to think carefully about the changes ahead and to respond after due consideration, avoiding overreaction at an early stage in a developing situation.

Noted The update from Student and Academic Administration on the applications for 2012/13.

27.2 Education update

Received A report, dated 20 February 2012, from Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris on the preparations for the Institutional Review and the issues which had emerged from the Faculty Self-Evaluation process.

Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris presented the report. She highlighted section 2.3 and the involvement of members of Senate in a reading group which would be set up to review the draft Institutional Self-Evaluation Document, on behalf of Senate. Five academic members were sought from a spread of Faculties and across the academic levels. Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris invited those who were interested in joining the group to let Dr Piggott in the Quality, Standards and Accreditation team know as soon as possible. The meeting of Senate on 2 May 2012 would be devoted to discussing the document.

Noted The content of the report, in particular the dates of the Institutional Review visit which would take place during the week commencing on 8 October 2012.

27.3 Education and the student experience, 2014/15

Received A discussion paper, presented by Pro-Vice Chancellor Humphris, entitled 'Transforming education and the student experience, 2014/15', dated 23 February 2012.

Over the last year the focus of the policy framework for the sector had shifted. In the light of the Government's reforms, the University Executive Group had reviewed the institution's strategic commitments education and the student experience. Pro Vice-Chancellor invited Senate to debate and advise on the ambitions, set out in the paper, for the educational architecture.

In discussion, the following points were raised:

- A curriculum structure which allowed students to take modules from other degree programmes retrospectively (backtracking) would be welcomed.
- The requirements of accrediting bodies would have to be taken into account when offering a choice in study options. Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris acknowledged that the professional accreditation of some courses might proscribe the range of choices some students could make. The matter would have to be looked at across the board, and discussed with the professional bodies to ensure that they were fully briefed on the developments and how their requirements would be built in to curricular choice, and what it might be possible to offer outside of that. Students, too, would need to understand the consequences of choice, as well as knowing what the pre-requisites were. They would be advised on the routes to an academic qualification and an accredited academic qualification. It should be remembered that a student would be free to make a choice from what would be offered, and that included choosing not to opt for modules that were not mandatory.

- Attention was drawn to recently publicized research undertaken on behalf of the University and College Union on the number of single honours degree programmes on offer across the country which, it had been reported, was declining. Such a development suggested that choice for the individual was becoming more limited. The link between teaching and research was vital. If the portfolio of taught courses declined, the associated research activities suffered, and, as a consequence, disciplines would be adversely affected. From 2012/13 undergraduates would bear the lion's share of the cost of their education. It was unlikely that this would not affect their choice of career. What steps would be taken to preserve the range of disciplines at the University which was traditionally broad-based, and how would academic excellence be preserved within those disciplines?

Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris said that the ambition of the University in respect of the quality and distinctiveness of its educational offer would ensure the institution was well placed to (continue to) attract academically talented students in the future. The portfolio of programmes evolved as research progressed in different areas. The Vice-Chancellor added that he did not think that the breadth of the portfolio was threatened by the current changes.

- Regarding the reference in the paper to a credit accumulation model, Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris outlined what was envisaged: a model which allowed students to determine the pace of their learning, taking account of their individual circumstances, and the requirements in respect of student finance. It would be flexible in terms of the choice of modules and the speed of completion. The option of a 'major/minor' structure, where this was feasible and cost-effective, and within the QAA framework for higher education qualifications, would be examined. Consideration could be given to the possibility of running summer schools to allow graduates and students to take modules over and above what was required for their undergraduate studies, with due regard to the resources involved.
- The discussion about the detail of the ambitions described in the paper would include the particular requirements of part-time students. Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris and the Registrar would be engaging with Senate members to develop the work that would be undertaken to achieve the education strategy. In parallel, the University Executive Group had started discussing how the realization of the strategy would affect the use of the University Estate over the next five years. Its use had to be optimized.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked everyone for their contributions to the debate. Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris and the Registrar would take the initiatives forward and keep Senate informed of the developments in the areas discussed.

Noted The strategic ambition for education and the student experience, 2014/15, set out in the paper.

28 **Transforming education: investing in the future**

Received A discussion paper, dated 16 February 2012, prepared by Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris on the investment across the full range of student support in the future.

The Vice-Chancellor explained that the University was starting to prepare its Access Agreement for 2013/14. He invited Senate to discuss what the optimal balance of investment might be in order to ensure that the University remained both competitive and accessible. Consideration had to be given to meeting the goals and obligations in relation to widening participation, attracting students offering 'A' level grades AAB+, and meeting the expectations of the current student body by enhancing the educational experience of all the students at the University.

In discussion, a number of comments were made and points raised, including:

- Given the University was offering one of the most generous packages of direct student support among the Russell Group and the 1994 Group, it was suggested that the current offering might not need to be changed.
- The work of the Recruitment and Outreach teams could be broadened to look nationally rather than regionally. Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris commented that efforts were being directed

towards the London boroughs and further afield, but, again, it was a question of putting limited resources to the best possible use.

- Providing a variety of sources of support would appeal, possibly, to a greater number of students. It would take account of their differing needs, for example, some might wish to have help with accommodation, while others might prefer bursaries or scholarships for higher degrees. More innovative packages should be designed for the range of entrants from 18 year-olds to mature students.
- More radical changes might need to be considered, such as differential fees. Some programmes of study simply did not lead to highly paid careers. Should the fees for these programmes be set at a lower rate than for those which were stepping stones to well-remunerated professions?
- The fee waivers offered up front could be reduced and directed in part towards providing financial support once the student had commenced his/her studies, based on his/her academic performance in any one year. This would open up the possibility of awarding a scholarship to an individual who, initially, might not have been eligible to receive support but through his/her academic efforts would be rewarded during the period of study.
- Currently, students from households with an annual income of up to £42,000 were eligible for financial support, on a sliding scale. The levels and amounts could be reduced.

The Vice-Chancellor concluded the discussion, thanking the members for their views. The work on the Access Agreement would be taken forward, taking account of the requirements of the Office for Fair Access (OFFA), distinctiveness, fairness and accessibility. He would convey Senate's views to the University's governing body.

Noted The Vice-Chancellor's intention to report to Council Senate's views.

29 **Academic reward and recognition project: update**

Received An oral update from the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor on the academic reward and recognition project.

The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor summarized the work that was being undertaken in respect of the academic reward and recognition project which was defining new academic pathways and titles, in addition to revising the structures for developing and appraising staff. Its implementation was considered to be step change in the way that academic staff were supported. It was intended that the new arrangements would be built in to the business planning cycle.

A period of consultation had commenced during which the proposals that had been drawn up were discussed at open meetings with academic groups. The Provost drew attention to the website that had been set up to present all the information about the project, and its progress – <https://sharepoint.soton.ac.uk/sites/arr/default.aspx> – to staff. He invited staff to use the electronic fora to respond to the plans if they had not had an opportunity to attend the meetings. A modified set of proposals, which would take into account the comments from the academic staff, would be presented to the University Executive Group in early April 2012. The new framework would be introduced over the next three years.

Professor Pope stated that among staff there was a considerable concern that the project challenged the current national pay framework and job descriptions in order to address a particular shortcoming of the present personal performance and development review (PPDR) arrangements: the failure of some of those in managerial positions to manage staff. The earlier system of regular appraisals had been similarly unsuccessful for the same reason. However, the current project did not focus on this area.

The Provost emphasized that the academic community as a whole had to address the inadequacies of the current system. The proposals coming forward were about working together as a group to help develop individuals, with appropriate support being provided for the senior management. During the summer months there had been discussions between the project team and the local branch of the University and College Union to ensure that the Union was properly briefed and given the opportunity to respond to the plans. This dialogue had resulted in changes being made to the initial proposals.

In response to a query about whether the final proposals would be introduced without presenting them first for Senate's approval, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the commitment to consultation was unequivocal. This had been carried out and was continuing in respect of the project.

Noted The oral update from the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

30 **Research Data Management Policy**

Received A proposed Research Data Management Policy for the University, presented by Pro Vice-Chancellor Nelson.

Pro Vice-Chancellor Nelson outlined the background to the policy which had been drafted to meet the requirements of UK Research Councils and other funding bodies. Institutions were expected to have the policy framework in place by 1 May 2012. A series of guidance documents would be drawn up in due course which would provide specific advice to researchers on how to comply with the policy. Those documents would be updated in response to experience. He thanked Dr Brown and colleagues for the work they had done to develop the documentation.

In response to a query about requests that might be lodged under the Freedom of Information legislation, Pro Vice Chancellor Nelson said that they should be directed to Legal Services where they would be processed. The University was discussing with a number of other higher education institutions possible ways in which they could collaborate on the storage of research data in the future. Other options were also under consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to two minor amendments to the policy document:

- section 4.1.2, the word 'effect' should read 'effective' and 're-use' should read 'reuse'; and
- section 4.2.2 the word 'effect' should read 'effective'.

He invited members of Senate to endorse the policy.

Resolved That the Research Data Management Policy be endorsed, subject to the correction of the minor errors, listed above.

Noted The plans to prepare guidance documents in support of the policy in due course.

31 **Membership of Council under Class 3: members appointed by the Senate**

Received A report from the Nominating Committee of Senate on the recent call for nominations, presented by Dr Gobbi, one of the members of the Committee.

[Prior to the discussion of the item, the Vice-Chancellor invited Professor Vickers to leave the room as he was the subject of the recommendation contained in the report.]

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Dr Gobbi was pleased to report that the calibre of the candidate who had put himself forward to serve on the governing body was excellent. However, the Committee wished to underline that, ideally, the selection of a nominee should be made from as wide a range of candidates as possible.

The Committee would convene later in the year when the next call for nominations would be issued.

Resolved That Professor James Vickers be appointed as the member of Senate on Council to fill the casual vacancy, which had arisen after the resignation of Professor Makhoul, in Class 3 to serve from 1 March 2012 until 31 July 2012.

32 **Amendments to Ordinances (Part 4): Students' Union**

The Vice-Chancellor explained that the item had had to be withdrawn because the final version of the paper was not ready for circulation. The matter concerned revisions to Part 4 of the University's Ordinances as a result of the Students' Union applying to become an incorporated company. Senators would be consulted early in March 2012 on the changes that were required before the document was presented to Council at its meeting on 28 March 2012.

33 **Government's higher education policies: discussion paper**

Received A discussion paper on the Government's higher education policies, written and presented by Professor Pope, dated 7 February 2012.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the agenda sheet had incorrectly listed the item as a motion. It was a discussion paper.

Professor Pope expressed the deep concern that was evident in some academic quarters about the Government's higher education policies. She understood the position of the University, as an institution, that taking a stand against Government's policies could make it more difficult for it to participate fully in, and contribute to, the debate on the future of the sector. As an academic, she had observed the effects of policy decisions on the sector, and more widely in society in terms of social mobility, and had started to question whether the University through its Senate should join those institutions which had supported statements against Government policies and, if it chose to do so, when would be the appropriate time to voice dissent.

The members of Senate offered their views:

- If the University took the type of action suggested, what would it accomplish? Would it guarantee higher levels of funding or restructured fee levels?
- Nothing could be achieved if nothing was done. It was a fundamental matter that demanded a response.
- The sector had not been successful in explaining how the changes in funding arrangements would affect students. The new model could be explained much more clearly to prospective students.
- The University had made its views known robustly in its joint response with the Students' Union to the Government's White Paper *Students at the Heart of the System*.
- The Government was introducing policies which the electorate had not voted for. Universities had a role to play in opposing such policies. Senate should vote on whether it should take a stand on the matter.
- The Vice-Chancellor said that he had on many occasions made powerful points in support of the sector, and these were a matter of public record. In his role, he had had to steer a course between retaining the ability to act effectively for the University in lobbying the Government and making public statements which critiqued Government policy. The joint response to the White Paper from the University and the Students' Union had been clear in its criticism that the current policy was incomplete in dealing only with undergraduate education, and inconsistent in its approach to widening participation (through OFFA), and in promoting competition for talented students. He believed that the debate should allow for the views from different forums to be expressed. The most effective approach for the University was persistent lobbying that was more measured in tone and delivered away from the glare of publicity. It was quite appropriate that Senate, as the principal academic body, should discuss its collective view, but it was separate to the University as the institution. In his view, it was probably too late for a statement of support of the type suggested in the paper to have an impact. As the next academic session approached and, looking further ahead, the general election, there would be other opportunities to engage in the discourse.
- Professor Pope emphasized that the paper should not be construed as a personal attack on the Vice-Chancellor who had a record of supporting the sector. She proposed that, together with Professor Vickers, she work on a paper which discussed the issues that arose in respect of the new funding framework, access and diversity. It could be presented to Senate's meeting in June 2012.

Resolved That Professor Pope should present a paper on the new funding framework to the meeting of Senate on 13 June 2012.

34 **University Programme Committee: report from the meeting held on 1 February 2012**

Received A report from the meeting of the University Programme Committee, held on 1 February 2012, presented by the Chair of the Committee, Professor Curry.

Professor Curry drew attention to items 6 and 7 on the review of the Progression Regulations and the revised arrangements for collaborative provision.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Professor Curry and her colleagues who served on the Committee for the work that was undertaken in this important area.

Noted The report of the meeting of the University Programme Committee.

35 **Military Education Committee: report from the meeting held on 12 January 2012**

Received A report from the annual meeting of the Military Education Committee, held on 12 January 2012, presented by Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris.

Noted The report of the meeting of the Military Education Committee.

36 **Hearing and appeals panels members**

Received A report, dated 21 February 2012, from Human Resources on the nominees who had volunteered to be considered to serve on appeal and grievance panels.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Human Resources and Legal Services would provide training sessions on the role of panel members which the individuals concerned would be expected to attend before they could take on the duties involved.

Resolved That the list of the names of the nominees, attached to the report, be approved.

37 **Vice-Chancellor's action(s) as Chair of Senate**

The Vice-Chancellor stated that there were no matters to report.

38 **Date of next meeting**

The Vice-Chancellor reminded members that the focus of the next schedule of meeting would be the Self-Evaluation Document, part of the requirements of the forthcoming Institutional Review. The meeting would be held on 2 May 2012, starting at 2.15 pm.

+++++

CS3/3

J:\Secretariat\Senate\Senate 2011-12\29 February 2012\Senate-minutesfeb2012-unrestricted-unconfirmed.docx