
Meeting: SENATE
Date and Time: Monday 11 May 2020 at 2.15 pm
Venue: MS Teams

Present Prof I White (Vice-Chancellor and President), (Chair)

| | |
|--|--|
| Prof B Morley (Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Provost) | Prof H Logemann (Elected by Professoriate) |
| Prof J Bradshaw (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Int&Doc)) | Prof M McManus (Elected by Professoriate) |
| Prof J Knight (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)) | Prof C Mitchell (Elected by Professoriate) |
| Prof P Lambert (Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning & Teaching)) | Prof G Sankaran (Elected by Professoriate) |
| Dr C Wilson (Vice-President (Student Experience)) | Prof D Stanton Fraser (Elected by Professoriate) |
| Prof N Brook (Dean, Faculty of Science) | Prof A Zalewska (Elected by Professoriate) |
| Prof D Galbreath (Dean, Humanities & Social Sciences) | Dr R Branston (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Prof G Hawley (Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Design) | Dr M Carley (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Prof B Squire (Acting Dean & Head of School of Management) | Dr J Darling (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Dr J White (Chair of Academic Assembly) | Dr M Garcia (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Ms K Robinson (University Librarian) | Dr S Gheduzzi (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Prof B Rayton (Chair of CPAC) | Dr M Harney (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Prof J Barnett (Elected by Professoriate) | Dr N Johnston (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Prof S Bending (Elected by Professoriate) | Dr F Laughton (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Prof D Bird (Elected by Professoriate) | Dr D Moon (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Prof J Davenport (Elected by Professoriate) | Dr J Troyer (Elected by Academic Assembly) |
| Prof T Ibell (Elected by Professoriate) | Ms E Alcock (Students' Union President) to 4pm. |
| | Ms R Osman (Students' Union Education Officer) |
| | Ms J Zhou (Students' Union Postgraduate Officer) |

Observers:

Prof A Heath - Academic Director, Centre for Learning & Teaching

In Attendance:

Dr C Harris - Governance Manager (back-up Secretary)
Ms A Pater - Deputy Director (Academic Governance & Compliance) (Secretary)
Ms R Sheer - Acting Director of Academic Registry
Mr M Williams (item 14772) - Director of Finance

Apologies: Apologies for absence were received from Dr R Chawla-Duggan, Dr L Milligan, Prof S White and Ms A Willingham.

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked everyone who had attended the informal meeting earlier that day at 11am at which Prof Rebecca Lingwood, Chair of the Effectiveness Review Steering Group, had presented the group's final report and recommendations.

ACTION

14769 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair asked for any declarations of interest which were not going to be declared during the discussions. There was none.

14770 SENATE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

- 1) The Chair introduced paper S19/20-162, which was the final report of the Senate Effectiveness review. He explained that several separate Boards were being set up with specific expertise, which were advisory to him and the University Executive Board; these were outside the scope of the review. These included a Buildings Board, People Board and Student Experience Board. They were listed in the chart in Appendix 5 to the report. He indicated that the decisions on some of the recommendations would need to take account of this, and some implementations of approved recommendations may also be affected.
- 2) The Chair suggested a way of approaching the recommendations would be to invite any generic comments, then to go through each recommendation in detail (see Appendix 1 of the report, appended to these minutes for reference) and this approach was agreed. If there was a clear view on a recommendation, then this would be noted and final the final approval of recommendations would be expected to occur without further discussion. Recommendations about which there was not a clear view could be further considered at the June meeting. This approach would also allow for appropriate consultation to be carried out with other bodies, including Council. An action plan would then need to be produced.
- 3) General comments:
Throughout the discussion, several members welcomed the Effectiveness Review report on the whole, whilst specific comments were made regarding several recommendations.
- 4) Specific comments are set out below alongside the recommendation number in Appendix 1:

Items agreed (or with minor wording amendments):

R1 Providing Assurance to Council:

It was recognised that the view of Council would be required to ensure that assurance was provided. However it was agreed to amend (i) to refer to an 'Academic risk register', to include requirements of all regulatory academic matters, including professional bodies, rather than 'OfS risk register';

(ii) Council should receive a report at each of its meeting from Senate on 'all academic regulatory matters' not just OfS; it was noted that the reports on the access and participation could come from the APPG;

Otherwise Senate agreed the recommendations.

R2 KPIs:

(ii) Amend to add 'on academic matters' after KPIs;

(iii) Amend to read 'Because the University will be judged externally on publicly available benchmarked measures, it is recommended that the University be aware of these measures relating to its KPIs', as these could vary.

Senate suggested that aspirational targets also be considered.

Otherwise Senate agreed the recommendations.

R3 Terms of Reference:

Senate agreed:

(ii) Move responsibility in clause 19.33 of the Statutes to the Council;
and (iii) – Review Academic Assembly.

R4 Agenda and Reports:

(i) SU wished to consider whether a standing written report to each Senate would be possible, but rather sought to allow for oral statements.

Otherwise Senate agreed the recommendations.

R6 Senate operating arrangements

(ii) Scheme of delegation: further consideration be given to the proposal to add: “Routine editorial changes to Student Regulations” to be delegated to the Director of Academic Registry in consultation with the Secretary to Senate.

Otherwise Senate agreed the recommendations.

R7.1 Boards of Studies:

There were questions about who would carry out the proposed reviews of Terms of reference for:

(i) Boards of Studies (Faculty/School), and

(iv) Board of Studies (Doctoral) along with the governance of Doctoral Committees (which was what was meant, rather than the Doctoral College itself).

Otherwise Senate agreed the recommendations.

R7.2 Research Committee, Ethics Committee and UDSC:

(vii) Amend ‘Faculty/School Ethics Committees’ to refer to PREC, REACH, SSREC etc;

(ix) reconsider the recommendation ‘that the membership includes HR (relevant to integrity of staff-student relations)’ as it may not be appropriate to have HR involvement in staff matters at this committee.

It was noted that a key aim of the Doctoral College was to reduce bureaucracy.

Otherwise Senate agreed the recommendations.

R7.3 EDC and Staff Committees:

(i) It was noted that Senate should have oversight of the process, not detailed information about individual cases.

Senate agreed the recommendations (i) and (vi)-(xii).

R7.5 Teaching & course approval committees and Disciplinary Committee:

Senate agreed the recommendations.

R7.6 Secretariat and operational matters:

Senate agreed the recommendations.

Sec

Items referred for further consideration:

R5 - Reserved business:

There was general agreement that reserved business should be retained for Senate committees, but not for Senate itself, but that further thought would be necessary about developing a policy/protocol to avoid conflicts of interest. This would need to align with practices in other committees including Council.

**HR/
Sec**

R7.3 - EDC and Staff Committees:

(ii) - (v), Academic Staff Committee, Senior Academic Appointments Committee: defer for more consultation with Human Resources.

VP(SE)

It was noted that the assumption was that probationary staff would still be dealt with centrally by an Academic Staff Board and that the proposal was for promotions to be considered at Faculty/School level. Consistency would be important. It was noted that this recommendation would require consultation with HR and potentially the unions, in addition to Council.

R7.4 - Student Experience, CSSU:

The recommendations regarding CSSU and Student Prize Committees required further consideration, alongside the new Student Experience Board.

Items postponed to June meeting:

R3 (i) Statute changes re Senate composition and functions.

This was a subject for detailed discussion. Issues had been raised about some members being elected from specified Faculties/School.

At the end of the meeting, the Secretary emphasised that any Statute changes relating to Senate composition and functions would now be unlikely to be considered in the current round of changes being agreed by Council and the Privy Council as their informal consultations were taking place that same week.

14771 GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS AND FUNCTIONS OF UNIVERSITY SECRETARY

The Secretary introduced Senate paper S19/20 – 163. She explained the changes being proposed to reallocate the functions of the University Secretary and to make some other changes to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances proposed by Council. Some minor changes were being made to Ordinances to bring them in line with Statute changes made the previous summer. She asked if there were any questions, but there was none.

Senate CONSIDERED the report and the appendices. There were no comments. The Secretary would confirm to Council that this had been considered.

Sec

14772 COVID-19 – CURRENT IMPACT AND POTENTIAL IMPACT IN FUTURE YEARS

Senate received oral reports from the Vice-Chancellor and the Director of Finance, who attended for this item. The Vice-Chancellor highlighted the key impacts of COVID-19 on the University community, namely physical and health and safety impacts, mental health aspects, and financial aspects. These affected staff and students. He thanked everyone who had been working hard to address the challenges of lockdown, especially the key workers still working on campus, and those who had ensured rapid and successful transition to online teaching and assessment. He also outlined mitigating actions that had been taken to address the crisis so far and also the priorities that were required for the University for the coming years.

The Director of Finance gave a presentation, confidential to attendees, with a forecast of the financial effects anticipated during this and subsequent years.

Senate NOTED the reports.

The meeting concluded at 4.30pm

Extract of Senate Effectiveness Review report

Appendix 1: Summary of Recommendations

R1. PROVIDING ASSURANCE TO COUNCIL:

- i. It is recommended that the University develops an OfS risk register, and an OfS conditions of registration 'governance matrix' (Appendix 15), which would allow the University to evidence comprehensively how it complies with the OfS conditions and allow Senate to provide greater assurance, transparency and clarity for Council.
- ii. It is recommended that Council receives a report at each of its meeting from Senate on OfS matters, including, for example, OfS reportable events, a compliance summary report and Access and Participation monitoring report.
- iii. It is recommended that the annual quality and standards report from Senate to Council is more closely aligned to the OfS conditions and requirements to monitor and evaluate progress towards Access and Participation Plan targets.
- iv. It is recommended that the report template for Senate and its Committees is modified to include a section entitled 'OfS Impact Assessment' (Appendix 13), which would allow Senate actively to take ownership of how the University complies with OfS conditions of registration via individual reports.
- v. It is recommended that members of Senate and its Committees ensure that they do not allow OfS considerations to narrow the range of their debates and continue to account for broader risks, opportunities and performance monitoring within their remit, as well as giving academic strategic direction.
- vi. It is recommended that consideration is given to: trialling some task-based joint workshops of Senate and Council to strengthen relations and shared understanding; and new members of Council observing a Senate meeting to become better informed on the nature of Senate's business and debate.

R2. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIs):

- i. It is recommended that the OfS conditions of registration, particularly those associated with Access and Participation Plan targets, are added to the University's KPIs.
- ii. It is recommended that Senate determines a clear relationship between its lead and lag KPIs and the University's academic strategy.
- iii. Because the University will be judged externally on publicly available benchmarked measures, it is recommended that these measures are used in the University's KPIs.
- iv. It is recommended that Senate's academic KPI monitoring and reporting is better informed by receiving the KPI information with set targets, year-on-year trends shown graphically, with the current year's performance RAG (red, amber, green) rated against relevant sector benchmarks, where available, with a commentary against red KPIs, and with principal KPI owners noted.

R3. SENATE TERMS OF REFERENCE:

- i. It is recommended that the redrafted sections 18 and 19 of Statutes and section 9 of Ordinances (Appendix 2) are accepted by Senate and passed on to Council, perhaps as a first phase of a recommended broader review of the Statutes covering other areas of the University's activities, and that cross-references elsewhere in the Statutes to sections 18 and 19 are reviewed and amended accordingly prior to

- submission to the Privy Council for approval.
- ii. It is recommended that the current clause 19.33 of the Statutes: “To take such steps as it thinks fit to control organisations of the Students” is moved, in an appropriate form, from the functions of Senate to the functions of the Council, as required by clause 22 of the Education Act 1994.
 - iii. While formally outside the scope of the Review, it is recommended that Academic Assembly is reviewed with a view to improving academic staff engagement and to strengthen the relationship with Senate.

R4. AGENDA AND REPORTS (APPENDIX 12 & 13):

- i. For improved information sharing, particularly of early views on strategic matters, it is recommended that early-stage discussion papers are considered by Senate routinely, and that the agenda template for Senate meetings is revised to include standing items under Part I comprising short (under one page in length) written reports from: the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Provost; the three Pro-Vice-Chancellors and the Vice-President (Student Experience); and the Students’ Union (usually the President). It is recommended that neither the writing nor the presentation of these reports is delegated.
- ii. It is recommended that the agenda template for Senate meetings includes (under Part I) a report from Council to summarize the key areas of discussion and decisions made, and on occasion to request that Senate reviews a particular aspect of the University’s academic activities.
- iii. To clarify the role and responsibilities of elected members of Senate, an additional note is recommended for the preamble to the Senate agenda that reiterates the role of elected members of Senate, as recommended separately in the revised terms of reference for Senate (see clause 9 of the recommended revised Senate Ordinances).
- iv. It is recommended that the Senate agenda template is updated such that the listings of Committees presenting minutes are align with the agreed changes to Senate and Joint Committees resulting from the recommendations of this Review.
- v. On a schedule laid out in the forward plan of business for Senate, it is recommended that each Senate and Joint Committee provides an annual report of significant business and decisions for discussion in Part I of the Senate agenda.
- vi. It is recommended that the report template for Senate (and Senate and Joint Committees) is updated in order to: improve the flow of information between bodies; enhance the effectiveness of discussion and decision making; to take a more risk-based approach; and to embed key cross-cutting themes, such as equality, diversity and inclusion, across all of Senate’s business.

R5. RESERVED BUSINESS:

- i. It is recommended that Senate Committees, Boards of Studies and Boards of Examiners should retain reserved business excluding student members but Senate itself (and the Joint Council and Senate Committees) would provide papers relating to reserved areas of business to student members and not require student members to withdraw from discussions of these matters. It is recommended that Secretaries ensure that reserved minutes do not progress to Senate unless suitably redacted.

R6. OTHER SENATE OPERATING ARRANGEMENTS:

- i. It is recommended that the Standing Orders of Senate are aligned with any accepted recommended changes to Statutes and Ordinances relating to Senate, and to changes in Senate’s Committees and Joint Council and Senate

- Committees.
- ii. It is recommended that the procedural rules (linking to the Standing Orders of Senate) are visible on each relevant Committee webpage.
 - iii. It is recommended that the Scheme of Delegation for Senate is updated to align with any accepted recommendations on future Senate Committees and Joint Council and Senate Committees. It is recommended that the following amendments to Part 2 of the Scheme of Delegation for Senate, are made to delegations from Senate to the Vice-Chancellor and other officers:
 - Page 2: remove the reference to “Annual Monitoring Statement approval (to Vice-Chancellor)”.
 - Page 2: amend delegation of “Calendar of meetings” from University Secretary to Head of Strategic Governance.
 - Page 2: add an item on “Routine editorial changes to Student Regulations” delegated to the Director of Academic Registry in consultation with the Secretary to Senate.
 - Page 4: amend the reference to “Routine editorial changes to IMCA document” to ““Routine editorial changes to IMC reference documents””.
 - Page 9: amend references to “University Research Students Committee” and “Faculty/School Research Students Committees” to “University Doctoral Studies Committee”.
 - Page 10: amend “Research and Development Support Office” to “Research and Innovation Services”.
 - iv. It is recommended that as part of the induction of new members to Senate they are introduced to Council’s members and business, and opportunities for Senate and Council members to interact beyond the induction period are increased.
 - v. As Council has done and in support of the University’s environmental sustainability strategy, it is recommended that Senate considers how it could move to “digital by default”, i.e. a position where all circulations are in electronic format, unless a request for a paper copy is submitted in advance.
 - vi. Once the recommendations have been completed, it will be necessary to undertake a thoroughgoing refresh of the University’s webpages and documents relevant to Senate and its Committees and Joint Committees of Council and Senate.

R7. SENATE COMMITTEES AND JOINT COUNCIL AND SENATE COMMITTEES:

R7.1 Boards of Studies

- i. It is recommended that the terms of reference for the Faculty/School Boards of Studies are reviewed in consultation with the Chairs, Secretaries and Academic Registry to bring them into line with appropriate current practice, e.g. on scrutiny of marking, and allow for more consistent chairing.
- ii. Taking advantage of the broad membership of the Faculty/School Boards of Studies, it is recommended that they operate to their full revised terms of reference and discharge their responsibilities around academy strategy fully; Senate should seek the advice of the Boards of Studies on matters of academic strategy.
- iii. Given the overlap in membership and the lack of clarity on where responsibilities for doctoral academic strategy lie in practice, it is recommended that consideration is given to whether the Board of Studies (Doctoral) and University Doctoral Studies Committee are working as intended when they were introduced.
- iv. It is recommended that the terms of reference for the Board of Studies (Doctoral) are reviewed, alongside the wider governance of the Doctoral College, including consideration of the responsibilities and membership of the Board of Studies

(Doctoral) in the context of those of the University Doctoral Studies Committee (both Senate Committees), and of the terms of reference for the Faculty/School Doctoral Studies Committees.

R7.2 Research, Ethics and University Doctoral Studies Committees

- i. It is recommended that the proposed report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) at each Senate meeting includes significant issues and decisions from the Research Committee.
- ii. It is recommended that a light-touch review of the terms of reference of the Research Committee is conducted by the Committee to explicitly reference the Knowledge Exchange Framework and otherwise update.
- iii. It is recommended that consideration is given to changing the name of the Research Committee to the 'Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee'.
- iv. It is recommended that the Research Committee updates its composition to streamline the contribution across relevant areas of Professional Services and to ensure this is in line with the strategic focus of the Committee.
- v. To enhance strategic development, is recommended the Chair of the Research Committee considers:
 - o using an annual forward plan to give strategic focus to a subset of the meetings each year to identify and explore issues; and
 - o making greater use of Associate Deans (Research) and relevant other members and appropriate non-members, in the form of temporary working groups, in between Research Committee meetings.
- vi. It is recommended that the Ethics Committee covers all academic ethical issues and actively responds to the growing need for consideration of the ethical issues around teaching. While outside the scope of the Review, it is recommended that a new University Ethics Advisory Committee is established as a Council Committee to take responsibility for non-academic ethical issues. It would be necessary to consider carefully the appropriate balance of academic and professional services staff representation on each Committee, and whether it would be necessary to have a lay member of Council as a member of the academically focussed Ethics Committee.
- vii. It is recommended that the Ethics Committee refocuses its terms of reference to give a platform for consideration of strategic matters, and shifts the balance of operational matters to the Faculty/School Ethics Committees.
- viii. It is recommended that explicit consideration is given to the membership of the Ethics Committee to position it optimally for more strategic discussions and to foster better engagement of the student body (especially doctoral students).
- ix. It is recommended that the terms of reference of the Ethics Committee are revised explicitly to include 'integrity' and that the membership includes HR (relevant to integrity of staff-student relations) and teaching representation, and that 'integrity' is incorporated in the name of the Committee, e.g. the 'Academic Ethics and Integrity Committee'.
- x. It is recommended that there is a standing item on Senate agendas for the Chair of the Ethics Committee to report on key items of Ethics Committee business.
- xi. It is recommended that Senate's oversight of the Awards and Prizes procedures for staff and, separately, student awards and prizes are appropriately included within the University's new governance arrangements for ethics.
- xii. It is recommended that the proposed report from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International and Doctoral) at each Senate meeting includes significant issues and decisions from the University Doctoral Studies Committee.

- xiii. Allied to the recommendation above, it is recommended that there is a wider review of the University's doctoral strategy and the governance of the Doctoral College, including:
 - o analysis of what is seen by some as increasing bureaucracy and staff burden, e.g. around PhD supervisory practices, to ensure proportionate and effective processes;
 - o clarification of demarcations in responsibilities and membership of the Board of Studies (Doctoral) and the University Doctoral Studies Committee to assist in operationalizing the governance of doctoral matters, to ensure good levels of attendance, appropriate student voice and professional services staff membership; and
 - o full engagement with the Research Committee to reflect the important component that doctoral strategy comprises in the University's research strategy, to demark and assign responsibility for aspects of doctoral studies, for example around PhD supervisory practices and doctoral complaints procedures.

R7.3 Staff and Equality and Diversity Committees

- i. It is recommended that timely and consistent procedures for reacting to circumstances where a member of academic staff has a competitive offer from another institution are reviewed, ensuring that Senate has appropriate oversight of such retention cases.
- ii. To enhance input of local expert knowledge and University-wide consistency, it is recommended that the Academic Staff Committee no longer operates as a formal Senate Committee and instead operates as a series of Faculty/School Boards, each chaired by the relevant Dean or designate, responsible for approving probation decisions in that Faculty/School, based on criteria set by Senate. Any probation applications not approved (extended or failed), as well as all applications for promotion would be reviewed by a central University 'Academic Staff Progression Board', according to the criteria set by Senate. In more detail:
 - o Professorial promotion applications would still go through a Faculty/School Board before submission for central University consideration, with enhanced monitoring and reporting of application at Faculty/School level.
 - o The 'Research Fellow Sub-Group' and 'Teaching Fellow Sub-Group' of Academic Staff Committee would no longer be needed as these categories of staff would be included in the proposed arrangements in the same way as other staff categories.
 - o The Faculty/School Boards and the University-level Academic Staff Progression Board would provide an annual report to Senate and the Equality and Diversity Committee, with an overview of probation and promotion decisions, including relevant equality and diversity data, as agreed by Senate.
- iii. The Academic Staff Appeal Committee is valued as a Joint Council and Senate Committee but it is recommended that its terms of reference are modified to reflect the removal of the Academic Staff Committee and its sub-groups, and also to clarify the eligible grounds for appeal, e.g. procedural irregularities only.
- iv. It is recommended that the Joint Council and Senate Senior Academic Appointments Committee is discontinued, with instead the procedures for these senior academic appointments agreed by Senate and Council but details of the job description, shortlisting and so on delegated to the selection committee, and appointments should be made directly by the selection committee, provided it has appropriate (for the post in question) representation from Council and Senate, e.g.

- at least one lay member of Council and at least one elected Senate member with delegated authority.
- v. It is recommended that the Academic Career Progression Framework and Principles document, which outlines the details for probation and promotion within the Education and Research Job Family, is updated to accommodate changes proposed by the Review.
 - vi. It is recommended that the Equality and Diversity Network becomes an informal network for sharing good practice and for discussing topics from the Equality and Diversity Committee.
 - vii. It is recommended that the Equality and Diversity Committee is renamed the 'Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee', and the Committee considers ways to improve its integration with Senate and Council as part of the minor changes the Committee has agreed (February 2020) to make to its terms of reference for approval by Senate and Council.
 - viii. It is recommended that support for the Equality and Diversity Committee is reviewed to consider suitable professional services support to help it meet its terms of reference without overburdening the Committee members.
 - ix. It is recommended that the President of the Students' Union is added to the membership of the Honorary Degrees Committee.
 - x. It is recommended that Senate and Council provide guidelines to the Honorary Degrees Committee, reflecting the University's values, on who could be considered "persons worthy of the conferment of an honorary degree and the appropriate degree for each such person." The Review Group, therefore, endorses the formation by the Committee of a small working group to review the processes for receiving nominations and the criteria of awarding honorary degrees, which is underway (as of the start of March 2020).
 - xi. It is recommended that the Awards and Ede and Ravenscroft (Staff) Committees are joined into a single 'Staff Awards Board' (no longer a formal Committee of Senate) to ensure consistency, while Senate should continue to be responsible for the framework of its operation, diversity of membership, and to receive reports of decisions.

R7.4 Student Experience Committees

- i. It is recommended that: CSSU reports to the University Executive Board on operational matters; Senate receives reports, including recommendations, for discussion on academic matters, including the student experience and student welfare; and Council receives regular reports on general CSSU matters. Further, it is recommended that Senate (and Council) consider whether there are topics that can be referred to CSSU for consideration.
- ii. In part to help give CSSU a longer-term vision beyond annual Students' Union targets, it is recommended that the Vice-President (Student Experience) becomes a member of CSSU (rather than simply an attendee), possibly replacing the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), and, assuming the Vice-Chancellor remains as Chair, that consideration is given to making the Students' Union President the Vice-Chair, perhaps jointly with the Vice-President (Student Experience).
- iii. It is recommended that consideration is given to whether it is necessary for the second Students' Union executive member to be the Education Officer (given the current broad scope of the Committee); nor does it seem to be necessary for Senate to elect members to CSSU unless there are more volunteers than vacant positions on the Committee.

- It is recommended that consideration is given to focussing the terms of reference of CSSU to: “discuss and make recommendations to Senate on any matters affecting the student experience, welfare, equality, diversity and inclusion,” moving the Committee from a Joint Council and Senate Committee to a Senate Committee and necessitating a change of name perhaps to the ‘Student Experience and Welfare Committee’. Further, in the light of the recommendations above on CSSU and the University Executive Board’s newly approved (24 March 2020) Student Experience Board,³⁸ it is recommended that discontinuation of CSSU is considered.
- iv. It is recommended that the Blues, Chancellor’s Prize, and Ede and Ravenscroft Prize (PGR) Committees are joined into a single ‘Student Awards Board’ (no longer a formal Committee of Senate) to ensure consistency, while Senate should continue to be responsible for the framework of its operation, diversity of membership, and to receive reports of decisions.

R7.5 Teaching, Curriculum Transformation, Course Approval and Quality Assurance Committees

- i. It is recommended that the respective roles of the University Executive Board (UEB) and Academic Programmes Committee (APC) in the programme approval and withdrawal processes are reviewed and clarified, including:
 - o UEB retaining strategic decision-making responsibilities for the business cases, resource implications and market information, for new programmes and strategically revised programmes coming through the curriculum transformation process, ahead of APC approval;
 - o consideration of delegating some of UEB’s decision-making responsibilities for new course approvals and withdrawals to APC, given the overlapping membership; and
 - o making the processes for programme approval and withdrawal more transparent, with the roles that each body takes more explicit. The Student Experience Board was approved by UEB after the conclusion of the Review Group’s work and this proposal is late addition to be considered as part of the consideration of the Review’s recommendations.
- ii. It is recommended that membership of the APC is reviewed in the light of the role clarifications with UEB recommended above, perhaps allowing an increase in academic representation on Academic Programmes Committee.
- iii. It is recommended that consideration is given to including ‘standards’ in the title of the Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, e.g. ‘Education, Quality and Standards Committee’.
- iv. It is recommended that the role of Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee (LTQC) in approval of doctoral provision, i.e. matters relating to the taught elements of doctoral provision, e.g. integrated PhDs, is included within the remit of the recommended review of doctoral provision and governance.
- v. It is recommended that the membership of the LTQC is reviewed, with consideration given to:
 - o the addition of Senate member(s) to LTQC to support integration;
 - o the balance of the contributions between members of the Committee, non-members of the Committee, student voice and observers at LTQC to ensure greater diversity and engagement of LTQC membership; and
 - o the efficacy of circulating papers to non-members rather than being in attendance.
- vi. It is recommended that more efficient use is made of the time within LTQC meetings by:
 - o ensuring timely circulation of papers ahead of meetings;
 - o ensuring the recommended report template, including an executive summary,

recommendations, main issues and options, and next steps for actions and action owners, etc. is used; and o making greater use of consultation, e.g. with Faculty/School LTQCs, possibly via email or collaborative tools, for detailed discussion, prior to LTQC meetings.

- vii. It is recommended that consideration is given to changing the name of the Disciplinary Committee to reflect its student focus and full remit, e.g. 'Student Disciplinary and Misconduct Committee', and consideration could be given to extending to explicitly cover fitness to study and practice.

R7.6 Committee Secretariat, Operations and Structure

- i. It is recommended that Senate and its Committees provide papers consistently one week in advance of a meeting; it is noted that achieving this is largely dependent on timely provision of papers from authors to the secretariat.
- ii. It is recommended that Committees maintain a healthy turnover of members and the numbers of people in attendance is limited to maintain focussed discussions.
- iii. It is recommended, where not already the case, that all new Committee members receive an induction to clarify expectations, roles, responsibilities and relationships between bodies.

May 2020