

# Minutes (unrestricted)

---

**Meeting title:** Senate

---

**Date:** Wednesday 24 February 2016

**Time:** 2.15 pm

---

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

---

**Present:** The President and Vice-Chancellor (*in the Chair*), Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor A D Neill, Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor M S Spearing, Dr A D'Amato, Professor J W Anderson, Dr L Armstrong, Ms C Atkins (*Academic Registrar*), Professor Y Baatz, Ms A Baileff, Professor A Barney, Professor G Brambilla, Dr S Brien, Dr H Bui, Dr K Bull, Professor I T Cameron, Professor S Colley, Dr H Cullington, Professor A Curry, Dr A Darlington, Mr I Dunn (*Chief Operating Officer*), Professor R W Eason, Dr T Ezard, Professor J Flynn, Dr N Gibbins, Dr H M Haitchi, Ms N Fazel-Hamedani, Mr B Franklin\*, Dr N Hammond-Browning, Dr A Hickman, Professor J W Holloway, Dr C Holmes, Professor N Hounsell, Professor K Jones, Ms J Kelly, Professor P Lagoudakis, Dr B Lwaleed, Dr J McAleer, Dr B Macarthur, Dr J Madsen, Dr N Maguire, Mr K Mahendiran\*, Dr C Metcalf, Professor R Mills, Mr S Mortimer, Professor M Niranjani, Dr D Nicole, Ms L Onaran, Dr O Parchment, Mr M Parry, Dr V Perisic, Dr J Pilgrim, Dr E Plum, Dr F Poletti, Dr K Poore, Professor C Pope, Mr B Price, Dr J Price, Professor P Reed, Ms L Richard, Mr D Richardson\*, Professor T Roose, Professor A Russell, Dr S Ryall, Ms J Savidge, Dr Y Sekhon, Dr E D'Souza, Dr E Swindle, Ms N Stecker-Doxat, Ms S Verma\*, Professor J A Vickers, Dr J Watson, Dr P White and Mr A Williams

---

**By invitation** Dr K Partington for Item 14; and  
Ms C Harris, Governance Service, attending as an observer

---

**In attendance** Ms C J Gamble

---

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

## Welcome

The President and Vice-Chancellor welcomed Mr Dunn, the Chief Operating Officer, who was attending his first meeting of Senate.

## 26 Obituaries

The President and Vice-Chancellor announced with regret the death of:

Mr Daneishwar Punithavelan, an Engineering Foundation Year student, on 15 January 2016.

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

## 27 Minutes (unrestricted) of meeting held on 11 November 2015

The Senators approved the unrestricted minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2015 for signing by the President and Vice-Chancellor.

## 28 Matters arising

### 28.1 **Change in title, introduction of new Vice-President roles, and associated amendments to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances** (Minute 10)

The President and Vice-Chancellor reported that on 12 February 2016 the University had received confirmation from the Privy Council that it had approved the revisions to the University's Charter and Statutes. Senate's Statement of Primary Responsibilities and Standing Orders would be revised to reflect the changes that had been introduced, and presented to the next meeting of Senate.

### 28.2 **The Prevent Duty and the responsibilities of the University** (Minute 11)

The President and Vice-Chancellor reported that the institution's initial self-assessment against the Prevent Duty requirements had been submitted to Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) in January 2016 and that the University was preparing to submit a full set of the necessary paperwork, which would include a risk register and action plan, on 1 April 2016.

### 28.3 **Revised Code of Practice for Ensuring Freedom of Speech within the Law** (Minute 12)

The President and Vice-Chancellor stated that, following endorsement by Senate in November of the revised Code of Practice for Ensuring Freedom of Speech within the Law, the Code had been approved by Council and was now in force.

### 28.4 **Academic Reward and Recognition: update on appraisal training compliance** (Minute 13)

The President and Vice-Chancellor informed Senators that the report on the training and completion of appraisals for academic staff, Levels 4 to 7, on the Education, Research and Enterprise pathway would be presented at the first ordinary meeting of Senate of the next academic year.

### 28.4 **Selection of Senate Nominating Committee members for 2015/16** (Minute 18)

The President and Vice-Chancellor reminded Senators that the report from the Senate Nominating Committee was a substantive item and would be taken under Agendum 12.

## 29 **The President and Vice-Chancellor's report and summary of University Academic Executive and Senior Management Team/University Executive Board discussions**

**Received** A report, drawn up on behalf of the President and Vice-Chancellor, dated 24 February 2016, on current strategic and operational issues, recent news and events, and international developments, which was presented by the President and Vice-Chancellor.

The President and Vice-Chancellor drew attention to various sections in the report, including:

- Student recruitment for 2016/17: A record number of home/EU undergraduate applications had been received as at 15 February 2016. International undergraduate applications had fallen by 1 per cent. This fall was mirrored in the number of international applications for admission to postgraduate taught programmes. The home/EU taught postgraduate applications had risen by 34 per cent.
- The key elements of the Government's Green Paper entitled, 'Fulfilling our potential: teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice'.
- The recommendations published in the review of Research Councils, led by Sir Paul Nurse.
- The announcements in the Government's Autumn Statement which would affect the higher education sector.
- The President and Vice-Chancellor highlighted two particular items in the list of awards and prizes: Professor Jennings had been made a Companion of the Order of the Bath in the Queen's New Year's Honours List for services to computer science and national security science; and the

ranking of SET<sup>squared</sup> as the world's number one university business incubator in the world by UBI Global.

- The award of an honorary degree which had been conferred on HRH The Duchess of Cornwall for her work supporting osteoporosis patients, and researchers and health professionals who were engaged in the management of the condition. The Duchess of Cornwall had received an honorary doctorate at a special degree ceremony which had been held on the Highfield Campus on 11 February 2016.

Referring to the section on the discussions and decisions of the senior management groups, Professor Pope commented that the monthly summaries, which were made available on the University's intranet, were not up to date. The most recent summary was of the November meeting. The Vice-Chancellor said he would look into the matter.

- Noted**
- (i) The President and Vice-Chancellor's undertaking to arrange for the December and January summaries of the discussions at meetings of the senior executive groups to be made available.
  - (ii) The information contained in the President and Vice-Chancellor's report and the summary of the discussions at meetings of the University Senior Management Team, University Executive Board and the University Academic Executive.

[Post-meeting note: There was an error in the circulated report: in section 39 the title of Professor Jennings was incorrect; it has been amended and re-posted on the SUSSED site.]

### 30 **President of the Students' Union's report**

**Received** A report, prepared by the President, Mr Franklin, and Vice-President (Education), Ms Verma, of the Students' Union, on recent initiatives and activities organized by the Union.

The Vice-President (Education) summarized the sections in the report which were presented under the headings 'Academic Awards', 'Assessment and Feedback' and 'Graduation Ceremonies'. The Excellence in Teaching Awards would be merged with the Academic Representative Awards to highlight the endeavours of staff and students. Three of last year's winners would present their research as part of a mini lecture series. Everyone was welcome to attend the events which would be publicized in the near future.

Turning to the subject of assessment and feedback, Ms Verma reported on the work that the Union had undertaken with Dr Bentley, Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Professor Evans, based in the Southampton Education School. Guidelines for feedback had been drawn up which aimed to standardize the structure of the feedback that was given to students.

Ms Verma drew attention to the work she had initiated on the timing of graduation ceremonies and whether it affected the student experience for postgraduate students who, after completing their studies in October, were invited to a graduation ceremony in July of the following year.

The President highlighted the last two items in the report: the hustings for the annual elections of sabbatical and other Union officers; and the review of the Union's brand. He stated that the Union was interested in the views of the members of staff and to this end had circulated a survey. He invited Senators to forward any comments they might have about the Union and way it fulfilled its role to him at [pres@susu.org](mailto:pres@susu.org).

**Noted** The report from the President and Vice-President (Education) of the Students' Union.

### 31 **Senate question time**

The President and Vice-Chancellor reported that he had received one question which he read out:

'Do you have any view on adopting the internationally understood titles of Associate/Full Professor for all level 6/7 academic staff?'

He reminded Senators that the current academic titles and the Education, Research and Enterprise (ERE) pathways had been introduced following a review which had been part of the Reward and Recognition Project in 2013/14. For entry on to the ERE balanced pathway with career progression opportunities to

the level of Associate Professor and Professor (Levels 6 and 7), academic staff had to have a mixed portfolio of activities, demonstrating that at least 20% of their time was devoted to research and at least 20% to education. Recognizing that academic staff chose to specialize in one of the three areas of Education, Research or Enterprise, separate pathways had been created with a clear progression route to Principal Fellow and Professorial Fellow at Levels 6 and 7, respectively. These titles replaced the former Director of Education and Director of Enterprise titles.

Responding to the point raised about the lack of international recognition of the titles at Level 6 and 7 of those on the specialist pathways, the President and Vice-Chancellor commented that in many countries the only academic route that was recognized was the balanced pathway. However, if staff with the titles Principal Fellow and Professorial Fellow were discovering that when abroad their status was not recognized, further consideration would have to be given to the current arrangements. The President and Vice-Chancellor proposed that, in view of the fact that the titles had only relatively recently been introduced, the matter be kept under review for the time being.

In terms of the promotion process, the President and Vice-Chancellor said that the Academic Promotions Advisory Group had carried out its task rigorously, scrutinizing a large sample of the applications that had been submitted at Faculty level in order to assure itself of the uniformity of the criteria that had been applied across the University.

**Noted** The question and the responses discussed during Senate question time, and the intention to keep the titles of Principal Fellow and Professorial Fellow under review during the next academic session.

## 32 **Open Access Policy**

**Received** A copy of a draft Open Access Policy submitted to Senate for approval, together with a brief covering report dated 18 February 2016, which was presented by the University Librarian.

The University Librarian introduced the document, explaining that the current version of the policy, which had been approved in 2009, had been substantially revised. It had been updated to reflect the open access requirements introduced by higher education funding bodies, linking compliance to eligibility to submit to the next Research Excellence Framework (REF) round. It also took account of other funder requirements and changes in the wider publishing environment, notably the proliferation of publisher options and routes to achieve open access.

The preamble to the policy outlined the University's commitment to making research outputs openly accessible via its institutional repository at the earliest opportunity to maximise the visibility and impact of research, while recognizing that there would be instances when ethical or contractual restrictions would apply. This section was followed by a list of the key principles (p 4) of the policy.

The University Librarian stated that the working group, whose members had included herself, the Associate Director (Research Engagement), and the Senior Solicitor (Legal Services), had consulted with a wide range of groups and individuals across the University – the Library Research Engagement Group, the Research and Enterprise Executive Group, the REF Planning Group, the Chief Information Officer, and the Director of the Doctoral College – before bringing forward the draft policy to Senate.

In response to a question about the steps the University could take to protect itself from the commercial pressures in this area, the University Librarian said that the institution was working with others in the sector to support particular publishers. The President and Vice-Chancellor commented that the Russell Group had approached a number of publishers and the Government about the financial ramifications for higher education institutions and the fact that some disciplines were more affected than others by the position taken by some publishers.

**Resolved** That the Open Access Policy be approved and introduced with immediate effect.

## 33 **Academic Quality and Standards Committee**

### 33.1 **Report of the meeting held on 9 December 2015**

**Received** A report of the meeting of the Committee held on 9 December 2015, together with four appendices: an amendment to the criteria for dual PhD arrangements (Appendix 1); a report of the visit to consider the re-accreditation of the University of Chichester (Appendix 2); a copy of the Postgraduate Taught

Experience Survey results (Appendix 3); and a copy of the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey results (Appendix 4).

Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor Neill introduced the report, drawing attention to:

- The report from the Collaborative Provision Subcommittee (Agendum 10.1, item 2.2) and the recommendation regarding the modification of one of the criteria for dual PhDs which was set out in Appendix 1 to the report. He reminded Senators that the set of criteria had been agreed by Senate in June 2015 and that the amendment proposed would revise the first criterion to include administrative complexity as one of the conditions which, if met along with the others, would allow the University to enter into a dual PhD arrangement. He added that the number of these arrangements, the amount of staff time and effort involved in setting them up, and the potential risks, would be kept under review. He planned to bring a report back to Senate on the subject.
- The report from the External Research Degrees Committee (Agendum 10.1, item 3) and the re-approval of the University of Chichester as an accredited institution. The report of the re-accreditation visit was attached for information (Appendix 2).

**Resolved** (i) That the modification to the first criteria for dual PhD arrangements, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved.

### 33.2 Report of the meeting held on 27 January 2016

**Received** A report containing extracts from the unconfirmed minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 27 January 2016, together with two appendices: a report entitled, 'Initial registration for PhD rather than MPhil (Appendix 1); and a copy of a report entitled, 'Academic Appeals, Student Complaints and Academic Integrity cases, 2014/15' together with a copy of the Annual Letter for 2014 from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (Appendix 2).

Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor Neill presented the proposal to change the current arrangements in respect of MPhil/PhD registration to initial registration of postgraduate research students directly on to a PhD or equivalent doctoral degree programme; it was also proposed that the transfer/upgrade panel would be renamed a 'confirmation panel' (Agendum 10.2, item 4). The timing of the meetings of the panel and the procedures involved would remain unchanged.

Members of Senate were content to approve the changes to the current arrangements, outlined in the report.

**Resolved** (ii) That the proposal that students who enrolled at the University from 1 August 2016 to study for a doctorate be registered directly on to a PhD (or equivalent doctoral degree) programme, and that the name of the transfer/upgrade panel be renamed 'confirmation panel' be approved.

- Noted** (iii) The discussions, and decisions, recorded in the reports from the meetings of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee held on 9 December 2015 and 27 January 2016, in particular the timetable for presenting the amendments to the Higher Degree Regulations and the Code of Practice for Research Candidature and Supervision and the work of the group revising the Programme Regulations and other related, regulatory sections published in the *Calendar*.
- (iv) The undertaking of the Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor Neill to report back to Senate on the subject of dual PhDs when appropriate.

### 34 Doctoral College Board: Report from the Director of the Doctoral College

**Received** A report on the discussions at meetings of the Doctoral College Board which were held on 3 November 2015 and 10 February 2016, presented by Professor Vickers, the Director of the Doctoral College.

Professor Vickers presented a number of items in the report:

*Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (Item 1)*

One of the key results from the survey indicated that the University did not do as well as other Russell Group universities in providing opportunities to postgraduate research students to become involved in the wider research environment and culture beyond their subject area. Work was under way to encourage the University Strategic Research Groups to involve postgraduate research students more actively in their interdisciplinary areas. With the establishment of the Doctoral College, it was anticipated that over time there would be improvements across the board for postgraduate research students. The Board had requested an action plan which would be focussed on the broader research culture, development opportunities, in particular placements, and career advice.

In response to a query about the comparison of the University's results in the PRES with those of the average results for Russell Group institutions, the President and Vice-Chancellor suggested that any questions should be taken up directly with Professor Vickers outside the meeting.

*Supervisory loading policy (Item 5)*

The Board had agreed that a supervisory policy should be developed for introduction across the University. The Postgraduate Research Quality Monitoring and Enhancement Subcommittee would lead on the drafting of the policy.

*Parental leave policy (Item 6)*

There was no University-wide parental leave provision. The Board was looking at the financial implications of extending this benefit to all doctoral students, regardless of the type of funding they received. Information received to date from the Research Councils suggested that offering parental leave would increase costs by approximately 5 per cent.

In discussion, it was agreed that there should be one policy, applied consistently across the Faculties. The Doctoral College would take into account the legal requirements on the University, what was fair and what was good practice, and consider the affordability of such a policy. Senators endorsed the work in this area that Professor Vickers had outlined and the proposal to bring forward a Parental Leave Policy. A policy for postgraduate research students who became carers during their studies should also be considered.

*PGR leave entitlement and paid work (Item 8)*

Professor Vickers drew attention to the discussion on leave entitlement: there was a maximum number of hours that Tier 4 PGR students could work in addition to studying during term time, and that any periods in excess of that would have to be taken as leave. Any breaches of this requirement would jeopardize their right to remain in the UK and the University's Tier 4 sponsor licence and highly trusted status.

*Employment of PGRs (Item 15)*

Professor Vickers underlined that the discussions on the matter of employment of PGRs at Board meetings had focused on issues of transparency and equality in respect of employment contracts and remuneration across the University. Members of Senate endorsed his proposal to develop policy guidelines in this area. Professor Vickers stated that his first step would be to arrange for a discussion paper to be drafted for Senate to consider before starting the work on policy formulation.

- Noted**
- (i) The undertaking of the Director of the Doctoral College that the Board, in due course, would bring forward a Parental Leave Policy, consider policy proposals for postgraduate research students who became carers during their studies, and a discussion paper on the employment of postgraduate research students.
  - (ii) The contents of the report from the Doctoral College Board, presented by Professor Vickers.

35 **Senate Nominating Committee: recommendations**

- Received** A report from the Senate Nominating Committee, established for the 2015/16 academic year, setting out its recommendations for the appointment of two Senators to join the University's governing body, the Council, and a summary of its discussions, dated 15 February 2016.

(Before the report was presented by the Chair of the Committee, Dr Armstrong, Professors Niranjana and Reed were invited to leave the room.)

Dr Armstrong summarized the points that the Committee had discussed during its consideration of the applications from Senators to sit on the governing body. She emphasized that all the individuals who had put themselves forward were excellent candidates, making the selection process extremely difficult. She was pleased to report that this year the number of applications had increased and that equal numbers of men and women had decided to apply. The Committee wished to recommend that Professor Niranjana and Professor Reed be appointed because of their particular backgrounds and strengths which would complement the range of experience brought to Council by the current Senate members.

Senate approved by acclamation the Nominating Committee's recommendations.

The President and Vice-Chancellor thanked all the Senators who had put themselves forward and the members of the Nominating Committee for their work.

**Resolved** That the Committee's recommendation that Professor Niranjana be appointed to serve on Council until 31 July 2017, and that Professor Reed be appointed to serve on Council until 31 July 2018 be approved, and that they would take up their seats on Council immediately.

**Noted** The points raised in the report would be drawn to the attention of the Nominating Committee which would be established at the start of the 2016/17 academic year, in particular the ones about equality and diversity and improving the application process by including with the information pack a summary of the role of Senators on Council which should be circulated when the invitation to apply was sent out.

## 36 **Student discipline: Annual Report**

**Received** The Annual Report on student discipline for the academic year 2014/15, dated February 2016, prepared on behalf of the Committee of Student Discipline, and presented by Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor Spearing and Dr Partington, Assistant Director, Student Services.

Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor Spearing presented the main points in the executive summary. The total number of disciplinary cases, particularly serious disciplinary cases, remained relatively small: the total number of cases dealt with under the University's Discipline Regulations at Faculty level and centrally was 42.

The number of incidents of possession, use, sale or trafficking of illegal drugs – predominantly cannabis - or controlled substances in the Halls of Residence had increased significantly between 2013/14 and 2014/15. The University's policy was one of zero tolerance; this policy also applied to so-called legal highs. The University always reported cases to the Police. However, the Police's response to such cases had changed over the years, possibly reflecting society's increasingly liberal attitude to drug use, and they did not attend every incident when it was reported. Student Services was working with the Students' Union on a campaign to inform students about the dangers of drug use and the avenues of support that were available.

Replying to a question about possible reasons for the increase in the number of breaches of University policies, such as health and safety matters, Dr Partington confirmed that this was a result of more effective reporting.

In discussion, a number of comments were offered, including:

- What were the University and the Students' Union doing collaboratively to educate students about the risks of drug taking, including taking legal highs?
- Concern was expressed about the number of cases of sexual assault listed in the section of criminal offences, which was especially concerning when research evidence suggested that this was a type of offence that was under-reported. What efforts were made to publicize to students what was deemed to be unacceptable behaviour?

It was agreed that, in order to provide a full picture to Senate of the services and support that were available to students who were either the victims of crime or who had committed an offence, a report outlining what was in place across the University would be presented to Senate's next meeting. It would include the detail of the arrangements introduced during Freshers' Week and the information that was circulated to members of the academic staff in pastoral roles. Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor Neill suggested that additional information should be made available to staff in the Personal Academic Tutors' Handbook and he undertook to organize this.

- Resolved**
- (i) That Dr Partington should arrange for a briefing on support provided for students to be presented to Senate at its next meeting.
  - (ii) That Pro Vice-Chancellor Professor Neill should arrange for additional information on the support available to students to be included in the Personal Academic Tutors' Handbook which was an online resource.

**Noted** The content of the Annual Report from the Committee of Student Discipline.

37 **The President and Vice-Chancellor's actions as Chair of Senate**

**Received** A report, compiled on behalf of the President and Vice-Chancellor, which listed the actions taken by him, acting as the Chair of Senate, since Senate's meeting on 11 November 2015.

**Noted** The Chair's action taken on behalf of Senate to approve a minor amendment to the membership of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee, and to approve two new Senate members on the Academic Promotions Advisory Group.

38 **Pictures in the Senate Room**

Professor Pope commented that there were still no pictures hung in the Senate Room of women members of either academia or the University. The matter had been raised in previous years. The President and Vice-Chancellor stated that he was arranging to address this matter and the first step he planned to take was to commission a portrait of the University's Chancellor, Dame Helen Alexander, which would be displayed in the Senate Room.

39 **Review of Senate**

The President and Vice-Chancellor raised the matter of carrying out a review of Senate's role. It was a subject that had last been discussed at the time of the restructuring of the University in 2010/11 when, amongst other things, changes had been made to the composition of Senate. The intention had been to conduct a review during the 2012/13 academic year, but this had not been undertaken.

The President and Vice-Chancellor wished to strengthen Senate's focus on academic matters and to increase the opportunities for Senators to become more involved in the debates and discussions. He proposed setting up a group to consider the role, membership and effectiveness of the University's principal academic body. The group would include a number of current Senators (staff and student members), a Senate member from another higher education institution and a lay member of the University's Council.

Members of Senate endorsed the proposal.

The President and Vice-Chancellor stated that the preparations would be made in due course to get the review under way and that Senate would be kept informed.

40 **Date of next meeting**

The President and Vice-Chancellor confirmed that Senate was scheduled to meet next on 22 June 2016.

+++++

Ref CS3/3