

THE SENATE

Minutes

This paper presents the confirmed Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 5 February 2014 at The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes.

The Senate **approved** these Minutes as a correct record of the meeting on Wednesday 2 April 2014, subject to inclusion of an amendment to minutes 4.2 and 4.3 (S-2014-02-M Minute 2.1).

Alan Burrell
Acting Secretary to the Committee

Julie Tayler
Working Secretary to the Committee
Email: julie.tayler@open.ac.uk
Tel: 01908 332729

Attachments:

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| S-2014-01-M Appendix 1 | Honorary Degrees Committee |
| S-2014-01-M Appendix 2 | Curriculum Partnerships Committee |
| S-2014-01-M Appendix 3 | Vocational Qualifications Committee |
| S-2014-01-M Appendix 4 | Curriculum and Validation Committee |

THE SENATE

Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 5 February 2014 at 2.00pm
in the Hub Theatre, The Open University, Walton Hall.

PRESENT:

1) Ex officio

Mr Martin Bean, Vice-Chancellor
Professor Tim Blackman, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Scholarship and Quality)
Professor Musa Mihsein, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Professor Belinda Tynan, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)
Professor Anne De Roeck, Dean, Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology
Professor Kevin Hetherington, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
Professor Mary Kellett, Dean, Faculty of Education and Language Studies
Mr Jeremy Roche, Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Care
Professor David Rowland, Dean, Faculty of Arts
Professor Hazel Rymer, Dean, Faculty of Science
Professor Rebecca Taylor, Dean, Faculty of Business and Law
Mr Keith Zimmerman, Director, Students
Professor Patrick McAndrew, Director of the Institute of Educational Technology
Mrs Nicky Whitsed, Director, Library Services

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts

| | |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| Dr Ole Grell | Dr Lynda Prescott |
| Dr Graham Harvey | Professor John Wolffe |
| Dr Paula James | |

Faculty of Business & Law

| | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Ms Carmel McMahon | Mr Mike Phillips |
|-------------------|------------------|

Faculty of Education and Language Studies

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| Dr Uwe Baumann | Dr Steven Hutchinson |
| Dr Jane Cullen | Dr Tim Lewis |
| Ms Felicity Harper | |

Faculty of Health and Social Care

| | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Professor Jan Draper | Dr Mary Twomey |
|----------------------|----------------|

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Dr Leonor Barroca | Dr Tony Nixon |
| Dr David Bowers | Dr Toby O'Neil |
| Professor Joyce Fortune | Mr Brendan Quinn |
| Mr Derek Goldrei | Dr Peter Robbins |
| Ms Maggie Holland | Dr Mark Woodroffe |

Faculty of Science

Dr John Baxter
Professor Monica Grady
Dr Arlene Hunter
Dr Nick Rogers

Dr David Rothery
Dr Robert Saunders
Dr Claire Turner

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Troy Cooper
Dr Anastasia Economou
Dr Richard Heffernan

Dr Raia Prokhovnik
Dr Hugh Mackay
Mr Matt Staples

Institute of Educational Technology

Professor Agnes Kukulska-Hulme

Professor Eileen Scanlon

Other Central Units

Dr Liz Marr

3) Associate Lecturers

Mrs Frances Chetwynd
Ms Janet Dyke
Dr Isobel Falconer

Mr Bruce Heil
Mr Stephen Pattinson
Dr Walter Pisarski

4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association

Mr Josh Brumpton
Mrs Marianne Cantieri
Mr Jeferson de Oliveira

Ms Alison Kingan
Dr Sandra Summers
Mr Alan Thomas (alternate)

5) Academic-related Staff

Ms Pat Atkins
Miss Karen Bradbury
Mr Mike Christensen
Mr Martin Ferns
Ms Sandi Guest
Mr Martin Kenward
Mr Billy Khokhar

Dr Christina Lloyd
Mr Tony O'Shea-Poon
Ms Clare Riding
Ms Gill Smith
Mr Michael Street
Mr Jake Yeo

6) Co-opted members

Mrs Lynda Brady
Mr John D'Arcy
Mr Christopher Goscomb

Mr Rob Humphreys
Dr David Knight
Dr James Miller

In attendance

Mr Alan Burrell, Director of Estates (Acting University Secretary)
Ms Michelle Gander, Head of University Secretary's Office
Mr Paul Hollins, Project Officer, Learning and Teaching (for Minute 8)
Professor Peter Taylor, Faculty of Science (for Minutes 12, 13 and 14)
Mr Niall Sclater, Director, Learning and Teaching (for Minute 8)

APOLOGIES:

1) Ex officio

Ms Anne Howells, Director, Learning and Teaching Solutions

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts

Professor Suman Gupta

Faculty of Business and Law

Mr Alessandro Saroli

Dr Sharon Slade

Faculty of Education and Language Studies

Mr Pete Smith

Professor Karen Littleton

Faculty of Health and Social Care

Mrs Sue Cole

Miss Christine Taylor

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Dr Nicholas Moss

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Helen Kaye

Institute of Educational Technology

Dr Robin Goodfellow

4) Students

Ms Jacqui Horsburgh

5) Academic-related Staff

Ms Hilary Robertson

6) Co-opted members

Professor Peter Scott

In attendance

Mr Fraser Woodburn, University Secretary

Mr Andrew Law, Director of Open Media Unit

1 WELCOME

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the new Director, Institute of Educational Technology (IET), Professor Patrick McAndrew, to the Senate. Dr Paula Janes, Staff Tutor in the Faculty of the Arts (the OU in the South East) was also welcomed to her first meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed Alan Burrell, who was Acting University Secretary during Fraser Woodburn's absence. On behalf of the Senate, the Chair wished Mr Woodburn a speedy recovery.

2 MINUTES**S-2013-04-M**

- 2.3 The Senate **approved** the minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 16 October 2013.

3 MATTERS ARISING**S-2014-01-01****Minute 4.5**

- 3.1 The Chair explained that the presentation on the Enquirer Experience Programme (EEP) that had been scheduled for this meeting would not take place as both Fraser Woodburn, University Secretary, and Mark Young, Head of Business Improvement, Marketing and SRFS, were unwell and absent from the University. The programme would be discussed at the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee (SPRC) meeting on 12 February 2014 and, if appropriate, the minute would be circulated to Senate members before the next meeting. The presentation would be rescheduled for the next meeting of the Senate.

Action: GT

- 3.2 Referring to paragraph 4, a member said that it would be useful to be able to compare the number of students registering before the introduction of the new regime with the number registering after.

Action: US

- 3.3 The Senate **noted** the responses to the matters arising.

4 REPORT FROM AND QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR

- 4.1 The Vice-Chancellor reported to the Senate on the 'go-live' of Student Support Teams (SSTs) on Monday 3 February 2014.
- 4.2 Members said that the early feedback from the SSTs was encouraging: Staff tutors had integrated well and were taking a positive approach. A member expressed concern about the purpose of introducing flat screens to monitor the activity of the SSTs and the impact of these on staff motivation. The Director, Students, Keith Zimmerman, responded that it was essential to monitor the volume of activity and to be able to move student traffic around in order to avoid queues and to spread the load on staff tutors. In response to a member's comment, Mr Zimmerman said that any concerns about the system not working would be followed up.

Action: Dir, S

- 4.3 Members also raised concerns about tutors having access to student records on VOICE. Whilst there were potential benefits, the possible problems had not been discussed with staff tutors. Dr Christina Lloyd, Director, Teaching and Learner Support, replied that the University was aware of the issue. It was essential to safeguard student data and better communications were necessary to provide guidance as to the use that Associate Lecturers (ALs) should or should not be able to make of student records. However, the

pilots had clearly demonstrated that AL access to such data was helpful. An AL member agreed that data on students helped ALs to do their job better; further work could be done to ensure that inappropriate information did not slip through.

- 4.4 It was noted that any concerns regarding SSTs should be fed back to Dr Lloyd, who would investigate.

Action: Dir, T&LS

Student Numbers

- 4.5 In the absence of the University Secretary, the Director, Students reported that the 2013/14 planning assumptions had been exceeded for both new regime students (103%) and transitional students (108%) in England. So far, the University had met 94% of its target numbers in Scotland, and 96% in Wales. The planning assumption had also been exceeded in Northern Ireland, with the University reaching 104% of its target numbers. The total student population was now the full time equivalent (FTE) of approximately 75,000.

- 4.6 A member commented that the EEP programme had been designed to improve the recruitment of students to the OU. In the light of the University's ambitious targets within the new funding regime, it would be helpful if the Senate could receive a report on the number of new students who were still with the University after 3-6 months, as well as the number of students recruited and the total student population. The OU's success in recruitment and retention should be reviewed regularly by the Senate, whether at every meeting or as an annual report. Another member added that information on postgraduate recruitment should also be reported to the Senate.

Action: US

- 4.7 The Vice-Chancellor observed that it was good to know that student numbers were holding up, particularly given the uncertainty surrounding the Student Opportunity Allocation (SOA), which was worth £30 million per year to the OU. The latest intelligence suggested that there would be a reduction in the SOA, but that it would be one that the University would be able to manage. In response to a member's query, the Vice-Chancellor said that the University had appropriately influenced a broad network of stakeholders in order to ensure their support and to bring about the desired outcomes for the OU. Whilst the decisions of the Treasury and the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) could not be certain until the grant letter was published, it was likely that the funding cuts would be within the tolerance of the University's risk mitigation.

- 4.8 The Vice-Chancellor also reported on:

- a) the vital role of the OU's Planetary and Space Sciences team, led by Professor Monica Grady, in the successful "wake up" of the Rosetta space craft and the media coverage that it had achieved;
- b) the award of the gold medal of the Royal Astronomical Society to Emeritus Professor John Zarnecki, Planetary and Space Sciences;
- c) the publicity and influence generated by the Enduring Love project, run by Dr Jacqui Gabb and Dr Janet Fink, Faculty of Social Sciences;
- d) the work of Media Relations in ensuring the OU's success stories were highlighted throughout the media. The team were thanked for helping to provide the University with the recognition it deserved.

4.9 The Vice-Chancellor also noted that it was the final meeting of the Senate for both Lynda Brady, Director, Learning Support Services and Anne Howells, Director, Learning and Teaching Solutions and thanked them for their hard work and their support to the Senate.

5 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE S-2014-01-02 A&B

5.1 Referring to minute 6.3 (confidential minutes), a member asked what was meant by the introduction of qualification pricing in the Celtic Nations for 2015/16, and what would be the implications. In the University Secretary's absence, the Director, Students said that he would provide a response to the question before the next meeting of the Senate.

Action: Dir, S/US

5.2 With reference to the discussion on employability (minute 8), a member said that companies would expect to see evidence of team working and communication from a broader base than just student study. OU students were well placed to demonstrate such skills, so the University should do better in this area. Mr Zimmerman said that he would take note of this observation.

5.3 The Senate **noted** the unconfirmed Minutes and Confidential Minutes from the meeting held on 6 November 2013 (SPRC-2013-04-M).

6 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE S-2014-01-03

The Senate **noted** the report of the meetings of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) held on 4 November 2013.

7 RESEARCH COMMITTEE S-2014-01-04

7.1 A member observed that the paper noted the Committee's business, but it did not highlight the Committee's decisions or recommendations. Unlike some of the other substructure reports, it did not provide any appendices to put decisions into context. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Scholarship and Quality) [PVC (RSQ)], Professor Tim Blackman, said that if decisions were not highlighted, it was because none had been made, but that he would refer the comments back to the Committee Secretary with a request that future reports were presented in the same way as for other committees.

7.2 The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Research Committee (RC) held on 13 November 2013.

8 CURRICULUM AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE S-2014-01-05

The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC) held on 20 November 2013.

9 LEARNING TEACHING AND STUDENT SUPPORT COMMITTEE S-2014-01-06

9.1 Referring to paragraph 5, a member observed that there did not appear to have been any consideration of the implications of the significant increase in disabled students, particularly with regard to support. The Director, Students agreed that this was not apparent from the report, but confirmed that there had been recognition of the increased pressure that would be created by these additional students. A project was being put together that aimed to deliver further student support, as well as training and development opportunities for tutors.

9.2 In response to a query about the Analytics Intervention Framework (paragraph 25), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) [PVC (LT)], Professor Belinda Tynan, agreed that informal interventions by tutors with students were important to successful

completion. However, some ALs recorded these interventions, whilst others did not. The Analytics Intervention Framework would attempt to bring some coherence to this activity and to absorb it into best practice. The issues around AL workload were acknowledged, but no changes would be made without consultation.

- 9.3 A member observed that the decline in postgraduate numbers, the higher than expected dissatisfaction amongst postgraduate researchers (PGRs) in the staff survey and amongst undergraduates seeking further study with the OU, and the drop in the University's rankings were all part of a story that was cause for concern and asked how the University intended to respond. Professor Tynan replied that considerable attention was being given to both quantitative and qualitative data concerning the student learning experience. The analytics work being undertaken within the Student Experience Programme (SEP) aimed to address these concerns in cooperation with Faculties and other business units across the University. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic) [PVC (A)], Professor Musa Mishein, observed that postgraduate numbers had fallen across the sector and that the OU had done well to maintain its share. However, the University was not complacent: work was being carried out with Marketing and with the faculties in order to restore the OU's market share, to provide distinctive support to postgraduate students and to introduce new areas of the curriculum targeted at postgraduates. In response to an enquiry from a member about when the planned curriculum would be available for consideration, Professor Mihsein said that the strategy refresh details were being fed into the faculty business plans. These should be completed in April, after which a paper on curriculum size and shape would be brought to the Senate.

Action: PVC (A)

- 9.4 With reference to Recommendation 2 from the Student Experience Advisory Group (SEAG) (S-2014-01-06 Appendix 1), which was concerned with the study of evidence of differences in performances between February and October start cohorts, a member asked why other undergraduate cohorts could not be included, as they would also provide useful information. The PVC (LT) said that other cohorts could be included in the study, but these had been prioritized as a starting point.

- 9.5 The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Student Support Committee (LTSSC) held on 25 November 2013.

10 SENATE MEMBERSHIP PANEL

S-2014-01-07

- 10.1 Referring to paragraph 9 of the report, a member asked whether there were potential issues for academic governance in co-opting people in specific management roles on to the Senate. The Chair of the Senate Membership Panel (SMP), Professor Eileen Scanlon, said that SMP had approved the continuation of some previous co-options that had come about because of a change in the organisation of the nations and regions. The Panel had been struggling to keep up with some of the organisational changes within the University, but it hoped that the Academic Governance Review (AGR) would result in co-options becoming less necessary.

- 10.2 The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Senate Membership Panel (SMP) held on 24 June 2013.

11 DEFINING THE PRINCIPLES OF GROUP TUITION

S-2014-01-08

- 11.1 The PVC (LT) introduced the paper, which was part of a journey towards an institutional Group Tuition Policy that would meet the needs of all students. The policy would be developed on the basis of these principles and would be presented to the Senate for approval. Consultation had already begun through the student consultative process and with staff tutors, and there had been positive and constructive feedback. Comments on critical issues, such as clustering and its practical implications, and the systems

development required, were particularly welcomed. Significant developments in technology meant that there was increased potential for online delivery, but it was not the University's intention to remove face-to-face tuition.

- 11.2 Members welcomed the paper and expressed appreciation for the consultation to date. One member asked for clarification regarding the status of the Group Tuition Policy. Did it constitute a set of rules against which modules and qualifications would be approved, or guidelines to ensure a common understanding? The PVC (LT) replied that the Policy would provide guidelines, but that all good policy should establish a framework for people to work within. Once agreed, the Policy would be regularly evaluated and reviewed.
- 11.3 Several members observed that the paper referred to modules, but that the Principles provided an opportunity to consider group tuition from a qualifications perspective, which would aid retention.
- 11.4 Referring to paragraph 6, which stated "The Principles aim to be delivered initially within the existing contractual relations between the University and its Associate Lecturers...", an AL member requested clarification as to whether there would be, or was there an aspiration to, change the current arrangements. The PVC (LT) said that the University was looking at the Principles in the light of the current contract, but if necessary there would be further debate. Another member observed that ALs needed security of employment for these Principles to work, which was not provided by the current contract.
- 11.5 With reference to paragraph 12, a member said that whilst it was important to find out 'how students feel about the tuition', the link between performance and attendance was not clear. More research was required to establish the difference between what students liked and valued, and what actually produced better results.
- 11.6 Members made the following comments about the draft Principles:
- a) **Principle 1: Purpose**

This appeared to be a 'top-down' principle. An AL might plan the group tuition for a module, but would need to be flexible in order to respond to the varying needs of different groups. The way in which tuition developed was a two-way process as students progressed through their studies.
 - b) **Principle 2: Student learning communities**

Central academics and staff tutors also had a role to play in learning communities, such as online forum, and should be included in the list of participants.
 - c) **Principle 3: Clustering**
 - i) Clustering was not always appropriate, so the wording of the principle should be changed to 'Tutor groups will **usually** (or **often**) be formed within clusters of groups ...';
 - ii) whilst clustering would provide students with considerable choice, the value of the student's relationship with the tutor should not be undermined; to dilute it would be counter-productive;
 - iii) the disaggregation and phasing out of dedicated tutorial groups could have a negative effect on the ability to develop student confidence;
 - iv) clustering often worked well, particularly at Level 1. However, the specification that clusters should consist of 2-10 tutor groups might be impractical and problematic in some geographic areas, especially at Level 3. The minimum cluster size might therefore need to be 1 tutor group;

- vi) geographical clusters could be created within the same module, but might also be across different modules. This should be enshrined in the Principles. The PVC (LT) said that the Policy would not limit this;
 - v) clustering might affect the flexibility available to students, who were currently able to join in any event taking place in any location;
 - vii) clarification was required on whether 'the viability of group tuition' was dependent on finances or group size.
- d) **Principle 4: Face to face and online learning events**
- i) Student members and others welcomed the confirmation that face-to-face tutorials were not under threat, and observed that blended learning worked well. A Principle relating to face-to-face tuition, as well as asynchronous group tuition should be considered;
 - ii) another member said that the demise of face-to-face was regrettable, as it was not good for student retention. The development of online learning events was difficult and staff intensive. A review of the University's resources and the remuneration of ALs was necessary, so that learning events might include visits to museums, plays, etc.
- e) **Principle 5: Online availability**
- i) Clarification was requested regarding the meaning of 'at least one full programme of online learning events'. The PVC (LT) replied that there had been a tendency to try to use technology to replicate what had gone before, for example a face-to-face tutorial. Professional development was essential to ensure the design of online events that were fit for purpose. The challenge was to be clear of the purpose of the online tutorial (Principle 1);
 - ii) the President, OUSA, Marianne Cantieri, observed that it was important that tutors were trained to provide excellent tutorials, of whatever type.
- f) **Principle 6: Student choice**
- i) It should be noted that learning events might need to be mandatory in order to meet the learning outcomes for a module;
 - ii) greater choice would lead to greater inclusion. However, the promise to provide alternatives for students should be broadened to include not just those with 'particular accessibility requirements', or disabilities, but all those needing adjustment '**in response to their needs and circumstances**'.
- g) **Principle 7: Asynchronous group tuition**
- i) It should be noted that group tuition was not always necessary in order to achieve the learning outcomes for a module;
 - ii) it was important to keep some form of tutorial available for students who could not access face-to-face sessions.
- h) **Principle 8: International students**

The President, OUSA, said that, whilst a choice of learning events was welcomed and international students liked to be mixed with UK students, it was important to avoid a situation where international students were not able to take advantage of all the events offered to the group. This might be an issue with face-to-face sessions.

- i) **Principle 9: Planning of learning events programmes**
 - i) Student members and others said it was an excellent idea to plan and communicate the core learning events programme as early as possible;
 - ii) Tutor-Student Allocation (TSA) was often a last minute activity. It would be difficult for tutors to engage with future events, if their recruitment was uncertain and late;
 - iii) tutors should be able to set up their own on-line tutorials, negotiating dates with their own groups, without intervention that required whole new IT systems and AL contracts.
- j) **Principle 10: Evaluation and sharing good practice**
 - i) the introduction of monitoring would help to highlight which students were engaging or not and to identify where the University might provide support. It should be noted that the benefits of group tuition included the fact that, like SSTs, it fostered a sense of belonging;
 - ii) concern was expressed as to how the data collected on student attendance at learning events would be used, specifically whether it might restrict what was made available to future presentations in a particular area based on the previous response. The PVC (LT) said that there would be multiple uses for the data; this issue would be one part of ongoing considerations;
 - iii) this principle should be the overriding one, as Principle 1 was obvious. The OU's research and evaluation should be disseminated first and then the University should consider the Principles.

11.7 Further comments were made about the **dependencies and next steps required for implementation:**

- a) IT systems development would not take place within a short timeframe (para 38 a). The current system provided tutor group timetables only, not ones for individual students. If all students were to sign up for multiple sessions, it would be very difficult to manage. A student member requested that sufficient resources be allocated to such development;
- b) the major split was between synchronous and asynchronous activity rather than between face-to-face and online (para 38 d). Synchronous activity had to be optional, but asynchronous activity could be designed into tuition and formative assessment. The integration of the two strands would solve the problems regarding the viability of forums. All would benefit and ALs should be involved in designing activities;
- c) the recognition of the need for AL development was welcome, as ALs were key to delivery (para 38 f). However, there should also be consideration of the development requirements of students;
- d) with reference to paragraph 39, clarification was necessary regarding the timescales for delivering the Principles. The implementation would have to be supported by IT, as well as by the realignment of ALs and SSTs. The Chief Information Officer (CIO) and the Director, Students were currently trying to align IT systems, so it might be possible to build in the necessary IT support at this stage.

11.8 With reference to C-2014-01-08 Appendix 2, a member asked whether rebranding 'tutorials' as 'learning events' would make any real difference to students. It was

important for the module team to make the purpose of a 'tutorial' clear. The PVC (LT) said that this was the rationale behind Principle 1.

- 11.9 A member commented that the increased use of mobile technology and social media, and the consequential need for tutors to provide support for peer collaboration, was not covered by the paper. Tutors should be better informed in order to provide appropriate guidance.
- 11.10 The PVC (LT) thanked members of the Senate for their helpful feedback, which had been noted. The consultation process would continue with different stakeholder groups in order to develop the Group Tuition Policy. It was unlikely that the Policy would meet all expectations and compromise would be necessary, but it was hoped that the University would eventually produce a Policy on which everyone could agree.

12 RESEARCH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY S-2014-01-09

- 12.1 The PVC (RSQ) said that the Policy had been updated after extensive consultation and had been recommended by the Research Committee for approval by the Senate.
- 12.2 A member commented that the text in the box said that the Policy had been updated 'to ensure that it is fit for purpose', which implied that it had not been so. It would be better to have said 'to ensure that it **remains** fit for purpose'.
- 12.3 Members raised the following queries:

- a) whether the IP Policy aligned with the terms and conditions for staff other than academics, visiting academics and research students, for example academic-related staff in the Library (para 5) The PVC (RSQ) said that the Policy should take into account the terms and conditions of all categories of staff and that he would ensure it was amended accordingly;

Action: PVC (RSQ)

- b) whether the reference to making other IP available could be strengthened by using the word 'will' instead of 'can' (para 6). The PVC (RSQ) said that the first principle was to protect IP; however, if the OU did not wish to protect the IP, then it will be made available;
- c) with reference to paragraph 4.3 a), what was considered to be 'a reasonable proportion of associated expenditure and fees'. The PVC (RSQ) said that this would be discussed in each case and any disagreement would go through the appeal process;
- d) whether the work undertaken by academic staff engaging with external organisations in their 20 days consulting allowance was covered by the Policy. The PVC (RSQ) said that the Policy would apply, but that he would ask the Enterprise and Knowledge Exchange Manager to contact the member to make sure that the policy would be workable regarding any case he had in mind.

Action: PVC (RSQ)

- 12.4 Members requested greater clarification in the following areas:

- a) the scope of the Policy (para 1.2), as many staff were engaged in scholarship activities not covered by the definition of the Research Excellence Framework (REF), for example through software and collaborative tools. There were now several policies covering scholarship and IP, which overlapped significantly. It should be clear that this Policy covered intellectual outputs not covered by the teaching policy. The PVC (RSQ) confirmed that the policy would be amended to

make it clear that it applied to IP that arose from all types of scholarship and which was not copyright in teaching activities;

- b) although it was explained in paragraph 6.5, the application of the banding regarding the apportionment of net IP licensing income required clarification in Table A (para 6.4), perhaps by placing paragraph 6.5 before the table

Action: PVC (RSQ)

12.5 A member commented that research was also undertaken by students who were sponsored by employers, so IP might also be produced in an undergraduate context. The PVC (RSQ) noted that current policy was that this IP lies with the student unless there was another agreement in force and agreed that the University might wish to amend the Policy in future.

12.6 The Senate **approved** the revised Research and Enterprise Intellectual Property Policy.

13 COMMITTEE MATTERS

S-2014-01-10

The Senate

- a) **approved** the recommendation for the constitutional change to the Honorary Degrees Committee (HDC) arising from the Annual Effectiveness Review (AER) (Appendix 1);
- b) **approved** the recommendations for the constitutional changes to the following committees:
- i) Curriculum Partnerships Committee (Appendix 2);
 - ii) Vocational Qualifications Committee (Appendix 3);
 - iii) Curriculum and Validation Committee (Appendix 4);
- b) **noted** the matters for report set out in paragraphs 14 and 18 of the paper.

14 RESEARCH CODE OF PRACTICE

S-2014-01-11

14.1 Referring to paragraph 3.1, second bullet, which proposed that a process be introduced whereby any proposal to collect data from more than 30 OU staff must be assessed by the Human Resources Staff Survey Group (HR SSG), a member commented that this was based on the premise that any data collected was 'survey' data. However, this was not always the case: some data was 'linguistic' data. Moreover, when such data was collected, staff might not know in advance the number of staff who might participate, as the intention was not to survey. It would be helpful if the policy referred specifically to 'the collection of **survey** data'.

14.2 Referring to paragraph 5.1m, first bullet, i), a member suggested that the wording be amended to 'being solely responsible for, or making a significant contribution to, the conception of the project, or **collection**, analysis and interpretation of the data on which the publication is based.'

14.3 The PVC (RSQ) agreed to incorporate these amendments.

Action: PVC (RSQ)

14.4 A member commented that the involvement of the HR SSG distanced researchers from the decision. The PVC (RSQ) replied that in the current policy the HR SSG had this

responsibility, but the revisions to the policy were relaxing this slightly. Such regulations were necessary for ethical practice and had been fully discussed at Research Committee.

- 14.5 A member asked whether the Student Research Project Panel, which gave approval to research that involved OU students or graduates, was referred to in the Code of Practice. The PVC (RSQ) thought that this was covered by the policy, but if not it would be added.

Action: PVC (RSQ)

- 14.6 The Senate **approved** the proposed amendments to the OU Code of Practice for Research.

15 BACHELOR DEGREES WITHOUT HONOURS

S-2014-01-12

- 15.1 A student member made the following comments:

- a) with reference to paragraph 4, more information, advice and guidance was required to ensure that students and employers understood the implications of accepting a degree without honours. The Director, Students said that he had extensive experience of addressing this issue with employers and this should not prove difficult;
- b) paragraph 7 acknowledged the possibility that the proposed changes could affect the standing of degrees without honours in the marketplace; yet there were many students who had taken such a qualification and would not want it to be devalued. Professor Peter Taylor responded that this approach would bring the OU into line with many other universities. Approximately 80% of students were studying on a named degree, which was not an Honours degree. The change should not affect the way in which these degrees were valued;
- c) some students would need evidence to confirm that they were a graduate (of a degree without honours). Such students might intend to continue in order to complete the degree with honours, but this was a bureaucratic process that would require the student to exit and then re-register. The PVC (A) said that there may be an issue with students returning to complete the BA with Honours, who were then classed as ELQ students.

Post-meeting Note

It has been confirmed post meeting that if a student exits with an ordinary degree as an exception they will be eligible for a loan for further study to get an honours degree.

- 15.2 The Senate:

- a) **noted** the background information to the proposal and an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the CVC held on 20 November 2013;
- b) **approved** the change to the Academic Framework.

16 MODULE REGULATIONS

S-2014-01-13

The Senate **approved** the revised Module Regulations 2014.

17 GENERAL QUALIFICATION REGULATIONS

S-2014-01-14

- 17.1 A member raised the following concerns:

- a) whether the language used in GQR 2.3.2 ii) (page 6), which referred to 'an award of higher level credit which has been counted down with the approval of the

Programme Director', would be clear to students. Moreover, as Programme Directors were not named, then it would be preferable to refer to 'a' Programme Director, rather than 'the' Programme Director';

- b) whether it would be clear what GQR 3.4.4 a) i) (page 8), which referred to being 'enrolled on the final module in a stage', meant in practice; the final module could be one of a number of different modules.

17.2 Professor Peter Taylor said that conversations had been taking place with a number of people about how best to advise students. It was thought that students should contact their SST, as the regulations were not the best place to put guidance. The member responded that students tended to read the regulations at the point of registration, so it was important for them to understand them at that point.

17.3 The Senate **approved** the revised General Qualification Regulations (Registered Undergraduate Qualifications).

18 STUDENT REGULATIONS

S-2014-01-15

18.1 A member requested clarification of OU 1.3 (page 3), which said that the Student Regulations might be changed 'at any time'. The Director, Students said that this regulation was intended to provide the University with the opportunity to change the regulations that apply to all students during their period of study, for example because there had been a regulatory body change. Otherwise, students might be subject to the regulations that were in force at the time they first registered, which could be up to 16 years previously. The University was obliged to give notice of any changes, but the intention was that the most recent set of regulations were the ones that should apply as a student progressed through their qualification from one year to the next.

18.2 The Senate **approved** the Student Regulations 2014 to take effect for all student registrations for modules and qualifications which start on or after 1 August 2014.

19 EMERITUS PROFESSORS

S-2014-01-16

The Senate :

- a) **approved** the recommendations from the Chair and Readership Subcommittee that the title Emeritus Professor was awarded to:
 - i) Professor Geoff Peters;
 - ii) Professor John Clarke;
 - iii) Professor Sue Himmelweit.
- b) **noted** that the Chair of the Senate took Chair's Action to approve on behalf of the Senate that the title of Emeritus Professor be awarded to:
 - i) Professor Trevor Herbert;
 - ii) Professor Jim Moore.
- c) **noted** that the Chair and Readership Subcommittee approved by correspondence the recommendation that the Senate award the title of Emeritus Professor to Professor Norman Clark, Faculty of Mathematics, and that the Chair of the Senate took Chair's Action to approve on behalf of the Senate that the title of Emeritus Professor be awarded to Professor Norman Clark.

- 20 RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK (REF) SUBMISSION S-2014-01-17**
- The Senate **noted** the report on the OU Research Excellence Framework (REF) Submission.
- 21 ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE REVIEW – PROGRESS REPORT S-2014-01-18**
- The Senate **noted** the report on the progress of the Academic Governance Review.
- 22 SENATE SUBSTRUCTURE – ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW S-2014-01-19**
- The Senate **noted** the report on the annual effectiveness reviews (AERs) (2012/13) for the Honorary Degrees Committee and the Faculty of Education and Language Studies.
- 23 FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE STUDIES S-2014-01-20**
- The Senate **noted**:
- a) a minor restructuring by which the Sport and Fitness team and the Working with Young People team (total 10 staff) moved from the Department of Education to the Department of Childhood, Youth and Sport, with effect from 1 August 2013;
 - b) a departmental name change in the Faculty of Education and Language Studies from the Centre for Childhood Development and Learning (ChDL) to the Department of Childhood, Youth and Sport, with effect from 1 August 2013.
- 24 THE COUNCIL S-2014-01-21**
- 24.1 Referring to paragraph 5, a member requested clarification on the issues around the IT security policy and the requirements of academic staff. The Vice-Chancellor responded that both internal and external audit had identified that the OU's IT security policy and procedures were not fit for purpose and were not protecting University data and networks sufficiently. Consequently, the Chief Information Officer (CIO) had been introducing acceptable standards to mitigate any risk. Great progress had been made in making the University more secure, but this had come at a price for some academic colleagues. Dialogue was continuing and the CIO would be reporting further on this issue to the Council.
- 24.2 The member commented that other universities had not experienced anything like the desktop optimization programme. The Vice-Chancellor responded that there were others that were surprised that the OU did not already have such security in place. The Government Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) had recently highlighted that higher education institutions (HEIs) were being specifically targeted by different types of hackers and had given notice that such institutions should take appropriate precautions. The cyber world could be hostile, and the security of the data held on students, staff and other stakeholders was extremely important to the OU's reputation.
- 24.3 The Senate **noted** the report on matters discussed at the meeting of the Council held on 26 November 2013.
- 25 ACTION BY THE CHAIR S-2014-01-22**
- The Senate **noted** the report on action taken by the Chair since the last meeting of the Senate.

26 FUTURE ITEMS OF BUSINESS**S-2014-01-23**

26.1 The Vice-Chancellor said that there was sufficient business to suggest that an April meeting of the Senate would be necessary and worthwhile. In response to a query from a member, the Director, Students agreed that an update on SSTs would be included on the agenda for the meetings in both April and June 2014.

26.2 The Senate:

- a) **noted** the potential items for the agenda for a Senate meeting on 2 April 2014;
- b) **agreed** that a meeting of the Senate should take place on 2 April 2014.

27 DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS

Meetings of the Senate will be held on the following dates:

- a) Wednesday 2 April 2014
- b) Wednesday 11 June 2014
- c) Wednesday 15 October 2014

28 GOODBYES AND THANKYOUS

28.1 On behalf of the Senate, the Director, Students thanked Lynda Brady, Director, Learner Support Services, who was leaving the OU to become Pro-Vice-Chancellor and University Secretary at Edge Hill University, for her contribution to the University.

28.2 The PVC (LT) also thanked Anne Howells, Director, Learning and Teaching Solutions, was retiring from the University, for her service to the OU. Unfortunately, Anne was currently unwell and had sent her apologies for the Senate meeting.

Alan Burrell
Acting Secretary to the Committee

Julie Tayler
Working Secretary to the Committee
Email: julie.tayler@open.ac.uk
Tel: 01908 3 32729

Attachments:

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| S-2014-01-M Appendix 1 | Honorary Degrees Committee |
| S-2014-01-M Appendix 2 | Curriculum Partnerships Committee |
| S-2014-01-M Appendix 3 | Vocational Qualifications Committee |
| S-2014-01-M Appendix 4 | Curriculum and Validation Committee |

Key:

| | |
|-----------|---|
| GT | Governance Team |
| PVC(A) | Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Professor Musa Mihsein |
| Dir, S | Director, Students, Keith Zimmerman |
| Dir, T&LS | Director, Teaching and Learner Support, Dr Christina Lloyd |
| PVC(RSQ) | Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Scholarship & Quality), Professor Tim Blackman |
| US | University Secretary |

HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 05.02.2014

Terms of Reference

Advising other governance bodies or management

To receive from members of the University and from accredited institutions nominations of persons thought worthy of the award of an Honorary Degree and, after scrutiny of such nominations, to recommend a shortlist for the consideration of the Senate.

Membership

1. The Vice-Chancellor, Chair, *ex officio*.
2. Five members of the Senate elected by the Senate, of whom at least one shall be a member of the professorial staff.
3. One member of the Validation Committee nominated by the Vice-Chancellor.
4. One other member, as from time to time the Vice-Chancellor may wish to appoint.

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall meet as and when required in accordance with the procedures agreed by the Senate for the award of Honorary Degrees.
2. The Chair shall have executive authority to act on its behalf in consultation with its Secretary. The Chair may appoint a deputy from amongst the committee membership to act as chair in the Chair's absence.
3. The Committee should act and be perceived to act impartially, and not be influenced in its role by members' social or business relationships.

Secretary

CURRICULUM PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 05.01.2014

Purpose

On behalf of the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC), to provide detailed scrutiny of proposals relating to curriculum partnerships, to approve amendments to existing partnership arrangements, to approve joint curriculum development partnerships and to make recommendations to the CVC on the approval of the introduction or closure of curriculum partnerships leading to an award of the University.

Terms of Reference

Legislation: setting policy and strategy frameworks, agreeing plans and priorities

1. To approve amendments and extensions to existing curriculum partnerships, where they lead to a direct award of the University.
2. To approve, in consultation as appropriate with the Qualifications Committee, the introduction and closure of collaborative credit agreements with other institutions.
3. To approve the introduction and closure of joint curriculum development partnerships.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

4. To monitor and review established curriculum partnerships under regular review, particularly through the annual monitoring process, working in consultation as appropriate with the Open University Worldwide Board of Directors, Validation Committee, and referring any major issues arising from the reports to the CVC.
5. To monitor the use of Open University modules by other organisations, especially those involving 'licensing' arrangements, in programmes leading to the awards of other institutions, both in the United Kingdom and elsewhere.
6. To monitor the demand for collaborative credit schemes with other institutions and to receive an annual report on the number of awards of credit made under each arrangement.
7. To monitor and review the effective operation of credit rating arrangements.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

8. To maintain and monitor the University's procedures and processes for curriculum partnerships, with reference to the current guidance from the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and to determine the institutional policy guidelines, good practice and enhancement within which areas of the University should operate when embarking upon new curriculum partnerships, managing existing partnerships, or terminating partnerships.
9. To ensure, in consultation as appropriate with the Qualifications Committee and the Assessment Policy Committee, that the curriculum and qualifications-related aspects of collaborative provision satisfy the University's own quality assurance requirements and those of appropriate national and international agencies.

10. To ensure that proposals for new collaborative partnerships involving the use of the University's curriculum have been properly appraised, and that they carry the endorsement of the relevant faculty committee and (in the case of international partnerships) of the OU Worldwide Board of Directors.

Advising other governance bodies or management

11. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the introduction of new curriculum partnerships leading to an award of the University, taking into account the QAA requirements relating to collaborative provision, and to make recommendations to the CVC on the approval of such partnerships and their quality and contractual frameworks.
12. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the closure of a curriculum partnership leading to an award of the University, ensuring that commitments to continuing students are protected by the partners to the completion of their studies, and to make recommendations to CVC on the closure of the partnership.

Making governance arrangements e.g. appointing to other committees

13. To nominate a member of the Committee to serve on the Validation Committee.

Membership

1. A Chair appointed by the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
2. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) or nominee.
3. One associate dean or equivalent with a relevant portfolio from each central academic unit (or the dean/director's nominee if no suitable portfolio exists).
4. The Director, Global Partnerships, Business Development Unit or nominee.
5. The Director of Academic Planning and Resources or nominee.
6. The Head of Quality.
7. The Director of Assessment, Credit and Qualifications, or nominee.
8. The Director of the Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships or nominee.
9. One registered student appointed by the Open University Students' Association.
10. One associate lecturer appointed by the Associate Lecturers Executive.
11. One member of the Validation Committee, nominated by that Committee.
12. One member of the Research Degrees Committee who is a members of the Affiliated Research Centre Management Group, nominated by the Research Degrees Committee.
13. Up to two members co-opted by the Committee, with expertise as necessary in either or both Scotland, Ireland and Wales and collaborative provision, if not otherwise elected or nominated.

Secretary

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall meet as and when required, and shall report at least annually to the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
 2. The Chair of the Committee shall have executive authority to act on its behalf in consultation with its Secretary to recommend proposals for approval by the Curriculum and Validation Committee, where a scheme fits identically with an existing model.
 3. The Chair of the Committee shall have executive authority to act on its behalf in consultation with a sub group of Committee members, to recommend new schemes of collaboration for approval by the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
-

VOCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 05.02.2014

Purpose

On behalf of the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC), to provide detailed scrutiny of proposals relating to vocational qualifications and to make recommendations to the CVC on the approval and withdrawal of new centres; to approve the operating framework that supports the Open University Awarding Body (OUAB) and to approve the introduction or withdrawal of vocational qualifications leading to an award of the University.

Legislation: setting policy and strategy frameworks, agreeing plans and priorities

1. To approve the operating framework that supports the OUAB.
2. To approve the assessment of learner claims for credit and the granting of credit for prior learning following scrutiny of claims by centres.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

3. To monitor and review established centres and qualifications, particularly through the annual monitoring process, and refer any major issues arising from the annual process to the CVC.
4. To monitor the OUAB Contingency Plan/Risk Register on a regular basis.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

5. To receive external verifier reports and consider general assessment-related matters raised within the reports.
6. To receive regular reports from OUAB on centres' compliance with the requirements on the use of the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) and other logos and agree any action to be taken in light of any non-compliance with requirements.
7. To receive reports from the Responsible Officer on the outcomes of learner appeals and complaints to OUAB and cases of academic misconduct.
8. To receive reports from the Responsible Officer relating to cases of malpractice and maladministration within centres and agree action to be taken.
9. To maintain and monitor the awarding body's procedures and processes for vocational qualifications, with reference to current guidance from Ofqual, ensuring that appropriate quality assurance processes are in place for all vocational qualifications approval and assessment activity.
10. To maintain and monitor the awarding body's qualification approval and assessment processes, ensuring that the University's own quality assurance requirements and those of appropriate agencies, such as Ofqual, are satisfied.

11. To maintain and monitor conditions and recommendations made during the approval or review of qualifications and centres referring major issues to the CVC as appropriate.
12. To maintain and monitor a Self-Evaluation document and make recommendations on the document to the CVC.
13. To keep under review the awarding body's operating framework, having regard to the external environment for vocational qualifications.

Advising other governance bodies or management

14. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the introduction, review or closure of centres, taking account of Ofqual requirements relating to vocational qualifications, and to make recommendations to the CVC on the approval of such centres.
15. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the introduction or closure of vocational qualifications leading to an award of the University, taking account of Ofqual requirements relating to vocational qualifications, and to make recommendations to Ofqual on the approval of such qualifications.

Matter of public record, eg ratifying appointments of staff or external examiners

16. To approve the appointment of an external verifier for each qualification or for each group of cognate qualifications offered by a centre.

Judicial: deciding individual cases

17. To approve the progression of learners and the conferment of units and qualifications, including aegrotat awards, following the consideration of assessment reports, including reports from external verifiers.

Membership

1. A Chair appointed by the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
2. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or nominee.
3. The Director, Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships (CICP) or nominee.
4. The OUAB Responsible Officer.
5. The Director of Assessment, Credit and Qualifications or nominee.
6. The Director of the Business Development Unit (BDU) or nominee.
7. Up to five members drawn from staff in The Open University.
6. Up to three members drawn from industry, commerce, appropriate professions and other organisations having experience in delivering and/or quality assurance of vocational qualifications.

Secretary appointed by the Director, CICP

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall meet three times a year and shall report three times annually to the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
 2. The Chair of the Committee shall have executive authority to act on behalf of the Committee in consultation with its Secretary and the Responsible Officer.
-

CURRICULUM AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 05.02.2014

Purpose

The Curriculum and Validation Committee is responsible to the Senate for strategy, policy and standards relating to curriculum and qualifications, including collaborative offerings, and associated and partner institutions; for monitoring the delivery and review in respect of qualifications based on occupational standards and to monitor the framework for the approval of qualifications of this type. It has delegated powers to approve assessment policy.

Terms of Reference

Legislation: setting policy and strategy frameworks, agreeing plans and priorities

1. To promote the strategic objectives and priorities relating to the University's curriculum in consultation with central academic unit committees, and to recommend the strategy to the Senate for approval.
2. To determine frameworks and guidelines to achieve the agreed strategic objectives and priorities, for the examination assessment and classification of qualifications which involve taught modules (with the exception of research degrees and higher doctorates) acting on advice from the Learning Teaching and Student Support Committee where necessary.
3. To monitor and review the curriculum aspects of central academic unit plans, encouraging collaboration between central academic units and sub-units in their curriculum planning and development activities and setting the overarching terms of reference for the programme committees reporting to the central academic unit committees.
4. To delegate to the Qualifications Committee the approval of the introduction of all standard qualifications and their regulations, the approval of the withdrawal of all qualifications and their associated amended regulations, and the approval of amendments to existing qualifications and their regulations, where these conform with the University's Qualifications Framework and other existing policies, and to make recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.
5. To delegate to the Qualifications Committee the approval of new modules and packs recommending the frameworks and guidelines to the Senate for approval.
6. To approve the introduction of new non standard qualifications and their regulations, where these are referred to it by Qualifications Committee, where these conform with the University's Qualifications Framework and other existing policies, and to make recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.
7. To formulate and interpret regulations that apply to the qualifications of the University generally.
8. To approve, on the advice of the Curriculum Partnerships Committee, the introduction of partnerships, leading to an award of the University, and their quality and contractual frameworks and the closure of existing partnerships, and to make recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.

9. To approve, on the advice of the Validation Committee, partner or associate status for institutions, the terms of their approval, and where appropriate, the termination of their approval and to make recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.
10. To interpret and approve exceptions to the policies and regulations relating to examinations and assessment and qualifications.
11. To delegate to the Vocational Qualifications Committee the approval of the operating framework that supports the Open University Awarding Body (OUAB); and the approval of the introduction or withdrawal of vocational qualifications leading to an award of the University.
12. To approve, on the advice of the Vocational Qualifications Committee, the approval and withdrawal of new centres offering vocational qualifications.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

13. To monitor the implementation of policy on all matters within the Committee's remit, including collaborative arrangements, and to ensure that activities are monitored against the standards set.
14. To monitor the annual review of qualifications, the annual review of curriculum partnerships and institutional partnerships, and the annual review of established centres and vocational qualifications to identify areas of the University's curriculum and qualifications structure requiring attention or development, and to draw these to the notice of appropriate officers and committees for review or development activities as appropriate.
15. To contribute to the Senate's annual academic review of the University.

Assuring Quality and Standards, including approving regulations

16. To ensure that standards are set for the qualifications, modules and assessment offered by the University, that they are consistent in standard and are compatible with those offered by other UK HEIs, that they support recognition by other organisations, and that they are in alignment with national and international qualification frameworks.
17. To approve recommendations for the recognition and inclusion in the qualifications of the University of modules and periods of study undertaken under the auspices both of the University and of other institutions.
18. To maintain and monitor the University's procedures for the monitoring and review of University qualifications based on occupational standards, ensuring that they are consistent and comparable to those awarded by other awarding bodies throughout the United Kingdom.

Advising other governance bodies or management

19. To advise relevant areas of the University of significant market opportunities which the market may present, in order to inform University strategy.
20. To advise the Senate on the introduction or withdrawal of specific categories of qualification.

21. To report to the Senate of new partnerships and new approved institutions (including refusal to approve) or any changes in the status of approval.

Making governance arrangements e.g. appointing to other committees

None

Matters of public record e.g. ratifying appointments of staff or external examiners

None

Judicial: deciding individual cases

None

Membership

1. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Chair, *ex officio*.
2. The deans of faculties or their nominees, and the Director of the Institute of Educational Technology or his/her nominee, *ex officio*.
3. The chairs of any committees reporting to the Committee.
4. The Director of Assessment Credit and Qualifications or nominee, *ex officio*.
5. One nominee of the Commercial Director, *ex officio*.
6. The Director of the Centre for Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships, or nominee, *ex officio*.
7. One nominee of the Director, Students.
8. One nominee of the Director of Marketing.
9. Four members of staff, elected by the Senate, of whom at least two shall be members of the central academic staff.
10. Two associate lecturers appointed by the Associate Lecturers Executive.
11. Two registered students appointed by the Open University Students' Association.
12. Four external members. These may be drawn from the following bodies: the University's partner institutions, external members of the Validation Committee, employers who are University partners, or external assessors. Members in this category are to be appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic) on the recommendation of University officers.
13. Such others as the Committee may co-opt up to a maximum of three, to include members with expertise as necessary in HE issues in Scotland, Ireland and Wales, if not otherwise elected or nominated.

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall meet in accordance with the University's Committee Timetable, not less than three times a year, and on such other occasions in the year as have been approved by the Senate. It shall report to each meeting of the Senate.
 2. It shall be permitted to delegate tasks to a duly constituted executive committee or committees of itself; or to specific individuals; and may make rules relating to its own procedure, but should not further delegate powers delegated by the Senate without the Senate's agreement.
 3. The Committee should designate a Deputy Chair. The Chair shall have executive authority to act on behalf of the Committee and any of its executive committees, in consultation with anybody designated to assist in this capacity by the Committee.
 4. The Committee shall review each year according to agreed University criteria how efficiently, effectively and economically it is working in respect of participation, the conduct of business and production of high quality decisions, the schedule of the review to allow for implementation of improvements from the beginning of the next committee year.
 5. The Committee shall ensure that strategies, policies plans and priorities within its remit are compliant with relevant University-wide policies implemented or being developed, particularly those relating to equal opportunities, environmental management and health and safety.
 6. The Chair shall have executive authority to act on the Committee's behalf, in consultation with the Secretary.
-