

# Minutes (unrestricted)

---

**Meeting title:** Senate

---

**Date:** Wednesday, 24 November 2010

**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 Fitt, Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris, Pro Vice-Chancellor Nelson, Registrar and Chief Operating Officer, Dr S Alam, Dr J W Anderson, Professor R J Astley, Professor P Atkinson, Dr A Barney, Dr S Beers, Dr R Bentley, Dr S Bleeck, Professor S Brailsford, Dr W S Brocklesby, Dr M L Brown, Dr S Colley, Mr P Cook, Professor A Curry, Professor N Donnelly, Professor J C Falkingham, Mr B Fitzjohn\*, Professor K Fox, Professor J G Frey, Dr I G Giles, Dr A M Gravell, Professor Dame Wendy Hall, Dr P Hancock, Professor B Harris, Dr N Harvey, Professor S Hawkins, Professor M Hill, Dr C W Jackson, Mrs R Jowett, Professor M Kaczmarek, Mr S Ling\*, Dr F Lorenzon, Dr M Karatas-Ozkan, Professor N Lee, Professor J Lumby, Dr T Maccarone, Dr J Maclean, Mr J McLoughlin\*, Professor N J Madise, Professor T A Minshull, Dr A D Neill, Dr D Nicole, Professor M Nind, Dr K Oliver, Dr J Parker, Professor J Petts, Mr J Preston, Dr J S Prichard, Professor A Russell, Professor H Rutt, Professor V Sassone, Dr C Smith, Professor G Smith, Dr P Smith, , Professor P W F Smith, Professor M Spearing, Dr V Spencer, Mr R Stanning\*, Mr R Stansbridge\*, Dr L Stras, Dr K Takeda, Dr A Tavassoli, Ms C M Telfer, Professor J A Vickers, Dr C Voll, Dr T Waters, Mr S Watson\*, Dr P Whittaker, Mr E Zaluska and Dr A Zervos

---

**By invitation** Dr A J Strike (University Secretary)

---

**In attendance** Ms C J Gamble (secretary)

---

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

## Welcome

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed everyone to the meeting, in particular the new members of Senate who were attending their first meeting.

## Obituaries

The Vice-Chancellor notified Senate of the obituaries that had been received since the June meeting, and invited members to stand for a minute's silence in respect:

Mr Michael Benham, Domestic Assistant, Estates and Facilities: 9 November 2010;  
Mr Geoffrey Gravelsons, second-year undergraduate, BA History: 28 July 2010;  
Mr John Taylor, part-time postgraduate, MSc Advanced Clinical Practice: last week of October 2010;  
Mr Philip Vernon, part-time postgraduate, MRes History: 28 October 2010; and  
Professor Gerrit Betlem, Faculty of Business and Law.

## Senate agenda and starring system

Commenting on the agenda for the meeting, the Vice-Chancellor stated that he wished to devote more of Senate's time to discussing strategic matters. He drew attention to the anticipated report to Council from a working group set up to consider the governing body's effectiveness. Some of the recommendations were likely to focus on procedural matters which would include the structure of the agenda and the use of the starring

system. There was also a likelihood that proposals would be brought forward in respect of the size of Council and its constituent classes. This would affect the number of Senate appointees on the governing body. The Vice-Chancellor would keep Senate informed of the developments in this area.

## 1 Standing Orders of Senate

**Received** A copy of the Standing Orders of Senate for the academic session 2010/11, together with a list of proposed revisions which were explained in a covering note, dated 17 November 2010, from the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer.

[Note: The heading of Standing Order 19 did not need to be corrected, and would remain as *Rescission of previous Senate resolution.*]

**Resolved** That the Standing Orders, as presented and with the correction of any typographical errors, be approved.

## 2 Minutes

The members approved the minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2010 for signing by the Vice-Chancellor.

## 3 Matters arising

### 3.1 Changes to the Charter and Statutes, and Ordinances (Minute 42.2)

The Vice-Chancellor announced that the Privy Council had informed the University on 21 July 2010 that it had granted the changes to the Charter and Statutes of the institution.

### 3.2 Ordinances: changes to be introduced (Minute 45.1)

The Vice-Chancellor reported that Council, at its meeting on 8 July 2010, had approved the changes to the Ordinances which were later revised after the University had received Privy Council approval in July for the changes to the Charter and Statutes.

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

**Received** The Vice-Chancellor's report, together with a list of decisions taken by UEG since the meeting of Senate in June 2010, which would be appended to the Minutes.

[Inadvertently, the UEG decision log had not been posted on the SUSSED group site before the meeting. The Vice-Chancellor read out the decisions listed. The paper would be circulated after the meeting of Senate.]

The Vice-Chancellor reported that he had received a suggestion that his regular report to Senate take the form of a question time. He considered this to be a good idea and, for it to be as informative as possible, questions could be submitted a week or so in advance of meetings to allow time for detailed answers to be drawn up which could either be included in his report or reported orally at the meeting, serving as a prompt for discussion. There were, of course, other channels through which members of Senate could engage directly with the Vice-Chancellor, for example, the website and e-mail, and at the open meetings which were held regularly. He sought Senators' views on the introduction of a question and answer session.

There was support from the members for the suggestion of a question/discussion session. The Vice-Chancellor said he would arrange for a note to be circulated on how best to introduce such arrangements in terms of when questions should be submitted and the subjects to be discussed.

The Vice-Chancellor highlighted the following items in his report:

### *Registrar and Chief Operating Officer*

Senators joined the Vice-Chancellor in congratulating the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer on his appointment to Royal Holloway, University of London. He would take up the post as Registrar and Director of Operations from 1 January 2010. Interim arrangements had been drawn up which would be put in place on Mr Higman's departure. Regarding Senate, the University Secretary would act as its

secretary during the *interregnum*. The Vice-Chancellor thanked the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer for his leadership during his three years in office.

#### *New Intake*

The Vice-Chancellor reported that the University had met its recruitment targets for 2010/11 comfortably and, furthermore, had managed to secure an increase in the average A-level score of students. He wished to thank everyone involved in the recruitment of students for this achievement in challenging times and he invited members of Senate to pass on his sentiments to their colleagues.

**Noted** The Vice-Chancellor's report and UEG's decisions, and his intention to introduce a question and answer session as part of Senate's agenda for each meeting.

### 5 **Higher education reform: presentation from the Vice-Chancellor**

[A copy of the presentation is available on the SUSSED group site for members of Senate.]

The Vice-Chancellor said that, rather than give a presentation on the subject of higher education reform, he preferred to outline the main points and encourage discussion with Senators about the changes that were imminent. He reported that the progressive withdrawal of Government funding for higher education seemed set to continue and that universities would need to adapt to the 'market' conditions. Under the Government's current proposals £2.9b in funding to support teaching costs would be removed from the higher education budget. Universities would then be allowed to charge higher annual tuition fees, up to £9k to compensate for the reduction in funding. Students would be eligible for government loans to meet the cost of tuition fees. The Vice-Chancellor emphasized that the planned cuts were of the same magnitude in all disciplines, although the University would continue to receive some supplementary funding from HEFCE in recognition of the higher teaching costs of STEM subjects. He also indicated that capital funding for universities would be reduced, along with support provided by some other HEFCE schemes. Under the proposals, universities would be expected to make a substantial contribution to widening participation and access if they wished to set fees above the £6k minimum level. It was likely that the Government would limit the overall student numbers in order to restrict the cost of maintenance grants.

The institution would have to decide how it would react to the reforms recently proposed and what position it should adopt, as a comprehensive, international research University. The first round of cuts was scheduled for the 2012 academic year. It had been made clear by the Government that, if the funding arrangements were not reformed, the alternative would be to reduce radically the number of students. It was also apparent that the consequences of creating a market had not been modelled by the Government in the longer term. The University would be operating in an untested market.

The Vice-Chancellor invited Senators to consider how the University should respond to these proposals, and, if implemented, how it would operate successfully in the new environment, and what it should offer students paying considerably higher fees.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- The Vice-Chancellor was able to clarify that the proposals under consideration only related to home/EU undergraduate students, and thus the scale of cuts, and proposed changes to tuition fees, were calculated on this basis.
- The Russell Group had campaigned vigorously against cuts to higher education funding on behalf of its members and the sector, and had contested, along with other mission groups, the proposals that had been presented in the Browne Review. The Vice-Chancellor explained the steps he had taken to influence the Browne Review and the subsequent political debate. This had included meetings with Ministers and Liberal-Democrat back-benchers.
- Concern was expressed about the effect of tuition fee rises on widening participation in higher education. Of great concern to the University would be the provision of bursaries, scholarships and other forms of student support that would allow the institution to follow a 'needs blind' admissions policy. The aim was to strengthen the University's current provision to ensure that, in the light of changes expected within the next 18 months, those who required financial help would receive support and would not be deterred from studying. The changes to the funding model had been so swift, institutions, prospective students and their families had little time to prepare.

- At this stage it was not clear how the admissions targets would be affected. Data was available on the total number of applications across all the programmes of study on offer, together with the 'A' scores of each successful applicant who had registered on a particular course. This information had been analyzed to discover the level of demand for individual programmes of study.
- It was not clear at this stage how the proposals would affect the Bologna Process, one of the aims of which was to remove obstacles to student mobility across Europe. Relatively little consideration had been given to the impact of the Government's proposals on the demand for postgraduate programmes. One of the Research Councils had indicated that it was considering withdrawing funding for doctoral students, offered as part of some response-mode grants. All of these factors would affect the composition of the student body.
- A question was posed about the level of investment the University would have to consider in order to make its offer more attractive. The Vice-Chancellor reported that, on the basis of preliminary calculations, the University would need to charge approximately £8k to replace what the Government planned to withdraw. For the University to be able to channel additional resources into a range of services that would improve student support and access provision, it would have to consider setting a higher fee. This would include enhanced provision for students with disabilities.

Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor Wheeler reminded members that the University needed to maintain its investment in capital projects that were expensive and took time to complete.

- Inevitably with a rise in tuition fees, students would start to expect much more from all aspects of University life, from studying to sport and recreation, and it was likely that they would want to know how their fees were being spent to support their education. Professor Russell highlighted how institutions in the USA informed those who were interested in the cost of tertiary education, for example, the University of Michigan's website<sup>1</sup> explained in detail what proportion of every dollar was spent on running the University and providing the academic and support facilities, and what was made available to help students financially. It might serve as an example of how Southampton could publicize the cost of its degree programmes.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Senators for their views and comments and asked that they pass on to him any further thoughts, ideas and advice on the next challenging phase in higher education. The debate would continue at the meeting of Council on 2 December 2010.

## 6 Senate membership

### 6.1 Current membership

**Received** A copy of the current membership of Senate, updated for the 2010/11 session.

The Vice-Chancellor pointed out that there were a number of errors in the titles that had been listed. These would be amended. He invited members to let the Secretariat know if there were other corrections required.

**Noted** The current membership list which would be corrected by the Secretariat, where necessary, as soon as possible, and posted on the Senate group site for information.

### 6.2 Further proposals for Senate membership in line with the new University structure

**Received** A report from the University Secretary, dated 11 November 2010, which developed the paper presented to Senate in June 2010 on proposals to revise the membership of Senate, and the election of its members, in line with the new organizational framework (Ordinances 2.12.4 and 2.12.6).

The University Secretary reminded Senators that the proposed revisions to Senate membership and its elections were set out in Annex 2 to Agendum 8.1 where the other changes to the Ordinances were explained.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.vpcomm.umich.edu/budget/fundingsnapshot/index.html>

In considering the report, a number of questions were raised about the proposal under point 3.2 which discussed the future election of academic staff under Ordinance 2.12.6, paragraph 3, which determined the membership of Senate under paragraph g. of Ordinance 2.12.4:

- It had not been clear to some members at the last meeting that the intention was to include the Heads of academic units in category g. membership (Representatives of the Academic Staff from each School and academic unit) and to remove category d. (The Heads of the Schools and academic units), part of the *ex-officio* membership, at the end of the end of the current session. If introduced, it would create difficulties in some Faculties because the number of Heads exceeded the number of the proposed places allocated which was limited to ten in total, divided between academic staff at levels 4/5, and those on level 6 and above. Having the possibility of including these senior members of staff on Senate was desirable because it was the body that discussed key academic matters. The proposal, as it stood, would also affect the level of representation across the University because some of the Faculties had larger groupings of academic staff. It was believed that this would also restrict the extent of the breadth of views that could be presented because some Faculties brought together a greater number of academic disciplines than others.
- The University Secretary reiterated that the proposal, discussed at the previous meeting of Senate, had not been based on the principle of proportionality. To include Heads of academic units *ex officio* would tip Senate towards being an appointed rather than an elected body. Furthermore, the view expressed in the report was that membership should be divided equally in category g. between the senior and more junior members of academic staff which was considered to be the most democratic approach.
- It was observed that limiting the number to ten would place a greater responsibility on those members to seek the views of their colleagues in the Faculty, convey them to Senate, and to communicate directly the discussions held at meetings and the decisions taken.
- The suggested number was considered by some to be too small given that it was proposed that the Heads of academic units would cease to be *ex-officio* members and thought should be given to increasing it to 12.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that alternatives to the number of representatives under category g. membership should be offered, and invited members to indicate their support for one of the following:

- i) The current proposal: ten representatives per Faculty in total.
- ii) To amend the current proposal to list 12 representatives per Faculty.
- iii) To amend the current proposal to give larger Faculties a greater number of representatives, for example 13, and smaller Faculties fewer, eight, for example.

Senators indicated by a show of hands that they preferred options ii) and iii) to the first option (ten representatives). The Vice-Chancellor moved to eliminate the current proposal and invited Senate to vote for one of the remaining options. The Vice-Chancellor stated that the University Secretary would report back to Senate on the classification of Faculties into 'large' or 'small' based on the number of full-time equivalent academic staff for the purposes of establishing the number of representatives in category g. membership, and on the number of representatives. Senate voted for option iii), again on a show of hands.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the recommendations contained in section 4 (1) (i) to (ix) of the report from the University Secretary be endorsed, with the exception of recommendation (vii) concerning Ordinance 2.12.6, paragraph 3 which would be revised to state that representation by Faculty would depend on its size, with a larger number of representatives for the bigger Faculties, on the basis of the discussions set out above; and presented to Council at its meeting on 2 December 2010 for approval with effect from 1 August 2011.
  - (ii) That the statement in section 4 (2) of the report be endorsed that notwithstanding the proposed amendment to Ordinance 2.12.6, paragraph 3, the current membership of Senate under category g. remain unchanged until 31 July 2011.

- (iii) That the proposal that the Director of the National Oceanography Centre, Southampton be invited to attend meetings of Senate as an observer after formal membership ceased, as proposed in section 4 (1) (iii) above, be endorsed.
- (iv) That the University Secretary report to Senate the outcome of the classification of Faculties for the purposes of establishing the number of representatives in category g. membership.

**7 Arrangements for identifying members of Senate to be appointed to Council**

**Received** A briefing note from the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer on the position regarding the vacancies on Council in Class 3 (Members appointed by the Senate).

**Noted** The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer’s decision not to seek nominations to the vacancies under Class 3 membership until the future composition of Council was established following Council’s consideration of the recommendations which would be brought forward in December 2010 by the working group set up to look at the effectiveness of the governing body.

**8 Governance**

**8.1 Proposed amendments to Statutes and Ordinances excluding Part 3**

**Received** A report, dated November 2010, from the University Secretary on the minor amendments to the Statutes and Ordinances which were brought forward as a consequence of agreeing additional academic titles which could be awarded or other changes relating to student representatives on University committees or as part of the restructuring of the institution.

The University Secretary summarized the amendments that were set out in the report: two modifications to the Statutes were presented which would require two formal readings at Council after Senate’s approval; and a series of revisions to the current Ordinances which were necessary to reflect various changes that had been made, including the definition of the professorial staff for the purposes of appointing members of the senior executive. (The revisions to the membership of Senate and its elections were discussed in Agendum 6.2 and those to Part 3 of the Ordinances in Agendum 8.2.)

Senators were content to endorse the recommendations set out under section 3 (i) and (ii) of the report. The recommendations would be presented to Council on 2 December 2010.

- Resolved**
- (i) That the revisions to Statutes 3.2 and 4.6, the detail of which was set out in section 2.1 of the report, be endorsed and presented to Council for a formal first reading on 2 December 2010.
  - (ii) That the changes to the following Ordinances, set out in detail in section 2.2 of the report, be endorsed and presented to Council at its meeting on 2 December 2010, covering:  
1.1.1; 1.6.1; 1.6.3; 1.7.1; 1.7.3; 1.8.1; 1.8.5; 1.9.1; 1.10.2; 2.11.3; 2.12.3; 2.12.7 paragraphs 1f. and 1i.; 2.12.9 paragraph 3; Part 6 title; 7.3.5; and 7.6.1.

**8.2 Proposed amendments to Part 3 of the Ordinances**

**Received** A report from the University Secretary which summarized a series of changes to Part 3 of the Ordinances ‘Dismissal, Discipline, Grievance Procedures and Related Matters pursuant to Statute 7.

The University Secretary drew attention to introduction of the report which explained the reasons for the changes: the need to renumber the references in Part 3 to the former Statute Section 31 which had been renumbered Statute 7 as a result of revisions introduced as part of ‘deregulation’; and organizational and legislative changes.

It was queried whether in Sections 3.3 and 3.4, and elsewhere if necessary, it would be possible to adopt a single term to define an academic unit rather than using several different descriptions. The University Secretary explained that the drafting revisions had been made as permissible as possible to accommodate the changes that were being made during the year to the academic structures. This would obviate the need to return to Senate and Council with further revisions to this part of the Ordinances should it emerge that Faculties wished to adopt different or a variety of titles.

**Resolved** That the revisions to Part 3 of the Ordinances, listed in detail in sections 1 to 11 of the report, be endorsed, and presented to Council on 2 December 2010 for approval.

### 8.3 **Governance: Primary responsibilities, delegated powers and decision-making**

**Received** A report from the University Secretary entitled 'University governance: primary responsibilities, delegated powers and decision making', dated 18 November 2010, together with appendices which included the Statements of Primary Responsibilities of Council and Senate, and proposed committees and advisory groups in the new structure with suggested terms of reference.

(Note: In Attachment 6 - Draft description of the work of the advisory groups - the reference to the 'Research Advisory Group' (p2) should read 'Research and Enterprise Advisory Group'.)

The University Secretary presented the report which developed the principles for a revised committee structure, discussed at Senate's meeting in June 2010, and described the consultation process that had taken place across the University. The feedback he had received had been valuable; the points made had been summarized in the report, and a number of them had been incorporated in the documents before Senate. He drew attention to one area where revisions had been made: the approval of taught and research programmes of study. The terms of reference for the Committees of Council and Senate (Attachment 5, p8) had been amended to include one rather than two programme committees at University level, and the responsibility for approving programmes would be carried by the Faculty programme committees rather than the University committee. Each Faculty would be able to decide whether it wished to have one programme committee for both taught and research programmes or two separate ones.

Regarding the timing of the introduction of the proposals, the University Secretary stated that, although it had been planned to introduce the new arrangements from 1 January 2011, after approval by Senate and Council, it had been decided that the existing QA/QE cycle should not be disrupted and the current Academic and Quality Standards Committee should continue its work into the second semester alongside the new framework.

He wished to thank all those who had been involved in the consultation.

In discussion, a number of points were raised, including the following:

- It was queried whether the decision logs the Advisory Groups would be expected to keep (covering report, p3, second bullet point) would be publicized or made available. Appropriate reporting mechanisms were necessary whatever the framework of decision-making to enable the institution to record not only the decisions taken but the reasons behind whatever course of action was followed. In response, the University Secretary underlined that the transparency of the decision-making process and the communication of decisions taken were vital components of the new framework. The meetings of committees would continue to be formally minuted. UEG's decisions were currently brought to Senate and Council in the form a decision log, and it was planned that the Chairs of the Advisory Groups would report at UEG so that decisions could be added to the decision log. Guidelines would be drawn up to this end. It was planned to publicize UEG's decisions on SUSSED, with the exception of restricted or confidential matters.
- Faculty Boards had previously acted as a forum where Deans could consult with members of the academic and support staff. They did not appear in the current structure; through what mechanisms would a dialogue with staff take place? The University Secretary said that although Faculty Boards were not vested with formal powers, the Faculties had powers (Ordinance 2.10) which should be exercised through

the Dean or boards, committees or advisory group as were required for the effective conduct of business. Some members of Senate pointed out that there appeared to be insufficient consideration of the nature of the academy where ideas, thoughts and views were sought from all levels of staff.

The University Secretary commented that the informal networks that existed for seeking views and consulting with staff, although not shown on the diagram (Attachment 3), would continue. The documents sought to describe the powers of the governing body and the Senate and how those powers were distributed across a committee structure, supported by Advisory Groups to the Pro Vice-Chancellors. With regard to the Faculties, the Deans would be expected to consult with members of staff on the delivery of the agreed Faculty Plans.

The Vice-Chancellor highlighted the change to the composition of UEG whereby the Deans formed the majority of members. This would serve to strengthen the voice of the academy at this central level where decisions would be reported across the University community, except in respect of those areas already mentioned in the discussion. The framework could have been drawn up in any number of ways, but he believed that the proposals were robust and would serve the University well. The nature of universities was complex and involved and the need to have a system for the distribution of formal powers and decision-making could not capture that.

- Regarding the membership of the Advisory Group on International matters, it was queried whether student representatives should be included in the list, for example, the Vice-President (Academic Affairs) and one other. Pro Vice-Chancellor Fitt agreed that the list should be revised in this way.
- In response to a hypothetical question about individuals with responsibility for particular portfolios choosing to ignore a consensus of views within their advisory groups, the University Secretary stated that the upward reporting line ultimately to Senate and Council would ensure that individuals would be held accountable for the decisions they made.
- On the subject of the Statement of Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters, a Senator questioned what Senate's role was in deciding on academic ventures overseas. The Vice-Chancellor clarified that matters which concerned investments and capital expenditure fell to the Council while matters of academic quality and assurance were important issues for Senate to debate. Regarding the example given, the University Council would want to assure itself that the business model was good and did not draw on other resources, and that the plans extended or enhanced the reputation of the institution. The arrangements for the delivery of programmes overseas, and their quality assurance, would come to Senate through the routes set up for programme approval of courses offered at the home institution.

The Vice-Chancellor invited Senate to endorse the proposed governance and committee structure as set out in the documents, subject to the amendments agreed, including the decision to move to one combined Programme Committee at University level, all of which would be presented to Council at its meeting on 2 December 2010 for approval.

**Resolved** That the documentation presented to Senate be endorsed and presented to Council, subject to the following amendments:

- The Research Advisory Group be named the Research and Enterprise Advisory Group (Attachment 6, p2);
- The membership of the Advisory Group on International matters include two students representatives, one of whom should be the Vice-President (Academic Affairs) (Attachment 6, p4); and
- The Statement of the Senate's Primary Responsibilities and delegated and related matters (Attachment 2), section 3.1.3, be revised in line with the decision to have one Programme Committee at University level while Faculties may operate one or two Programme Committee at their discretion.



9 **Amendments to regulations governing academic appeals and regulations governing student complaints: Inclusion of additional authorized officers to sign 'Completion of Procedures' (COP) letters**

**Received** A paper from the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Unit (LATEU), setting out a recommendation that the current University Regulations in respect of student complaints and academic appeals be amended to allow a number of senior officers, in addition to the Vice-Chancellor, to act as authorized signatories of the Completion of Procedures Letter.

Dr Giles, the Director of LATEU, reported that, incorporated in the regulations, would be a proviso stating that it was not advisable that an individual who had been involved in an appeal or complaint would also act as an authorized signatory.

**Resolved** That the Director of LATEU arrange to add the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, the Registrar and Chief Operating Officer and the Director of Corporate Services to the list of authorized signatories of the Completion of Procedures Letter, and arrange for the changes to be made to Section IV of the *Calendar* 'General Regulations': Regulations Governing Academic Appeals by Students (4.5 and 5.21); and Regulations Governing Student Complaints (26 e), together with the proviso referred to above; all of which be introduced with immediate effect.

10 **Report on academic structures: progress with strategy**

The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor summarized the developments under way to introduce the new academic structures. The new Deans were all in post, with the exception of Professor Howells who would join the University early in the New Year. They were working with their academic colleagues on the key priorities for the Faculties which included their individual contribution to the University's Vision and Strategy. His schedule of regular meetings with the Deans had commenced. Workshops had been held with the Associate Deans where ideas and views had been exchanged about the new set-up and the Faculty Plans which would be submitted to the University Executive Group in mid-December 2010. The three-year rolling plans, and the implications for the resources at the University's disposal, would be discussed again at the beginning of January. The detail of the academic structures in place in the Faculties should be agreed by the end of the calendar year. The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor said that a further report to Senate on the matter would be presented at its meeting on 2 March 2011.

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

11 **Academic Reward and Recognition project: update**

**Received** A report entitled 'Academic reward and recognition', prepared by the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, dated 17 November 2010.

The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor outlined the scope of the project that would assess how the University could improve its approach to rewarding and supporting high academic performance, and creating flexibility within the structure for academic staff to show excellence in teaching and research. The steering group, which he chaired, comprised Professors Curry, Hall and Petts and the Acting Director of Human Resources. He expected that a series of proposals would be put forward for consultation with staff in 2011, with a view to introducing them at the start of the next academic session.

**Noted** The scope and timetable of the Academic Reward and Recognition project.

12 **iSolutions issues**

**Received** A report entitled 'Filestore: problems experienced and actions affecting the University, compiled by Dr Hancock, the Director of iSolutions, in response to a query from a member of Senate about the recent difficulties with filestore.

[Note: The item had inadvertently been wrongly numbered. It was Agendum 12, not 13.]

The Vice-Chancellor invited Dr Parker to explain the item he had raised. Dr Parker said that, as a result of the problems since the beginning of the semester, he was querying whether the problems were solvable or whether the University should think about major changes to its IT provisioning and strategy. He was not questioning the professionalism of iSolutions staff, or their response to the problem.

Dr Hancock highlighted the point in his report which explained the problems that had been encountered from the beginning of the semester, and the steps that were being taken to rectify matters and what iSolutions would do to improve its performance. A full major incident review would be carried out when the services were stable, and further recommendations would emerge from that exercise which would be made available to the University. The architecture of the current system needed to be reviewed. A consultant had been contracted to carry out the work.

The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor reminded members that under the previously devolved IT strategy the level of investment in the IT infrastructure had been inadequate. It now required considerable capital investment because the Data Centre, and the network, were reaching the end of their operational lives.

The Vice-Chancellor emphasized the importance of finding ways of being responsive locally in the face of difficulties experienced with a service that was delivered centrally; this applied to all the Professional Services. A substantial investment in IT over the coming years was required, and the commitment to do this was part of the capital programme being drawn up for the next five years.

**Noted** The report from the Director of iSolutions.

13 **Education Committee: report from the meeting held on 13 October 2010**

**Received** A report from the meeting of the Education Committee which was presented by Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris.

[Note: The paper had been wrongly numbered 15.]

Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris summarized the matters that the Committee had considered, drawing attention to the item on quality assurance and quality enhancement arrangements during 2010/11, the work on a draft Student Charter, the successful 'Learn with US' programme, and the review of postgraduate taught provision which had been conducted by Professors Moon and Ward. Further work would be required in this area which would be reported during the year.

A number of points were raised about the review, in particular:

- Whatever the Government finally agreed in respect of higher education funding, based on the recommendations of the Browne Review and the Comprehensive Spending Review, it was likely that postgraduate education would be affected. Students who emerged with considerable debt after completing a first degree might be less inclined to undertake master's level study.

Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris acknowledged that the changes to the sector's funding and their impact on postgraduate provision would have to be closely watched, along with the development of the competition in the sector, and the costs involved in delivering any programme of study, whether taught or research. From 2011/12 the University would charge £4,500 *per annum* for taught postgraduate programmes, a similar level of fee to that of its comparators.

- Professor Lumby commented that the increase was a considerable uplift, and asked that consideration be given to the effect this would have on continuing students, and whether bursaries might be made available. Some might not be in a position to complete their studies. Pro Vice-Chancellor Humphris confirmed that she would clarify whether this fee increase would apply to all students or only those starting postgraduate study in 2011/12.

**Resolved** That the recommendations in respect of the postgraduate review be endorsed.

**Noted** The content of the report, and Pro Vice-Chancellor's intention to clarify the position in respect of the introduction of the increase in postgraduate taught fees.

14 **Academic Quality and Standards Committee: report from the meeting held on 20 October 2010**

**Received** A report from a recent meeting of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

[Note: The paper had been wrongly numbered 16.]

**Noted** The content of the report from the Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

15 **Graduate School Committee**

**Received** A report from the Graduate School Committee, dated 21 October 2010, from Professor Curry and Ms James.

[Note: The paper had been wrongly numbered 17.]

**Noted** The progress made towards setting up a Researcher Development and Graduate Centre.

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

The Vice-Chancellor reported that there were no actions he had taken as Chair of Senate that required reporting to the meeting.

17 **Restructuring**

A member of Senate stated that he had observed that the current restructuring appeared to be setting MSA staff against their academic colleagues because, within the former group, some believed that the reduction in the number of support staff was taking place in order to recruit faculty. The Vice-Chancellor responded that he too had noted that the two issues were being conflated in some quarters when the rationale for them was quite different. They were not interrelated and it was unhelpful to present them as such.

18 **Date of the next meeting**

The Vice-Chancellor reminded members that the next meeting of Senate was scheduled to take place on Wednesday, 2 March 2011 at 2.15 pm.

+++++

CS3/3

J:\Secretariat\Senate\Senate 2010-11\24 November 2010\Senateminsovnov2010-unrestricted-unconfirmed.doc