

THE SENATE

Minutes

This paper presents the confirmed Minutes of the last meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 27 January 2016 at The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes.

The Senate **approved** these Minutes as a correct record of the meeting on Wednesday 13 April 2016, subject to an amendment to Minute 10.5.

Keith Zimmerman
University Secretary

Sue Thomas
Working Secretary to the Senate
Email: sue.thomas@open.ac.uk
Tel: 01908 655083

THE SENATE

Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 27 January 2016 at 2.00pm
in the Hub Theatre, The Open University, Walton Hall

PRESENT:

1) Ex officio

Mr Peter Horrocks, Vice-Chancellor
Professor Belinda Tynan, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning Innovation)
Professor Kevin Hetherington, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Academic Strategy)
Professor Richard Brown, Interim Executive Dean, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Professor Mary Kellett, Interim Executive Dean, Faculty of Education and Language
Studies and Health and Social Care
Professor Anne De Roeck, Interim Executive Dean, Faculty of Science and Mathematics,
Computing and Technology
Professor Rebecca Taylor, Dean, Faculty of Business and Law
Mr Jeremy Roche, Dean, Faculty of Education and Language Studies and Health and
Social Care
Professor Hazel Rymer, Dean, Faculty of Science and Mathematics, Computing and
Technology
Dr Christina Lloyd, Director, Academic Services (Interim)
Professor Patrick McAndrew, Director of the Institute of Educational Technology
Mrs Nicky Whitsed, Director, Library Services

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Faculty of Arts

Professor Ole Grell
Professor Graham Harvey
Dr Lynda Prescott

Professor John Wolffe
Dr Cristina Chimisso
Dr Naoko Yamagata

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Troy Cooper
Mr Matt Staples
Dr Jovan Byford

Dr Deborah Drake
Dr Helen Kaye

Faculty of Education and Language Studies and Health and Social Care

Faculty of Education and Language Studies (FELS)

Dr Tim Lewis
Dr Elodie Vialleton
Mrs Annie Eardley

Professor Regine Hampel
Dr Indra Sinka

Faculty of Health and Social Care

Mrs Sue Cole
Dr Verina Waights

Professor Jan Draper
Mr Mick McCormick

Dr Mary Twomey

Faculty of Science and Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Faculty of Science

Professor Monica Grady

Dr Arlène Hunter

Dr Claire Turner

Dr John Baxter

Dr Janet Haresnape

Professor Hilary MacQueen

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Dr Leonor Barroca

Ms Maggie Holland

Dr Tony Nixon

Dr Hayley Ryder

Dr David Bowers

Dr Rachel Hilliam

Professor Andy Lane

Dr Toby O'Neil

Mr Brendan Quinn

Dr Magnus Ramage

Faculty of Business & Law

Ms Carmel McMahon

Dr Sharon Slade

Miss Carol Howells

Dr Kristen Reid

Mr Mike Phillips

Institute of Educational Technology

Dr Anne Adams

Mr Chris Edwards

Professor Eileen Scanlon

3) Associate Lecturers

Mrs Frances Chetwynd

Dr Clare Spencer

Dr Tim Parry

Dr Tricia French

Dr Linda Walker

Dr Fiona Aiken

Mr Gary Clifford (alternate)

4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association

Miss Ruth Tudor

Mr Josh Brumpton

Ms Alison Kingan (alternate)

Mr John Murphy

Mrs Nicola Simpson

Dr Barbara Tarling

5) Academic-related Staff

Dr Donna Smith

Mr Jake Yeo

Ms Pat Atkins

Ms Clare Riding

Mr Phil Berry

Dr Victoria Crowe

Mr David Smith

Mr Mike Innes

Mr Michael Street

Mrs Joanne Smythe

Mr Simon Horrocks

Mr Billy Khokhar

Miss Barbara Poniatowska

6) Co-opted members

Dr David Knight

Professor John Domingue

Mr Rob Humphreys

Mr John D'Arcy

Ms Susan Stewart

In attendance

Mr Keith Zimmerman, University Secretary

Mrs Dawn Turpin, Head of Governance

Ms Sue Thomas, Senior Manager, Governance

Miss Teresa Coyle, Manager, Governance

Observing

Mr Lucian Hudson, Director of Communications

Ms Kathryn Baldwin, Vice-Chancellor's Business Manager

APOLOGIES:

Appointed

1) Ex officio

Mr Chris Rooke, Director, Learning and Teaching Solutions

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Anastasia Economou

Dr Catriona Havard

Faculty of Education and Language Studies (FELS)

Dr Uwe Baumann

Dr Jane Cullen

Faculty of Science

Professor David Rothery

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Dr Peter Robbins

Other Central Units

Dr Liz Marr

3) Associate Lecturers

Dr Robert Johnston

4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association

Mr David Humble

6) Co-opted members

Mr Christopher Goscomb

In attendance

Mr Andrew Law

1 WELCOME AND THANK YOU

- 1.1 The Vice-Chancellor, Mr Peter Horrocks, welcomed the following members to the Senate:

Dr Verina Waights, Faculty of Health and Social Care
Ms Susan Stewart, Director, Scotland
Mr Gary Clifford, Associate Lecturer (attending as a deputy)
Ms Alison Kingan, OU Students Association (attending as a deputy)

- 1.2 The following member participated in the meeting remotely:
Professor Eileen Scanlon, Institute of Educational Technology
- 1.3 The Vice-Chancellor thanked Ms Maggie Holland, MCT, who was retiring from the University, for her contribution to the Senate.

2 MINUTES

S-2015-05-M

The Senate **approved** the minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2015 (as amended) as a correct record of the meeting.

3 MATTERS ARISING

S-2016-01-01

The Senate **noted** the responses to the matters arising from the minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 14 October 2015 (S-2015-05) that were not dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

4 REPORT FROM AND QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR

QAA Higher Education Review

- 4.1 The Vice-Chancellor drew attention to the paper on the agenda which gave details of the indicative key findings from the University's Higher Education Review, conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) for Higher Education in December 2016. The indicative results were very positive and Mr Horrocks thanked the Quality Office team and all those who had participated in the Review. The report will be published on 11 March 2016 so the results remained confidential until then. An action plan would be compiled to take forward actions identified by the QAA.

Civil Service Learning contract

- 4.2 Mr Horrocks announced that as part of a consortium with other suppliers, the University had acquired a contract to provide learning programmes for 440,000 civil servants from March 2016. The project had involved colleagues from the Business Development Unit, Faculty of Business and Law, and Learning and Teaching Solutions and was a key part of the University's strategy to increase commercial income to satisfy its mission.

Locations Analysis

- 4.3 Mr Horrocks acknowledged the concerns of staff following the decision by the Council on 24 November 2015 to approve the recommendation to reconfigure University services in the national and regional offices. He explained that he would reflect on those concerns but he encouraged the Senate to focus its discussion on moving forward.

Role of Senate

- 4.4 The Vice-Chancellor explained that he wanted the Senate to play a more proactive role in setting policy and practice. He intended to be more direct and share more information with members about strategy and performance, and be more open on the challenges facing the University. Examples of this new approach would be the discussions of the Academic

Performance Report (S-2016-01-08) and the University Strategy (S-2016-01-07). He also hoped that the new seating configuration would be part of a renewed commitment to come together as colleagues who shared the desire for the University to be successful.

Group Tuition Policy: Adjustments

- 4.5 The Senate was informed that having considered feedback from staff and particularly from associate lecturers (ALs) the introduction of the Group Tuition Policy would be phased with implementation focussing initially on modules identified in Faculty Plans. Mr Horrocks explained that the phasing had been discussed with representatives of the OU Students Association and further details would be issued shortly.

5 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE S-2016-01-02

- 5.1 A member commented that at the time of the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee, the outcome of the Government's Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) was not known. He asked what impact the Review had on the University's strategy once it had been announced. The Vice-Chancellor commented that the outcome of the Review had not been as extreme as had originally been feared. The Student Opportunity Fund was being refocused and reduced by up to 50% (a loss of circa £16 million to the University) but this reduction was being phased and the University was seeking to influence the ways in which the Fund would be refocussed. Positive outcomes had been the extension of student loans for postgraduate study for those aged 30-60 and the relaxation of the restriction on those studying equivalent or lower qualifications (ELQs) in STEM (Science, Technology and Mathematics) subjects. Mr Horrocks commented that the full impact of the CSR on the University was likely therefore to have a delayed effect.
- 5.2 The member commented that as the Locations Analysis project progressed, the likely outcomes of the CSR had been referred to as reasons for the project's recommendations. The Vice-Chancellor assured the Senate that the University had robust finances and the case for the location changes was driven by a desire to prioritise services to students.
- 5.3 The Senate **noted** the unconfirmed Minutes and Confidential Minutes from the meeting held on 4 November 2015.

6 ACADEMIC QUALITY AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE S-2016-01-03 A&B

- 6.1 An AL representative drew attention to minute 6.3 and enquired why ALs were not represented on the Academic Quality and Governance Committee. The Chair of the Committee, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Academic Strategy) agreed to consider the issue.

Action: PVC (RAS) and Governance Team

- 6.2 The Senate **noted** the minutes of the meeting of the Academic Quality and Governance Committee held on 15 October 2015.

7 EDUCATION COMMITTEE S-2016-01-04

The Senate **noted** the minutes of the meeting of the Education Committee held on 10 November 2015.

8 RESEARCH COMMITTEE

S-2016-01-06 A&B

The Senate **noted** the minutes of the meetings of the Research Committee held by correspondence between 23 and 29 September 2015 and held on 11 November 2015.

9 LOCATIONS ANALYSIS

S-2016-01-06 A&B

S-2016-01-06 A: Locations Analysis Project Implementation: Student Recruitment and Support Centres

- 9.1 The University Secretary reported to the Senate that on 24 November 2015 the Council approved the recommendation from the Locations Analysis Project to reconfigure University services in the national and regional offices. As part of the implementation work, a programme team has been established led by Mr D Matthewman, Chief Operating Officer. A comprehensive governance structure had been established with membership at each level from across the University, including each faculty and the OU Students Association. Mr Zimmerman reported that more detailed implementation planning was ongoing, including a thorough review of the time allowed for knowledge transfer, recruitment, training and 'parallel' running. The team was also exploring options in response to the request from the Council to review the timetable with a view to shortening it from the three years described in the draft plan presented in November. The results of this planning process would be shared with affected staff in the next two weeks, then with the University. Work was also proceeding with the development of Target Operating Models for academic and student services to be delivered from the three remaining locations. Planning and dissemination of this work were following very similar processes and timescales.
- 9.2 The programme had been renamed the Student Recruitment and Support Centres Programme (SRSC). The change reflected the critical role the Locations Programme would play in implementing the new operating models for the future delivery of academic and student services.
- 9.3 Mr Zimmerman drew attention to paragraphs 19-22 of the paper which set out a response from the Interim Executive Deans to part (c) of the motion before Senate in paper S-2016-01-06B. He suggested comments were taken on this section during consideration of the motion itself.
- 9.4 The Dean, Faculty Health and Social Care commented that it was vital for the University not to lose sight of issues affecting colleagues who were adversely affected by the implementation plans and to ensure they received appropriate support. The Interim Executive Dean of the Faculty of Education and Language Studies and Health and Social Care (HSC) assured the Senate that such issues were being discussed in Faculties as work progressed with implementation plans.
- 9.5 A member drew attention to the reference in the paper to the Council considering the provisional implementation timeline of three years too long and requesting a review. She commented that the minutes of the meeting of the Council of 24 November 2015 did not record a formal request to review the timetable and she believed that the longer timetable allowed time to mitigate against the risks identified. The University Secretary explained that the programme team was asked to undertake further, more detailed implementation planning, which took into account the Council's request to review the implementation schedule. Another member commented that decisions acted upon after a Committee meeting must be those of the whole committee and not reflect the views of individual members. He expressed his concern that following the meeting of the Council, staff morale

was very low and staff were already leaving. He was also concerned that the needs of those staff remaining in post were not being met.

- 9.6 The University Secretary reiterated that the Council was acting within its responsibilities and authority by asking the University to review the implementation timescales. The University had responded to that request and any decisions taken to alter the timetable would be taken by the project governance structure. Another member asked for further information on how the decisions were taken to increase the rate of the proposed changes as there were numerous implications to consider. He was concerned that such decisions had been made outside of formal governance and requested more transparency. The Vice-Chancellor suggested that points of this nature be covered in the discussion of the motion before the Senate.
- 9.7 The Interim Executive Dean Faculty of Maths, Computing and Technology and Science, acknowledged that a number of issues were arising from the implementation plans and also drew attention to paragraphs 19-22 of the paper which set out a proposed mechanism for Senate members of their faculties to be explicitly included as part of the Review Team being established in each Faculty.
- 9.8 The Senate **noted** the update on implementation of the Locations Analysis and the recommendation on the approach to academic engagement being proposed by the Executive Deans.

S-2016-01-06-B: Locations Analysis

- 9.9 Professor J Wolffe proposed the motion which stated:

The Senate:

- a) Notes the recent decision of the Council, notwithstanding the Senate's advice, to approve the locations recommendations and the consequent widespread anger, demoralisation and distrust among the Open University's academic community;
- b) Strongly urges the Vice-Chancellor to take prompt action to restore confidence in leadership and governance, and in particular to provide Senate with a clear and delineated vision statement of the benefits of reconfiguration for the core business of learning, teaching and student support;
- c) Sets up a Senate working group, which is to be regularly consulted on the implementation of the locations decision, to advise on the mitigation of risks to academic quality and standards. (It will be comprised of members of the Senate in the same membership categories and ratios as the Senate itself and appointed by the Chair of the working group.)

- 9.10 The motion was seconded by Dr T O Neill.

- 9.11 Professor Wolffe explained that in part (a) the motion asked the Senate to register its legitimate concerns over the decision taken by the Council at its meeting in November 2015. It also reflected in part (b) the concerns of staff over the rationale of the decision taken and emphasised the importance of rebuilding trust and confidence, and providing reassurance to the Senate that its concerns would be taken seriously. In part (c) the motion proposed a means to establish a forward-looking framework to move ahead in a cohesive way.

9.12 Professor Wolffe acknowledged the work already carried out in respect of this part of the motion as set out in the previous paper (S-2016-01-06A) and indicated he was prepared amend the motion to reflect this, by deleting the text in brackets in part (c) to read:

- (c) Sets up a Senate working group, which is to be regularly consulted on the implementation of the locations decision, to advise on the mitigation of risks to academic quality and standards.

However he considered there still to be a role for a University-wide group to consider collective concerns. The Vice-Chancellor commented that he would consider ways to provide the Senate with the information and reassurance it required.

9.13 An AL representative expressed concern that the Review Teams being established in each Faculty did not include representation of ALs. The University Secretary explained that if the Executive Deans' proposal (in paragraphs 19-22) was agreed, the membership of the Review Teams would be considered in detail and would include representatives of associate lecturers.

9.14 The President of the OU Students Association commented that many student representatives already had a significant workload so consideration would need to be given as to how they could contribute to the implementation proposals.

9.15 Another member expressed her support for the motion. She accepted the role of the Faculty Review Teams but emphasised the potential role a Senate-based group could play in considering wider issues pertinent across faculties. Another member supported the motion and believed that a Senate Group could take a more independent view of issues and help to restore trust and confidence amongst staff. Another member commented that a Senate Group could have an enriching effect on the implementation work by encouraging cross-Faculty co-operation. He felt that OU Students Association members should be encouraged to participate via electronic means rather than necessarily attending in person.

9.16 The Interim Executive Dean, Faculty of Education and Language Studies and Health and Social Care explained that the proposal in the paper from the Executive Deans was a means of setting up an inclusive mechanism that could respond to colleagues quickly as cross-Faculty groups did not have that agility. The Interim Executive Dean, Faculty of Maths, Computing and Technology and Science commented that the Review Groups would have clear terms of reference and Senate members would have the opportunity to be involved in decision making within their Faculties.

9.17 A member reflected that a number of issues required a cross-University perspective such as conditions for staff classified as home workers, effects on the student experience, delivery of the curriculum and standards of quality. She did not consider that the Senate met sufficiently frequently to take decisions on such issues so felt establishment of a Senate Group was an important way forward. She also queried whether there might be a conflict of interest if Interim Executive Deans who were members of the Vice-Chancellor's Executive chaired the Faculty Groups.

9.18 The University Secretary welcomed the helpful comments from members. He assured the Senate that every effort would be made to work through all levels of management and governance to ensure engagement with faculties and the Senate.

9.19 The motion as amended in minute 9.12 was **carried**.

10 STUDENTS FIRST STRATEGY

S-2016-01-07

- 10.1 The Vice-Chancellor explained that a number of opportunities were forthcoming for all staff to engage in the development of the strategy. Workshops were planned in Faculties and also across the University to identify issues and share creativity and innovation. The vision statement that had been shared with the Senate in November 2015 had been refined as a result of feedback and there was now more focus on increasing the numbers of students who successfully complete a qualification. That would encompass the recruitment of more students, their success with their chosen qualifications and also consideration of qualifications below degree level whilst maintaining academic standards. Mr Horrocks drew attention to the “enablers” identified in the strategy and explained these were critical to the University’s success. He believed that the University needed to be more ambitious in recruiting students and supporting them to succeed in their aims and that would lead to income generation and become a driver for the focus of activity and resource allocation.
- 10.2 A member requested that reference to the University’s research programmes be included in the vision and strategy. Research activity was an important way to demonstrate the impact of the University’s activities on the economy and society and the outputs influenced the University’s teaching. Another member commented that the references to the University’s contributions to social justice had been lost from the vision and the references to “impact” could have negative connotations. She acknowledged that reference to life-changing learning in the vision was significant but she felt the reference to high-quality university education was important to maintain. Another member added that the vision appeared too exclusively linked to teaching activities and she urged further consideration.
- 10.3 A representative of the OU Students Association supported the vision and in particular the aim of more students qualifying and the provision of different types of qualifications. She suggested that the University reflect upon students’ own views of their success as this could incorporate a number of different aspirations. The Vice-Chancellor commented that the University was currently initiating work to examine students’ study aims and goals as it acknowledged this was a very important area to understand.
- 10.4 Another member enquired how the new structures being implemented following the Locations Analysis Project would help more students to qualify compared to the structures in place at present. The Vice-Chancellor emphasised that the strategy centred on having clear criteria for success and overall visions to drive the University forward.
- 10.5 The Director of the OU in Wales supported the vision and strategy though suggested the University incorporated some flexibility in its definitions of qualifications to acknowledge the different definitions used by the different UK funding bodies.
- 10.6 Another member supported the concept of striving for academic excellence but questioned what was understood by it as interpretations varied across the higher education sector. She believed it could reflect a number of themes including, for example, the student experience and teaching materials. The University Secretary commented that consideration also had to be given to how research activity was reflected in academic excellence.
- 10.7 The Vice-Chancellor proposed that another session be arranged for Senate members to discuss the strategy in detail.
- 10.8 The Senate **noted** the report.

11 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE REPORT

S-2016-01-08

- 11.1 The Vice-Chancellor introduced the report and emphasised that it presented a set of draft key performance indicators for the Senate to monitor the University's academic performance. These were being presented in this form to provide an opportunity for Senate to consider the type of information that might be required to meet its needs. These would be informed by the University's emerging Strategy and the Academic Strategy and so were likely to change. Mr Horrocks invited members to indicate which slide they wished discussion to focus upon and slide 3, retention of students on modules was chosen for discussion.
- 11.2 An AL representative commented that the definitions of engagement in the slide were not representative of the full range of engagement students might have with the University. It excluded types of engagement such as contact between an AL and a student and she requested that a broader definition of engagement be used. Another member enquired whether use of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) was included within the definition of engagement on the slide. She was concerned that the Senate was not clear over the information it was being asked to consider. Another member explained that she had sought clarification and the data included students who had been withdrawn by the University to avoid incurring fees as they had not engaged with any study.
- 11.3 A member expressed his support for increasing personalised support for students to improve levels of engagement. He felt that the University should consider creating a single point of contact for students, such as a personal tutor, and move away from standardised emails and calls. Another member commented that the University should concentrate its efforts on ensuring students started their studies at an appropriate level and this would improve retention rates. The Vice-Chancellor commented that the Student Success Project and Student Seamless Journey were considering a number of the points raised and would be reporting shortly.
- 11.4 The Vice-Chancellor requested that any further comments on the Performance Report should be sent to him or colleagues in the Strategy Unit.

Tea break

12 ACADEMIC STRATEGY

S-2016-01-09

- 12.1 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Academic Strategy) introduced the paper and explained that the University intended to introduce an Academic Strategy as part of delivering the University Strategy. The Academic Strategy would draw together and refresh existing strategies within the context of the new University strategic plan and vision, and establish a framework to enable and facilitate academic activity across the new Faculties and professional services units. The Strategy would also be externally focussed to reflect an increasingly competitive external environment and changing expectations from students. It was intended that the Academic Strategy would be presented to the Senate in June 2016 for approval and then discussed at Strategy Week in October 2016 to identify the priority areas for the University for 2017/2018. This would provide the framework for the business planning process for the new Faculties for 2017/2018 that would start in November 2016.
- 12.2 The Dean and Director of Studies, Faculty of Science and MCT explained that the Academic Strategy would also define academic excellence and examine how this would be sustained and delivered. It would capture the academic identity of the University and enable it to develop as a thriving institution.

- 12.3 A member enquired how the strategy would work alongside the increasing amount of vocational curriculum offered by the University. A representative of the OU Students Association requested that an examination of students' individual study goals should be included within the work of the project. Another OU Students Association member asked that students be involved in the project.
- 12.4 The University Secretary considered that work on defining the academic strategy would be a valuable opportunity for the University to define academic excellence and communicate this widely and ultimately benefit the student experience. He commented that the role of vocational provision would be identified in the institutional strategy and confirmed that representatives of the OU Students Association and ALs would be invited to join the project steering group.
- 12.5 The Senate **noted** the proposed scope and approach to developing and delivering an Open University Academic Strategy.

13 FACULTY CONFIGURATION:

Academic Organisation

S-2016-01-10

- 13.1 The Interim Executive Dean, Faculty of Science and MCT introduced the paper and explained that the Senate was being asked to consider three specific elements of academic organisation:
- (a) the establishment of Schools in the new Faculties bringing together aligned disciplines under a Head of School,
 - (b) the transfer of the Development Policy and Practice Group to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences from Faculty of Mathematics Computing and Technology, and
 - (c) a recommendation to the Council for amendments to the appointment procedures for professorial staff to allow for an Executive Dean to chair professorial appointment committees and ensure the procedure reflected current practice.
- 13.2 A member asked for clarification on the differences in roles between a proposed Head of School and a current Head of Department. Professor De Roeck confirmed that a Head of School would be seen as equivalent to a Dean of a Faculty. Appointments would be made using processes aligned to those currently used for the appointment of Deans.
- 13.3 A member sought clarification of the approvals being requested of the Senate. He recalled that at the meeting of the Senate in July 2015, the Senate had approved the establishment of four faculties led by three Executive Deans and one Dean. This had subsequently been changed to four Executive Deans. He asked whether any of the proposals being considered at the meeting were likely to be changed in the future. The Vice-Chancellor commented that he was unable to give that assurance though no changes were planned at present. In response to a question from the Director, Institute of Educational Technology, it was confirmed that the appointment procedures for professorial staff applied to the appointment of professors within Institutes.
- 13.4 The Senate:
- a) **approved** the establishment of Schools in faculties
 - b) **approved** the transfer of the Development Policy and Practice Group to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

- c) **recommended for approval by the Council**, the amended appointment procedures for professorial staff.

Governance

S-2016-01-11

- 13.5 The Interim Executive Dean, Faculty of Science and MCT explained that the paper proposed a new model of governance in academic units to provide assurance to the Senate on the effectiveness of academic governance at faculty level. This model proposed the establishment of a single teaching governance body in each academic unit, the Teaching Committee, with new terms of reference and a membership based on roles and expertise, including students and ALs. Consultation on the terms of reference and membership would take place imminently and would be considered by the Academic Quality and Governance Committee at its meeting at the end of February for recommendation to the Senate in April 2016. The model also proposed that Programme Committees would no longer be governance committees and would be replaced by Boards of Study operating within the academic units. These would be agile, working structures responsible for the management and development of curriculum, advised by subject-specific external expertise and working together with students and associate lecturers. They would make recommendations to the unit's Teaching Committee. Academic units would also be required to have a new body, the Faculty/Institute Assembly, to provide opportunity for wider discussion and consultation on curriculum, teaching, research, strategy (unit planning), and to discuss wider University developments.
- 13.6 A member welcomed the proposals overall but queried the reference in paragraph 18 of the paper to matters relating to research students being within the remit of the Teaching Committee. Professor De Roeck explained that the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) required the University to report on research students in this way.
- 13.7 Representatives of the OU Students Association welcomed the opportunity to be involved in faculty governance structures but commented that students might find it difficult to attend meetings. They suggested that three places be available for student representatives without restrictions on undergraduate or postgraduate membership to ensure breadth and improve the likelihood of students being able to participate.
- 13.8 Another member commented that Faculty Committees currently included regional staff in its membership and it was important not to lose this expertise. The proposed constitution referred to representation from Student Support Teams (SST) but there was no indication as to who would take on the role. Professor De Roeck reiterated that the constitutions of the Teaching Committees would be consulted further upon, but clarified that it was envisaged the Academic Services SST lead would be the SST representative on the Committee.
- 13.9 Another member expressed concern over the proposed responsibility for research students being under the remit of individual Teaching Committees due to the interdisciplinary nature of research. The University Secretary explained that although research students were an integral part of the University's research endeavours, the Teaching Committee would have responsibility for quality assurance issues regarding their supervision and the student experience of postgraduate students overall.
- 13.10 Another member commented that the Teaching Committee did not have a strong academic membership. A member also queried whether the constitutions of the proposed Boards of Study and Faculty Assemblies would come back to the Senate for approval. Another member expressed concern over the role and functions of the proposed Faculty Assembly. Professor De Roeck confirmed that reports would be presented to the Senate on the establishment of Boards and Assemblies but as they were not committees within the formal governance structure the constitutions would not require approval by the Senate.

- 13.11 A member queried whether oversight of the University's validated provision would be referred to the Faculty Teaching Committees. Professor De Roeck confirmed that issues relating to validation would be considered by Teaching Committees and referred to the Curriculum Partnerships Committee where appropriate. A member also commented that Teaching Committees would have oversight of the work of possibly six Schools and he sought assurance as to how such oversight would operate in large disparate academic areas.
- 13.12 A representative of the OU Students Association sought clarification on the distribution of business between the proposed bodies and what input would be required from members. Professor De Roeck explained that this was still to be determined.
- 13.14 Following a vote the Senate overwhelmingly **approved** the new model of governance in academic units.

Executive Deans Appointment Procedures

S-2016-01-12

- 13.15 The University Secretary introduced the paper and explained that the proposed Appointment Procedures for Executive Deans were based on those previously approved by the Council in July 2004 for the appointment of Pro-Vice-Chancellors and in December 2004 for the appointment of Deans and Directors. The procedures stated that appointment would be made by a joint committee of the Council and the Senate, comprising both Council and Senate members.
- 13.16 A member expressed his concern that the procedures did not permit a stronger input from the Faculty to which the Executive Dean was being appointed. He felt this was crucial to establish confidence in the appointments. He proposed an amendment to point 2 (iii) to read *two members of the Senate, one of whom should be from the Faculty and one of whom should be from outside the Faculty, appointed by the Senate, by election*. He also proposed the inclusion of a new category of the proposed membership of the Joint Appointment Committee which would be *one member of the Faculty, appointed by the Faculty, by election*.
- 13.17 The President of the OU Students Association thanked the University for the opportunity to be involved in the appointment of Executive Deans. Another member commented that it should be explicit that the aim of the presentations to the Faculty by prospective candidates referred to in paragraph 11 was to assist the Appointment Committee.
- 13.18 Another member expressed support for the proposal that greater Faculty involvement was required in the Appointment Committee. She commented that the Executive Dean would be the academic voice of a faculty and they had to command the trust of staff. She proposed that it would be more appropriate for the Faculty itself to elect the members of the Appointment Committee.
- 13.19 Another member reminded the Senate that in the past Deans were elected entirely by Faculty members so the involvement of Council members was a significant change. He proposed that the balance of membership between Senate and Council members be revised to include four members of the Senate (balance between Faculty and Senate appointments to be confirmed) and two Council members. The University Secretary advised the Senate that this proposition to alter the balance of Senate and Council appointed members would fundamentally change the approach the University has taken towards Executive appointments.

- 13.20 Mr Zimmerman summarised the proposals in relation to the membership of Appointment Committees for Executive Deans as follows:
- a) the proposed membership as set out in paper S-2016-01-12;
 - b) the proposal that Senate membership was made up of two members from the relevant Faculty and one member from outside the Faculty;
 - c) the proposal that the Senate delegated the election of one Faculty member of the Appointment Committee to the relevant Faculty, with all members of that Faculty (not only Senate members) being eligible for election;
 - d) the proposal that the balance of membership between Senate and Council members be revised to include four members of the Senate (balance between Faculty and Senate appointments to be confirmed) and two Council members.
- 13.21 A member reminded the Senate that its role in respect of appointment procedures was to make recommendations to the Council. The Vice-Chancellor reiterated that approval of the fourth proposition would significantly alter the approach the University has developed towards Executive Appointments and would result in Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Executive Dean Appointment Committees being constituted differently.
- 13.22 The Senate **agreed** the amendments as set out in points (b) and (c) in minute 3.20. A vote was taken on the amendment in point (d).
- 13.23 With 26 votes in favour, 24 votes against and 17 abstentions the Senate **agreed to recommend to the Council** the appointments procedures for Executive Deans subject to amendment to sections 2(ii) and 2(iii) as below:
- ii) ~~three~~ two members of the Council not being members of the Senate appointed by the Council;
 - iii) ~~three~~ four members of the Senate, (balance between Faculty and Senate appointments to be confirmed)

15 QAA HIGHER EDUCATION REVIEW S-2016-01-13

The Senate **noted** the indicative key findings from the University's Higher Education Review, conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in December 2016.

16 RESEARCH PLAN UPDATE S-2016-01-14

The Senate **noted** the report of progress on the implementation of the University Research Plan approved by the Senate in January 2015.

17 ACADEMIC REGULATIONS (TAUGHT COURSES) 2016 S-2016-01-15

The Senate **approved** the Academic Regulations (Taught Courses) 2016, effective from the date of opening of registration for the 2016/17 academic year.

18 EMERITUS PROFESSORS S-2016-01-16

The Senate **approved** the award of the Emeritus Professor title to:

- a) Professor Robert Fraser, Arts
- b) Professor Anne Laurence, Arts

- c) Professor Patricia Murphy, FELS
- d) Professor Sheila Peace, HSC
- e) Professor Kevin McConway, MCT
- f) Professor Steve Swithenby, Science

19 THE COUNCIL S-2016-01-17

The Senate **noted** the report of matters discussed at the meeting of the Council held on 24 November 2015.

20 ACTION BY THE CHAIR S-2016-01-18

The Senate **noted** the report of action taken by the Chair since the last meeting of the Senate.

21 FUTURE ITEMS OF BUSINESS S-2016-01-19

The Senate:

- a) **noted** the potential items for the agenda for a meeting of the Senate on 13 April 2016 subject to the inclusion of an item on the Locations Analysis Project Implementation: Student Recruitment and Support Centres.
- b) **agreed** that a meeting of the Senate should take place on 13 April 2016.

22 DECLASSIFICATION OF PAPERS

The following papers remained confidential after the meeting:

S-2016-01-2B Strategic Planning and Resources Committee – Confidential minutes
S-2016-01-13 QAA Higher Education Review: Report

The following paper was declassified after the meeting:
S-2016-01-16 Emeritus Professors

22 DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

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

Wednesday 13 April 2016
Wednesday 8 June 2016

Keith Zimmerman
University Secretary

Sue Thomas
Working Secretary to the Senate
Email: sue.thomas@open.ac.uk
Tel: 01908 655083