



THE SENATE

Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 6 April 2011 in the Hub Theatre

Present:

1) Ex officio

Mr Martin Bean, Vice-Chancellor
 Professor Alan Bassindale, Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise)
 Professor Denise Kirkpatrick, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality)
 Professor Alan Tait, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Qualifications)
 Professor James Fleck, Dean, Faculty of Business and Law
 Dr Sharon Ding, Dean, Faculty of Education and Language Studies
 Mr Jeremy Roche, Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Care
 Dr Simon Bromley, Faculty of Social Sciences
 Professor Hazel Rymer, Dean, Faculty of Science
 Professor Anne De Roeck, Dean, Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology
 Professor Josie Taylor, Director of the Institute of Educational Technology
 Mrs Nicky Whitsed, Director, Library Services
 Ms Anne Howells, Director of Learning and Teaching Solutions

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts

Professor Richard Allen	Dr Lynda Prescott
Dr Graham Harvey	Professor John Wolffe

Faculty of Business & Law

Mrs Keren Bright	Mr Mike Phillips
Dr Jacky Holloway	Mr Alessandro Saroli

Faculty of Education and Language Studies

Dr Jane Cullen	Professor Karen Littleton
Dr Regine Hampel	Mr Pete Smith
Ms Felicity Harper	Dr Peter Twining
Dr Steve Hutchinson	

Faculty of Health and Social Care

Mrs Sue Cole	Dr Sarah Earle
Professor Monica Dowling	Dr Verina Waights
Professor Jan Draper	

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Dr David Bowers	Professor Andy Lane
Dr Judy Ekins	Dr Toby O'Neil
Professor Joyce Fortune	Dr Sally Organ
Mr Derek Goldrei	Dr Helen Yanacopulos
Professor Uwe Grimm	

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Helen Kaye	Dr Raia Prokhovnik
Dr Bob Kelly	Professor Michael Saward
Dr Hugh Mackay	Dr Jason Toynbee

Faculty of Science

Dr John Baxter	Dr Robert Saunders
Dr Payam Rezaie	Dr Terry Whatson
Dr David Rothery	Professor Ian Wright

Institute of Educational Technology

Dr Robin Goodfellow	Professor Agnes Kukulska-Hulme
---------------------	--------------------------------

Other Central Units

Dr Rebecca Ferguson

Regional/National Centres

Mrs Lynda Brady	Ms Barbara Stephens
Dr Liz Manning	

3) Associate Lecturers

Mr Paddy Alton	Mr Bruce Heil
Dr Janet Dyke (alternate)	Mr John James
Dr Isobel Falconer	Dr Walter Pisarski

4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association

Mrs Marianne Cantieri	Mr David Reed
Mrs Roz Evans	Mr Carey Shaw
Ms Laura Murphy	Mrs Sandra Summers

5) Academic-related Staff

Mrs Carole Baume	Mr Tony O'Shea-Poon
Mrs Lynda Juma	Ms Hilary Robertson
Mr Martin Kenward	Mr Ian Roddis
Mr Billy Khokhar	Ms Gill Smith
Dr Christina Lloyd	Ms Elaine Walker

6) Co-opted members

Mr John D'Arcy	Dr James Miller
Mr Rob Humphreys	Dr Petrina Stevens

In attendance

Dr Tony Walton (Present, minute 11)

Apologies:

1) Ex officio

Professor David Rowland, Dean and Director of Studies, Faculty of Arts
Mr Will Swann, Director, Students

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts

Professor Suman Gupta Dr Bob Wilkinson

Faculty of Business & Law

Ms Carmel McMahon

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Dr Nicolas Moss Dr Shirley Northover

Faculty of Social Science

Dr Troy Cooper

Faculty of Science

Dr Nick Rogers

Institute of Educational Technology

Professor Eileen Scanlon

Regional/National Centres

Mrs Celia Cohen

3) Associated Lecturers

Dr Roma Oakes

5) Academic-Related Staff

Mrs Liz Armitage Mrs Bethan Norfor
Ms Fiona Carey Mr Michael Street

6) Co-opted Members

Dr Peter Scott

In attendance

Dr Kate Clarke Mr Andrew Law

1 MINUTES**S/11/1/M**

The Senate **approved** as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 26 January 2011.

2 MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising not dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

3 REPORT FROM AND QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR

- 3.1 The Vice-Chancellor, Mr Martin Bean, welcomed Professor Hazel Rymer to her first meeting of the Senate as the new Dean of the Faculty of Science.

- 3.2 Mr Bean quoted from a recent honorary graduate:

"I loved getting my honorary degree on Friday and cried pretty much from start to finish. What an amazing institution it is. I am so privileged to be connected to it"

This was a reminder of the importance of the University's degree ceremonies and the wonderful celebration that they were for both students and honorary graduates.

- 3.3 Referring to some of the good news from around the University, Mr Bean said that an OU project to make it easier to choose between different university courses had won a £50,000 prize. Dr Tony Hirst, a telematics lecturer, had come first in the Open Up competition with his proposal to make UCAS course information publicly available as Open Linked Data.

- 3.4 The Institute of Physics had approved the physics pathway through the new BSc Natural Sciences. The physics modules could be studied almost anywhere in the world as they were now available globally online. This was the first professional accreditation of the new undergraduate science degree and congratulations were offered to the Faculty of Science for their bold approach.

- 3.5 Professors John Wolffe, Tim Benton, Josie Taylor, Mike Fitzpatrick, David Wield and Monica Grady were congratulated on their appointment to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) panels for their respective disciplines. Mrs Fay Harrison of the Faculty of Education and Language Studies (FELS) had also been appointed as a panel secretary.

- 3.6 Ms Sarah Bakewell, associate lecturer for *Creative Writing* (A215) had received two prizes, the 2011 Duff Cooper Prize and the US National Book Critics Circle Award, for her critically acclaimed biography *How to Live: A life of Montaigne*. This publication had previously been one of only three books shortlisted for the Costa Biography Book Award 2011.

- 3.7 OU Law students and graduates had won the final of prestigious national mooting tournament against Exeter University at Gray's Inn in London on 30 March 2011.

- 3.8 The Vice-Chancellor congratulated Professor Monica Grady and her team of OU planetary scientists, who had been awarded £3.4 million over three years by the Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC). The research "*Understanding Origins @ The Open University*", with the snappy acronym UO@OU, sought to understand the origins of the solar system and to study how environments suitable for the origin of life came about.

- 3.9 The OU's Vital programme had won £2.5 million continuation funding from the Department of Education (DfE) in 2011/12. Vital CPD (Continuing Professional Development) was set up in July 2009 with £5.6 million from the Department for Children, Schools and Families

(DCSF). It had been officially launched in January 2010 with the remit to support schools in England to make even better use of ICT both in the ongoing professional development of staff and to enhance teaching and learning. After exceeding all of its key targets in Phase 1, the new funding would enable the team to extend VITAL's reach and increase its impact.

- 3.10 The OU's U101 course, Design Thinking: Creativity for the 21st Century, won a prestigious award at the Institute for IT Training annual award ceremony at the Dorchester Hotel in London on 3 February 2011. Module Team Chair, Professor Peter Lloyd, Curriculum Manager, Ms Karen Ross, and Executive Director IT & Telecoms, Mr Kevin Streater, had collected the award for Innovation in Training Services which recognised the significant achievements in online learning pioneered by U101 and established The Open University as a leading provider of IT training services to industry.
- 3.11 During March 2011, the University had celebrated Climate Week and the Vice-Chancellor announced a new initiative to boost the levels of recycling around the University. Waste bins would be replaced with desk trays for waste paper and other recyclable material. Everyone would be asked to take their waste to the recycling stations that would be installed in offices. The University had been recycling waste paper since 1970 and this scheme should make a significant impact on the OU's collective environmental performance.
- 3.12 In response to a question from a member, the University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, said that a similar programme would be rolled out in the regions. Another member said that the level of recycling currently undertaken in the regions was determined by the policies and practices of the local councils.
- 3.13 With reference to the OU's recent activities in the political arena, the Vice-Chancellor said that the University's discussions with Government on the future of funding continued to progress well and that the OU was getting a fair hearing across all four nations of the UK. In March, the Vice-Chancellor had addressed the Children and Education Public Bill Committee in Parliament. The Committee were asked to consider three important areas that the OU believed still needed to be addressed:
 - a) First, in order to ensure equality of access and to support social mobility, the Higher Education Funding Council for England's (HEFCE) annual £372 million Widening Participation (WP) allocation, which created opportunity for students from the most disadvantaged backgrounds, had to be maintained. The OU's allocation, with a small reduction, had been secured for the forthcoming financial year. However, widening participation could not be implemented in annual cycles, but required longer-term consideration.
 - b) Second, students who studied full-time at a distance were currently not entitled to the support available to campus-based students simply because they were not 'in attendance' at an institution. The OU was calling on Government to remove the 'in-attendance' rule that had been introduced in the 1962 Education Act, because it prevented flexibility of study and was an inappropriate way to define the university experience today.
 - c) Third, in order to ensure a system that does not discriminate on the grounds of mode of study, the additional costs of delivering part-time higher education should continue to be offset through the part-time allocation. The University currently received a significant sum of money every year from HEFCE to offset the additional costs of supporting a part-time cohort.
- 3.14 The OU's Director, Wales, Mr Rob Humphrey, had just chaired the Independent Review of Governance Arrangements for Further Education (FE) Institutions in Wales. This had been published at the same time as the McCormick Review of Governance of Higher Education

(HE) in Wales, which looked at the future configuration, form and purpose of HE in Wales. The FE review, which recommended a radical governance model that derived in part from models in the social enterprise sector, was by and large received favourably across all parties, and would now go to formal consultation.

- 3.15 The Vice-Chancellor had just recorded a new video message to all staff, in which he gave an update on the UK higher education funding situation. The University had received notification of its grant funding figures for 2011/12 from all of the UK Higher Education Funding Councils. All of the UK nation recurrent allocations had been cut from the current year's allocations, except in Wales, which had shown a small but welcome increase in funding. There would be an overall reduction in recurrent grants for 2011/12 of £14.6 million from the current year's original allocations. There had already been some in-cycle reductions within the current financial year. In terms of capital funding across the UK, the total grants for 2011/12 would be around £2.5 million, which was a big reduction from allocations in previous years. However, thanks to the work of the Director of Estates, Mr Alan Burrell, and his team, the vast majority of the University's buildings were in a very good state. In England, the Widening Participation and Teaching Enhancement and Student Success grants for 2011/12 totalled £35.5 million. This was only £900,000 less than the previous year and would allow the University to continue its good work in these areas into the next fiscal year.
- 3.16 Referring to the Widening Participation consultation currently underway in the University, a member commented that it seemed to imply that the £35.5 million of WP funding would not continue after 2012. The Vice-Chancellor responded that the consultation exercise was necessary, whatever was going to happen to future funding. It was inevitable that there would be much less Government funding in the future, but this would provide the University with more scope to choose where to invest in its widening access activities. The consultation exercise, being led by the Director, Students, Mr Will Swann, was intended to identify those areas in which the University should focus its investment.
- 3.17 The University now had a high degree of certainty over its grant funding for 2011/12, which was in line with its most recent estimates, so it could continue planning for the new financial year in the knowledge that the grant funding for that year was fairly secure. However, recent history indicated that the University should expect some in-year reductions and this should be planned for.
- 3.18 A cut of £14.6 million was a significant loss of money for the University. The Vice-Chancellor thanked everyone for supporting the cost and efficiency measures that had been introduced and that allowed the University to be prepared for the financial challenges that lay ahead. The OU's strategy was designed to minimize the impact on the University's ability to deliver on its mission and to provide an excellent experience for its students. The three work streams outlined at the previous meeting of the Senate were progressing well. With respect to the work stream on the UK Market Strategy, a substantial survey of people aged over 16 who were interested in entering higher education had just been completed across the four nations. The data from this work would provide much more information regarding what is important in HE to different groups of potential students. The work was helping to identify the right areas on which to focus the University's future efforts by identifying those segments where the University was likely to see the greatest demand for its modules and qualifications. The next step was to survey current OU students and to gauge their likely reactions. By combining both pieces of work, the University would be able to develop a new marketing strategy, including revised pricing. Further information should be available in September 2011.

4	STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE (SPRC)	S/2011/2/01
----------	--	--------------------

- 4.1 Referring to paragraph 2.1 of the SPRC minutes, a member asked what the implications would be of the University routing EU business through a subsidiary company. The University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, responded that this option would not affect operations, but would allow the University to charge a different fee in Europe.
- 4.2 With reference to paragraph 4.3 regarding new technology, a member asked for further details about what the Vice-Chancellor, Mr Martin Bean, had meant by his comment that “equipping associate lecturers to present modules was the main issue”. Associate lecturers were offered training, but had to buy their own hardware to get involved in activities such as pod casting, web-casting and wikis. Mr Bean replied that he was aware that this issue was wrapped up in the University’s negotiations around the new associate lecturer (AL) contract and acknowledged the cost of the equipment that was required to successfully interact in such an environment. However, his point had been that before technology that was relied upon for teaching, such as Elluminate, was released on mass, the University had a duty of care to ensure that all staff and students were able to use it. The member said whilst ALs were prepared to embrace new technology, the accumulation of the demands on ALs for the new equipment necessary was cause for concern. The issue should be examined not only from the perspective of ability and readiness to use new technology, but also from the perspective of cost.
- 4.3 The Senate **noted**:
- a) the unconfirmed Minutes from the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee (SPRC) held on 9 February 2011 (SPRC/11/1/M).
 - b) the unconfirmed confidential and restricted Minutes from the meeting (SPRC/11/1/Confidential Minutes).

5	QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE (QAEC)	S/2011/2/02
----------	---	--------------------

The Senate **noted** the report from the meeting of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) held on 14 February 2011.

6	LEARNING, TEACHING AND STUDENT SUPPORT COMMITTEE (LTSSC)	S/2011/2/03
----------	---	--------------------

- 6.1 Referring to the proposed changes to the regulations for Insufficient Academic Progress (IAP) set out in Appendix 1 to the paper, a member said that whilst student advisors acknowledged that the policy was not as effective as it should be and were keen for improvements to be made, many of the changes proposed in the paper had given rise to considerable concern. The paper laid down some very strict rules for students who had not successfully completed a module in three eligible presentations. Many students in these circumstances were at their most vulnerable and needed considerable support from the University. The policy did not appear to consider the student’s previous record and could disadvantage some students more than others depending on where they were in their studies. The Head of Teaching and Learner Support, Dr Christina Lloyd, said that the current policy was inadequate in terms of student support and had led to much inconsistency. The push for a review had come from those having to implement the policy: it was important to apply such a policy consistently, but at present the scope for discretion was too wide. Students must develop and manage their expectations, and be aware of the difficulties of failure as early as possible, not least to ensure that they got value for money. A working group had been set up to review the policy, which had included nine advisors from across Scotland and five regions. It was unfortunate that the paper that had been

provided was a technical one, rather than one that captured the rationale for the revisions, but much thought had been given to the changes in policy.

- 6.2 An associate lecturer member observed that paragraph 12 of this paper stated that learner support would be cut, whereas paragraph 36 of the report from the Council (S/2011/2/12) acknowledged that students were facing an increasing complex entry process for HE and more complicated pathways for building degrees. Individuals were likely to need more information, advice and guidance (IAG) and on-line systems would not be a substitute for support that was more personal and encouraging, particularly in a situation where there was a lot of competition to recruit every student. Dr Lloyd responded that there was no intention of taking away person-to-person advice if that was required.
- 6.3 A student member, who was also member of LTSSC, said that the paper that had been presented to the Committee had contained a lot of references to student support. However, the route plan and the way in which flags were raised and removed had been quite convoluted. It was important that students received timely advice when the first flag had been set and they were at risk if they did not finish their module. The advice should be personal, through a face-to-face meeting or a telephone call, rather than via the web; and it should be proactive in terms of what they should do next in their current situation. Dr Lloyd said that the expectation would be that the issue would not only be raised with the student on StudentHome, but also to the tutor on TutorHome, and agreed that direct contact should be encouraged, rather than the reliance on an electronic flag.
- 6.4 With reference to paragraph 13, which referred to more on-line advice and support, a student member commented that the University had never insisted that a student must have a computer and be on-line. It would therefore be possible that some students could not be reached in this way. Dr Lloyd responded that students were asked to inform the University if they were unable to pick up messages on-line, so that alternative means of communication could be used.
- 6.5 The student member was also concerned that the policy did not allow for an appeal or the use of discretion. If students had already achieved 360 points and had almost completed their degree, but were excluded at that point for IAP, they would have to begin all over again at Level 1. As a point of accuracy, the Conditions of Registration – Part 2, 1.12 quoted in paragraph 1 should refer to module and not course.
- 6.6 Another member enquired whether there was an interaction between student progress and engaging students on programmes, and the University receiving public funding from HEFCE for student fees. Dr Lloyd said that it was important to ensure that the money that the student was paying for their course was spent wisely and to best effect. Similarly, the University should recognise that it should make good use of public funding. If the University could support a student to move on to something more appropriate in order to help them reach the level necessary for them to complete their degree studies, then it should do so.
- 6.7 The Chair proposed that a follow up paper, including more detail and addressing the concerns that had been raised by members, should come back to the Senate.
- 6.8 The Senate:
 - a) **noted** the report from the meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Student Support Committee (LTSSC) that took place on 24 February 2011;
 - b) **asked** that a more detailed paper proposing an exceptions policy come back to the Senate for further discussion.

7	CURRICULUM AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE (CVC)	S/2011/2/04
7.1	A member suggested that it would be useful for the Senate to see a full account of previous discussion of key papers that were subsequently presented to the Senate, as it might help the Senate discussion to be more productive. This point might also have been relevant in respect of the debate on item 6, but in this case the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC) had discussed the Postgraduate Strategy at length and, whilst the paper might have been amended to take account of the discussion at CVC, it would have been helpful for the Senate to be aware of the detail of that debate. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Qualifications), Professor Alan Tait confirmed that the paper had been amended subsequent to the discussion at CVC and agreed that a note on the Postgraduate Strategy paper to that effect would have been helpful.	
7.2	The Senate noted the report from the meeting of the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC) held on 8 March 2011.	
8	RESEARCH COMMITTEE	S/2011/2/05
	The Senate noted the report from the meeting of the Research Committee held on 9 March 2011.	
9	HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE Honorary Awards 2011	S/2011/2/06
	The Senate noted the arrangements made for the conferment of honorary degrees at degree ceremonies being held in 2011.	
10	HONORARY DEGREES COMMITTEE Honorary Awards 2012	S/2011/2/07
	The Senate noted details of the nominations recommended by the Honorary Degrees Committee for the award of honorary degrees of Doctor of the University (DUniv) and Master of the University (MUniv) to be conferred in 2012.	
11	POSTGRADUATE STRATEGY	S/2011/2/08
11.1	The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Qualifications), Professor Alan Tait, introduced the paper, which was based on work undertaken by Professor Kevin McConway and his team in the Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology (MCT), and had been supported by the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC).	
11.2	The paper proposed that the University should continue to have a taught postgraduate (PGT) offer. Although, with the exception of the Masters in Business Administration (MBA) and the Masters in Education (MEd), the University's postgraduate provision was not performing well in terms of student numbers, contribution levels or income generation, there was still a strong rationale for the OU to continue to be involved in this area of curriculum. The current provision had grown in a fragmentary way as a result of niche interests, so the paper proposed that it should be refocused, with an overall institutional identity and purpose.	
11.3	The paper was broadly supported by members of the Senate. Several members commented that it represented a watershed for the University, with its proposal that postgraduate provision should be clearly seen as a cornerstone of the OU's identity. The	

recommendations were supported as a direction of travel, but there were some concerns about the detail and implementation.

Postgraduate provision

- 11.4 A member observed that the University should not be complacent: the OU was the largest distance learning provider of postgraduate provision, but also the only one not appending it to face-to-face provision; but this would not continue in the future and the University should compare itself to the postgraduate marketplace as a whole. The decline in the part-time postgraduate market was not surprising, as overall growth in the sector had been predicated on overseas expansion in face-to-face provision, and the decline in the overall postgraduate market in the UK had been taking place for some time. An element of analysis was needed to provide shape to the strategy. The previous work on qualifications and modules undertaken at undergraduate level had been important in enabling the University to understand the postgraduate landscape. Problems regarding qualifications based registration, tuition and assessment, where the University tended to do its costing around undergraduate models, had yet to be solved. Other institutions had completely different ideas about how to teach and support a postgraduate student, how to take out cost, and how to articulate value for the postgraduate student in a way that was different to that for undergraduates.
- 11.5 A graduate member said that feedback from OU graduates suggested that lack of information was one reason that students did not continue their studies with the OU and that other institutions were more prominent in their postgraduate promotion. There was also a perception that OU courses were career or work place specific, and that there was nothing suitable to follow their first degree or for personal fulfilment. The original attraction of the OU had been the opportunity to gradually build a qualification through a number of small courses that could fit around a busy life, but this did not appear to be offered at postgraduate level. Whilst there was a need for change in the OU's postgraduate provision, the University should be careful to protect the individual student's personal learning and continue to promote educational opportunities which are open to all.
- 11.6 A student observed that, in her view, the University was not doing enough to encourage students with equivalent and lower qualifications (ELQ) to undertake higher degrees.

Development of a postgraduate product strategy

- 11.7 Several members were concerned with the recommendation that the development of a postgraduate product strategy should be led by Marketing. The strategy should be informed by Marketing or developed in conjunction with Marketing, but academics should lead the decisions about what was taught in the University. Professor Tait responded that Marketing should not lead the development of the strategy, but that it should play a significant role. Postgraduate provision should relate to markets and not just academic interest.
- 11.8 A member commented that there was a great deal of experience and knowledge residing in the academic community regarding the way in which the University should move forward in the postgraduate area. It was important the Postgraduate Advisory Group was able to move forward quickly, but in a thoughtful and planned way, which clearly engaged with the academic units.
- 11.9 In response to an enquiry about the proposed composition of the Postgraduate Advisory Group, Professor Tait said that this had not yet been defined, but that he would envisage that all faculties would be included in the membership, as would Marketing. Pedagogical advice should also be available from those involved on the learning and teaching side.

Several members, including the deans, the associate lecturers, and the Business School, offered their experience and support to the Postgraduate Advisory Group.

Action: AT

Development of the OU brand for postgraduate teaching

- 11.10 A member said that the recommendation for the creation of a new brand for postgraduate teaching should be considered carefully. Another member commented that a clear and distinctive postgraduate brand would have to be very sophisticated, as the data provided in the paper suggested that the postgraduate market was extremely varied in terms of subject and scale. It was a fragmented market and this should be explicitly recognised in the work to be done. The paper also indicated that Birkbeck College was one of the largest providers of postgraduate provision in terms of its market growth, much of which was full-time and was not all vocational. The Postgraduate Advisory Group should conduct further market intelligence, financial analysis and business modelling, as things would change substantially within the time span concerned. One factor would be the change in the fee differential for undergraduates and postgraduates, which might or might not have an impact. The paper should include an explicit commitment to pursue such investigations, in order that the University ran with the trends, rather than behind them.

Employer input

- 11.11 A member observed that a university in Yorkshire was offering 60% of its postgraduate provision on-line as distance or blended learning, which demonstrated a pedagogical encroachment on the OU's market. At a meeting of the Yorkshire universities, it had been said that the development of postgraduate programmes was not being led or informed by marketing, or by faculties, but by employers.
- 11.12 Some student members commented that there was a tension in some programmes between the academic and the vocational or professional requirements: programmes should reflect the needs of employers more closely and not just academic ideals. If postgraduate provision was to be used for continuing professional development (CPD), as implied in paragraph 20, the expectations of employers would be quite different to those of the University. With respect to paragraph 24, a student member suggested that, as some employers conducted their own graduate training programmes, it might be worth exploring whether there was scope for accreditation of prior experience and learning (APEL) at Masters level. However, the notion of employer engagement was, to a certain extent, a myth. Students had argued to the Browne Review that, in general, employers were not keen to sponsor students to achieve a qualification, if it then meant that they moved on to another employer.
- 11.13 A member observed that working with a group of employers on the development of a taught Masters had affected the way in which the project had been delivered. The faculty had found it necessary to adapt to meet employer requirements and to work closely with the University systems in order to provide a more flexible model. As well as having employers as partners, the University also needed to develop partnerships with government departments, as these would be important in terms of badging OU products.

Focus on professional and vocational provision

- 11.14 A member enquired about the distinction between professional and vocational areas, and how these were distinguished from academic areas. Many academic subjects, such as sociology, had vocational relevance. The diagram in paragraph 21 indicated that the biggest demand for Masters' study was in the areas of leadership and management and general education and management. Were those subjects being studied in order to advance a person's career the same as those being referred to as professional and vocational? Professor Tait responded that some occupations had taken on the title of

professional, whereas others had not. Some areas of the curriculum derived directly from occupations and served students who wished to enter or make progress within an occupation. Other areas derived much more clearly from academic disciplines. It was clear that career related aspirations were the dominant motivation in the taught postgraduate market.

- 11.15 A member observed that 7 out of 10 of the OU's current postgraduate students were life-long or interest learners, so it was important not to lose postgraduate qualifications in the Arts or Social Sciences fields. As postgraduate programmes were an integral part of the University's offer, they should not be considered as financial stand-alones. The paper acknowledged that there was a problem, but how could the University establish a more postgraduate-friendly environment, pump-prime its postgraduate provision and develop its postgraduate brand. A clearer vision was required, other than the focus on professional and vocational areas. Professor Tait responded that the vision was centred on a number of key principles, one of which was that the centre of gravity of the taught postgraduate offer should be in response to professional and vocational motivation, because it was seen to be the most dominant across the sector. The provision should also be very exciting in terms of e-learning pedagogy, and it should have an institutional perspective, because the current provision would not be sustainable in the future.
- 11.16 Referring to paragraph 24 a) of the paper, an associate lecturer member asked whether faculties would be able to cross-subsidise programmes in order to provide funding to non-vocational subjects, which could then be pump-primed to achieve greater student numbers in the future. Professor Tait responded that different academic programmes created varying financial returns and that the deans had to manage this over time. Changes in funding might create changes in demand and it was difficult to see how the various motivation strands might be sustained over the next 3-5 years. The paper did not state that the University's taught postgraduate provision could only be directly related to vocational subjects, but where this provision was successful in the sector it was dominated by vocational motivation. If the OU wanted to make a step change in its postgraduate provision, it would have to recognise this.
- 11.17 A member said that there was a danger of an artificial separation and opposition between professional and vocational development and more academic, research based and subject focussed work. It was important not to overlook the extent to which one was a vehicle for the other. The subjected focussed areas could be an excellent way of delivering critical skills, which were important to business. The separation of these two areas, and of the process and the outcome, could evolve into a weakness in the OU's offer.
- 11.18 Another member said that the University should think creatively about vocational and professional applications that demonstrated the relevance of programmes in ways which were beyond the narrow definition of professional qualifications.
- 11.19 A member asked how the notion of vocationalism would be translated into the recommendations. Paragraph 48 b) stated there should be a clear business case for the subjects being taught. On the other hand, the Council report had referred to double bottom line accounting (S/2011/2/12 paragraphs 38-39). A model might exist that accommodated the diversity of subjects that the University wanted to teach in a way which clearly involved accounting, but not in the narrowest of regimes. Professor Tait responded that this was in some ways a rerun of the discussion on the University's overall curriculum strategy in January 2010 when the Senate had agreed that the curriculum should be market enabled. The curriculum would not just be market led, because the OU had an educational vision that included widening participation and employability, but the University should not teach courses for which there were no students. It was essential to work with these distinctions in order to make the postgraduate strategy more successful.

Learning design

- 11.20 A member said that the ability to take parts of the postgraduate curriculum and use them as CPD would offer a way into the OU for many people, but it was not certain whether the curriculum was flexible enough to be used effectively in this way. Paragraph 30 seemed to suggest that one of the future principles regarding the postgraduate curriculum might be to break down modules into smaller units that might be used for different purposes. Professor Tait responded that this was already an established principle: for example, the Centre for Professional Development in the Business Development Unit already used content from larger modules for smaller scale purposes; and would be part of the future approach to learning design.
- 11.21 A member said that the consideration of structures and standards at an institutional level was welcome, in order to minimise set up costs and overheads and to help ensure financial viability. Common structures and standards would also facilitate the cross-faculty integration of such elements into interesting offerings and might bridge the apparent gap between vocational and subject focussed offerings, for example combining science and management modules. It was necessary to address the nature of the demand across the sector for postgraduate programmes. The current model of small, diverse programmes, often driven by research rather than market opportunity, was probably intrinsic to the nature of postgraduate education. There were few areas where the demand might accumulate into large standardised mass produced courses. Some radical and creative thinking was required about a different pedagogic model, which perhaps considered face-to-face rather than on-line modules that were applicable to small volumes at relatively low cost. This might be successful if the University could offer an overall configuration that, for example, enabled common methods courses, thereby providing economies of scale and enabling cross subsidisation. By looking creatively at different ways of engaging and teaching students, it might be possible to accommodate niche interests and create new markets, as well as providing efficient large scale programmes.
- 11.22 Another member commented that one of the issues for the University was that it ran courses at postgraduate level, and the higher levels of undergraduate study, that would be large in any other institution, but for the OU were small. One of the drivers for the development of pedagogical models, other than effectiveness in teaching, should be to find efficient ways of running courses with moderate numbers in a sustainable way. This might require institutional changes in terms of the organisation of support for PGT students.
- 11.23 A member observed that the paper made generalisations about the wide spread of postgraduate provision across the University, whereas detail about individual areas might reveal a different picture. Some postgraduate courses regularly made a profit, although they were not large in volume.

Decommissioning of current postgraduate provision

- 11.24 A student member said that the current decommitment from postgraduate provision in many central academic units (CAUs) in the face of budget cuts was causing difficulties for postgraduate and undergraduate students coming to the end of their degrees now. For example, students finishing their last undergraduate [module] in June 2011 were unable to register for the last offer of their first postgraduate [module] in May 2011. This disjointed approach was affecting a significant number of students and resulting in a loss of business and promotional opportunities. It was not currently clear what future support would be available for postgraduate programmes and it would be helpful if the University could clarify the situation. Professor Tait responded that the process of curriculum rationalisation had been carefully considered.

- 11.25 The Chair invited the Dean of Social Science, Dr Simon Bromley, to comment from a faculty perspective. Dr Bromley said that the Faculty of Social Sciences were withdrawing some old qualifications and had been planning to launch some new qualifications in autumn 2011. Students would not have been allowed to transfer credits between these qualifications. The Faculty had been attempting some low level rationalisation similar to that proposed in paragraph 5 a) of the paper. However, when it became apparent that the Postgraduate Strategy was likely to move towards a more radical overhaul, as proposed in paragraph 5 c), the Faculty had decided that it would not be sensible to launch the new qualifications, as they would not have fallen within the parameters or met the standards proposed in the strategy. Unfortunately, the decision not to publish information on the new qualifications had to be taken quickly, as the Faculty did not want students to sign up for programmes that would then be withdrawn again. This had frustrated the expectations of some students, but it would have been inadvisable to go ahead with these qualifications. The timing of the teach-out period for the old qualifications had caused some disquiet amongst students, but this was unavoidable. With regard to whether undergraduate students should have been allowed to register for the Masters programmes before their undergraduate studies had been completed, the Social Sciences programmes had a clear entry requirement for an undergraduate honours degree that it would have been neither sensible nor responsible to waive. Students would have joined programmes that were being taught-out and it would have been necessary for them to have studied continuously without interruption in order to complete the qualifications. This would have set up most students to fail.
- 11.26 Another student commented that whilst the teach-out time for Social Sciences was tight, the notice given that the programmes were going to be decommissioned had been even tighter. The University should appreciate that students required sufficient notice to plan their studies and to take account of issues such as finance, work, family commitments and health.

Links between postgraduate teaching and research

- 11.27 A member sought clarification that the paper referred to taught postgraduates (PGTs), rather than PhD students undertaking research degrees. Professor Tait confirmed that the paper referred to PGTs.
- 11.28 Another member remarked that the interaction between research and taught masters programmes, and the way in which they informed each other, was mentioned several times in the paper and enquired whether the Research Degrees Committee would be represented on the Postgraduate Advisory Group. Professor Tait said that this had not yet been considered, but he would take note of the suggestion.

Action: AT

- 11.29 A member said that, if the University was to maintain its PhD programme in the future, it should be careful not to remove the ladder by which OU students could progress from undergraduate degree, through Masters to a research degree. The report acknowledged the relationship between Masters and progression to study at Doctorate level. There was a small minority of Masters students who went on to support the University's doctorate work, so the University's PhD ambitions, which were a necessary part of the research effort, were substantially dependent on the Masters level provision, although this should be allowed to take place in the future.
- 11.30 In support of this point, another member said that the only reference to this was in the fifth bullet point in paragraph 48 g) which said that further work should be done on building links to postgraduate research provision, including the potential development of a common web presence and student community. The links should also include research themes.

- 11.31 The Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), Professor Alan Bassindale commented on the relationship between postgraduate research as exemplified by research students (PhD and taught postgraduates). Now that there was a framework in which to work, the research and teaching areas could come together in many ways through some of the recommendations in the paper. The paper did not cover postgraduate researchers (PGRs). Paragraph 19 and the recommendation in 48 g) both mentioned the relationship between research programmes and postgraduate taught courses. It was worth finding ways of articulating this more strongly where possible. There were a number of modules in the Research area on training for research methods and these might overlap with some of the taught courses. Work was currently going on in another context on ways to support postgraduate students (PhD) through web based methods. It would be timely to discuss this kind of work with Professor Tait and to take advantage of the opportunity to link the teaching and research missions in a very positive way.

Action: AB & AT

- 11.32 A member commented that within engineering, which appeared to be particularly unattractive on the contribution charts in the paper, postgraduate provision was not separate entity to undergraduate provision, but an important part of an integrated programme. The University was becoming increasingly successful in gaining professional recognition from the engineering institutions, and this was largely dependent on there being both UG and PG provision. Professor Tait said that the integrated Master's model was unusual, but accepted the point with regard to engineering.

Postgraduate expectations and requirements

- 11.33 Referring to paragraph 40, an associate lecturer member observed that it was missing a statement to the effect that taught postgraduate students should expect high quality academic support to ensure that the offer was appropriate to their needs, their context and the level of study. The inflexibility of the University's bulk distribution model tended to make postgraduates feel that they were being treated like undergraduates. Specific mention of academic support should be included in the paper, together with a recognition that a change of mindset was required if the University was to provide the necessary flexibility to tailor PG provision to student needs and ensure the success of the strategy.
- 11.34 A member observed that although paragraph 39 referred to service expectations, rather than academic expectations, it was important that students were not set up to fail and should be made aware that academic standards at Masters level were higher than at undergraduate level. Paragraph 40 iv, regarding varied entry routes, should include explicit entry requirements, in order that students could judge for themselves what they needed. There should be risk markers, similar to those used for undergraduate students, which would highlight that students with low grades in their undergraduate modules might be considered to be at risk.
- 11.35 A member said that paragraph 41 i provided a statement of the type of provision required to support students, with respect to English language, within the complex and flexible configurations that were being suggested and where the focus might be on employability as well as academic achievement. However, the final bullet in paragraph 48 g) only referred to the English language requirements. This might be intended to reference the International Strategy and students for which English was not a first language, but the points made about e-learning, information skills and employability suggested that the University needed to articulate a much wider range of digital academic literacy. Another member added that the reference to English language proficiency should consider output behaviour, as well as input behaviour: what should be expected of a Masters graduate in terms of English proficiency.

International aspects

- 11.36 Several members welcomed the acknowledgement of the international market in the paper. Many professions were now global and some 60-70% of students on the Business School Masters programme were not from the UK. One member commented on the importance of context and diversity as the University ventured into more international partnerships. The complexity and sophistication of the many different models of partnership should be reflected on by the Advisory Group, who should factor in the challenge of addressing the different pedagogical expectations which arose in different cultural contexts, particularly at Masters level.

Communication and implementation

- 11.37 Another member said that academic and student services staff working on postgraduate recruitment would appreciate a clear communication about the University's postgraduate strategy. Whilst new competitors were coming into the OU's market, many others were rationalising their own postgraduate provision, which provided market opportunities for the OU in the areas that they were shedding. Staff clearly understood the financial imperative, but did not have the confidence to take advantage of these opportunities and were frustrated at not being able to make a contribution in this way.
- 11.38 A student member asked when and how the strategy would be implemented. The paper referred to an initial report for the meeting of the Senate in January 2012, but did not say what the report would cover. Professor Tait said that if the Senate supported the principles set out in the paper, the Advisory Group to CVC would then examine how these would work in practice and report back to the Senate for comment.

Action: AT

- 11.39 The Senate **approved** the recommendations that:

- a) The University should confirm a commitment to providing taught postgraduate curriculum.
- b) In curriculum terms, the rethought programme should have a clearer focus, particularly around the development of professional and vocational provision, although recognising that where there is a clear business case and academic rationale other subjects might be taught.
- c) The taught postgraduate programme should be given a clear and distinctive postgraduate brand with appropriate marketing support.
- d) There should be a commitment to a University-wide perspective across the taught postgraduate spectrum, in terms of curriculum, pedagogy and learning design, and the student experience generally delivered through a Postgraduate Advisory Group reporting formally to the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
- e) The predominant focus in learning design and delivery in future provision should be on e-learning and the innovative use of internet technologies.
- f) As far as possible, future taught postgraduate curriculum should be delivered through consistent models, which allow for both a subject/research focus and a professional/practice-based approach.

g) Further work should be done on:

- i) Developing a postgraduate product strategy (led by Marketing).
- ii) Creating a new brand for postgraduate teaching.
- iii) Developing new financial models leading to the creation of a more sustainable postgraduate programme.
- iv) Building pedagogical models- including implementation of e-learning, collaboration with the Business Development Unit on business-to-business approaches, progression between nested postgraduate qualifications, appropriate developments for new markets in the UK and internationally, whole-qualification approaches to pedagogy and learning design.
- v) Building links to postgraduate research student provision, including the potential development of a common Web presence and student community.
- vi) Articulating the English language requirements expected of postgraduate students.

12 THE UK POLITICAL LANDSCAPE AND FUNDING ENVIRONMENT

S/2011/2/09

- 12.1 Referring to paragraph 28, a member asked if any further information was available regarding the review of the UCAS admissions process to accommodate part-time study and a variety of start dates. The University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, said that this review would not move quickly as it presented difficulties for UCAS. However, it was important for the OU to be in UCAS, as UCAS would be handling loans to students. There was likely to be an interim position where the OU was represented on the UCAS website, but where students were referred back to the OU for admission. Ms Barbara Stephens, Director, the OU in London, who was leading the UCAS project, said that OU qualifications should be displayed on the UCAS website in January 2012 for admission for study commencing in October 2012. Soon after, OU qualifications would be displayed for admission, and possibly a test run for admission via UCAS, for study beginning in October 2013. The earliest date on which it was envisaged that students could be admitted in large numbers through UCAS was for study in October 2013.
- 12.2 The Senate **noted** the paper on the current political landscape and funding environment across the four nations of the UK and the ways in which the University was seeking to influence public policy on key issues affecting teaching and research.

13 COMMITTEE MATTERS

S/2011/2/10

- 13.1 A member observed that the Senate appointed members category 2, as noted in paragraph 18 of the paper, was inaccurate, as the 'other central units' still included COBE, which had now been merged into CIC.
Action: Central Secretariat
- 13.2 With reference to Appendix 1: Disciplinary Tribunal and Grievance Committee Panels, another member noted that the list of members in category 1 had not been amended for retirements.
Action: Central Secretariat
- 13.3 A member asked whether the reference in Appendix 2: Curriculum and Validation Committee in the paragraph on Purpose to 'in collaboration with the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority' was correct. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and

Qualifications) said that there appeared to be an error in the printing that would be amended.

Action: Office of PVC (CQ)

- 13.4 Referring to the note under category 1 of the Membership in Appendix 5: Examination and Assessment Boards (EABs), an associate lecturer member said that the ALs were not aware that the Faculty Committee had any responsibility for the appointment of members. Currently the appointment of ALs to EABs was somewhat haphazard, but the ALs thought that one of the five internal examiners should always be an AL, as they were familiar with the issues that might arise. Another member said that the reference to 'full-time' academic staff in category 2 of the Membership must be incorrect and should be removed, as many academic staff worked part-time. Professor Tait suggested that the term should be 'internal'.

Action: Examinations & Assessment

- 13.5 The Senate:

- a) **approved** the following recommendations, subject to the corrections noted above:
 - i) a one year extension to the term of office of the ten UAP members of staff on the Disciplinary, Tribunal and Grievance Committee Panels, with immediate effect (Appendix 1)
 - ii) the constitutional changes for the following committees:
Curriculum and Validation Committee (Appendix 2);
Qualifications Committee (Appendix 3);
Research Committee (Appendix 4);
Examination and Assessment Boards (Appendix 5).
- b) **noted** the matters for report.

14 EMERITUS PROFESSORS

S/2011/2/11

The Senate **approved** the recommendations from the Chair and Readership Subcommittee that the title Emeritus Professor be awarded to:

- i) Professor Diana Norman
- ii) Professor Cath King
- iii) Professor Bob Owens
- iv) Professor Darrel Ince
- v) Professor Phil Potts

15 THE COUNCIL

S/2011/2/12

- 15.1 Referring to paragraph 28, which noted the major report due from Monitor and the potential for a radical review of the OU vision, a member said that such reports and discussions should also come before the Senate, so that the Senate might be an integral part of any decision making process. The University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, said that the way in which the Senate could be involved was being considered. It might be appropriate to run a workshop for Senate members on the outcomes of this large and complicated piece of work. The decisions arising from the work would be reflected in a revised *OU Futures*, which would certainly be presented to the Senate for comment.

Action: AFW/Central Secretariat

- 15.2 A member remarked that the forecast surplus of £41 million was particularly good news in the context of the cuts reported earlier in the meeting.
- 15.3 With reference to the Council's approval of the abolishment of the existing default retirement age from 1 October 2011, the member commented that this presented a discontinuity from the 30 September 2011 resulting in a number of problems that had yet to be resolved with regard to the AL appointment process currently underway. A flexible and sensitive transition period was necessary, but it did not appear to have been considered by the Council. The Head of Learner and Teaching Support, Dr Christina Lloyd, confirmed that work was being done with HR to establish the nature of such a transition period and to communicate it widely as soon as possible.
- 15.4 The Senate **noted** the report on the meeting of the Council held on 1 March 2011.

16 FUTURE ITEMS OF BUSINESS

S/2011/2/13

- 16.1 A member said that there were members of her faculty who would appreciate sufficient opportunity to discuss the following papers before they were presented to the Senate:
- a) Thematic Research Networks
 - b) Student Employability Policy
 - c) Code of Practice for Student Discipline
- 16.2 The member also asked whether it was possible to suggest items for the list. Some fundamental changes regarding curriculum, modules and qualifications were in prospect and it would be helpful to understand by June 2011 how this would play out. This would enable the University to prepare a smooth path through the governance process for these changes.
- 16.3 The Senate **noted** the list of potential items for discussion at the meeting of the Senate in June 2011.

17 DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS

Meetings would be held on the following dates:

Wednesday 8 June 2011
Wednesday 19 October 2011
Wednesday 25 January 2012

18 FAREWELL AND THANKS

On behalf of the Director, Students, Mr Will Swann, the Head of Learner and Teaching Support, Dr Christina Lloyd, reported that Mrs Roz Evans was attending her final meeting of the Senate, as she would be retiring as the President of The Open University Students Association (OUSA) at its conference later in April 2011. On behalf of the Senate, Dr Lloyd thanked Mrs Evans for her contribution to OUSA and the University's students and wished her well in the future.

Julie Tayler
Assistant Secretary
Central Secretariat
j.d.tayler@open.ac.uk
April 2011

Attachments:

- Appendix 1: Disciplinary, Tribunal and Grievance Committee Panels
- Appendix 2: Curriculum and Validation Committee
- Appendix 3: Qualifications Committee
- Appendix 4: Research Committee
- Appendix 5: Examination and Assessment Boards

DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE PANELS

MEMBERSHIP LIST – UPDATED 01.0406.04.2011

-
1. Panel of ten members of academic staff appointed by the Senate on the recommendation of the Senate Membership Panel.

Mr Uwe Baumann	FELS	to 31.08.2012
Professor Chris Bissell	MCT	to 31.08.2012
Mrs Celia Cohen	OU in the South	to 31.08.2012
Ms Lin Smith	OUBS	to 31.08.2012
Dr Bob Wilkinson	Arts	to 31.08.2012
Professor Allan Cochrane	Social Sciences	to 31.08.2013
Dr Robin Goodfellow	IET	to 31.08.2014
Dr Terry Whatson	Science	to 31.08.2014
Professor Nicholas Braithwaite	Science	to 31.08.2014
To be appointed		

2. Panel of ten members of the UAP (academic-related) staff elected by and from such staff.

Ms Pauline Collins	Student Services	to 31.08. <u>2011</u> <u>2012</u>
Ms Kate Levers	HSC	to 31.08. <u>2011</u> <u>2012</u>
Mrs Sue Rippon	Curriculum and Qualifications	to 31.08. <u>2011</u> <u>2012</u>
Mr Michael Street	Science	to 31.08. <u>2011</u> <u>2012</u>
Mr Alan Carr	Ireland	to 31.08. <u>2013</u> <u>2014</u>
Ms Sue Dutton	Arts	to 31.08. <u>2013</u> <u>2014</u>
Ms Sandi Guest	Student Services	to 31.08. <u>2013</u> <u>2014</u>
Ms Hilary Robertson	Arts	to 31.08. <u>2013</u> <u>2014</u>
Dr Diana Stammers	LTQ	to 31.08. <u>2013</u> <u>2014</u>
Mr Ekkehard Thumm	LTS	to 31.08. <u>2013</u> <u>2014</u>

Secretary: Member of Central Secretariat staff

CURRICULUM AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 13.10.201006.04.2011

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; in collaboration with the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, where appropriate, to recommend policy 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, and for the approval of new modules and packs, recommending the frameworks and guidelines to the Senate for approval.
3. To monitor and review of 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 approve ~~the introduction of new modules and packs and on the advice of Qualifications Committee to approve~~ the introduction of new 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.
6. 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.

7. 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.
8. To approve, on the advice of the Vocational Qualifications Committee, proposals for any new types of qualifications based on occupational standards and any new curriculum areas in which vocational qualifications might be developed.
9. To interpret and approve exceptions to the policies and regulations relating to examinations and assessment and qualifications.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

10. 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.
11. To monitor the annual review of qualifications, and the annual review of curriculum partnerships and institutional partnerships 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.
12. To contribute to the Senate's annual academic review of the University.

Assuring Quality and Standards, including approving regulations

13. 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.
14. 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.
15. To maintain and monitor the University's procedures for the approval of proposals for 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

16. To advise relevant areas of the University of significant market opportunities which the market may present, in order to inform University strategy.
17. To advise the Senate on the introduction or withdrawal of specific categories of qualification.
18. 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 (Curriculum and Qualifications), Chair, *ex officio*.
2. The deans of faculties and schools 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, OUVS, *ex officio*.
5. The Head of Assessment Credit and Qualifications or nominee, *ex officio*.
6. The Director of the Centre for Professional Learning and Development, *ex officio*.
7. The Director of the Centre for Centre for Inclusion and Curriculum, or nominee, *ex officio*.
8. One nominee of the Director, Students.
9. One nominee of the Director of Marketing.
10. Four members of staff, elected by the Senate, of whom at least two shall be members of the central academic staff.
11. Two associate lecturers appointed by the Associate Lecturers Executive.
12. Two registered students appointed by the Open University Students' Association.
13. 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 (Curriculum and Qualifications) on the recommendation of University officers.
14. 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 any body 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, in particular for the approval of courses and packs.

QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 26.0106.04.2011

Purpose

On behalf of the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC), to provide detailed scrutiny of proposals relating to individual qualifications, to approve the introduction of standard qualification proposals, and their regulations, to approve proposals to withdraw qualifications, and their amended regulations, to approve amendments to existing qualifications, to approve credit transfer schemes and to make recommendations to the CVC on the approval of non-standard qualifications, including where such qualifications involve a partnership dimension; where any aspect of the qualification is being funded from strategic/central funds; where the qualification is the first example of a new type of qualification; where the qualification has non-standard elements, or where the qualification is in a subject or sub-subject that is new to the University.

Terms of Reference

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

1. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the introduction of individual taught qualifications, and their regulations, taking into account the QAA requirements relating to programme specifications, learning outcomes and subject benchmarking, the balance of such awards between Open University originated credit and credit originated outside the University, and taking into account of the University's validated programmes and qualifications; where appropriate, to refer proposals for classification schemes to the Assessment Policy Committee.
2. Following scrutiny, to approve new qualifications and their associated regulations where the proposals are standard.
3. To approve proposals for the withdrawal of individual taught qualifications, and amended regulations, ensuring that students are given reasonable notice of any changes.
4. To approve amendments to existing qualifications and their regulations.
- 5. To approve the introduction of new modules and packs.**
- 56. To approve the award of general and specific credit, specific credit transfer schemes and, in consultation as appropriate with the Curriculum Partnerships Committee, collaborative credit agreements with other institutions, for the University's taught qualifications, which do not require regulatory changes.**

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

- 67. To monitor the demand for the University's taught qualifications and to receive an annual report on the number of qualifications made of each type.**
- 78. To monitor the process for the annual review of qualifications.**

- | **89.** To have oversight (on behalf of the Senate) of the award of credit to applicants and students towards the University's taught qualifications based on study undertaken outside the University in accordance with established regulations.
- | **910.** To receive regular reports on the approval of awards of general and specific credit and to monitor the annual review process for such awards.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

- | **1011.** To monitor the University's procedures for the approval and review of its qualifications, ensuing that they are in accordance with the current guidance from the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA).
- | **4412.** To keep under review the credit structures and requirements for the University's taught qualifications, having regard to the relationships between such qualifications, their comparability with the University's validated qualifications and the relevant national qualifications frameworks.
- | **4213.** To make recommendations to the Curriculum and Validation Committee for new or revised general regulations, including credit transfer regulations, for the University's taught qualifications.

Advising other governance bodies or management

- | **4314.** To make recommendations to the CVC on the approval of proposals for the introduction of individual taught qualifications, and their regulations, particularly where such qualifications involve a partnership dimension, where any aspect of the qualification is being funded from strategic/central funds; where the qualification is the first example of a new type of qualification; where the qualification has a non-standard element; or where the qualification is in a subject or sub-subject that is new to the University.
- | **4415.** To identify and consider credit accumulation and transfer issues particularly those involving the status and recognition of the University's modules and qualifications arising from discussions with other institutions and from national and international developments, to co-ordinate the University's response to consultative documents and reports on such issues, and where appropriate to propose the introduction of new types of qualification or changes to existing curriculum policy to the CVC.

Membership

1. A Chair appointed by the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
2. 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).
3. The Director, OU Validation Services, or nominee.
4. The Director, Centre for Inclusion and Curriculum (CIC) or nominee, *ex officio*.
5. The Head of Assessment, Credit and Qualifications or nominee.
6. The Head of Product and Service Development, or nominee

7. Two members of Student Services support staff, nominated by the Director, Students.
8. One member of staff based in Scotland, nominated by the Director, Scotland.
9. Two registered students, one of whom should be a postgraduate student, appointed by the Open University Students' Association.
10. One associate lecturer appointed by the Associate Lecturers Executive.
11. Two external members of the Validation Committee, nominated by that Committee.
12. The Chair of the Credit Rating Panel, *ex officio*.
13. The Head of the Learner Advisory Service or nominee.

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.
3. The Committee shall delegate to the Credit Rating Panel the authority to approve and review awards of general and specific credit.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 13.10.201006.04.2011

Purpose

The Research Committee is responsible to the Senate for strategy, policy and standards relating to research, research degrees and higher doctorates in the University.

Terms of Reference

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

1. To maintain and promote the University's strategy on research, in consultation with central academic unit committees, and to recommend the strategy to the Senate for approval.
2. To determine policies and guidelines within the agreed strategy for research, research degrees and higher doctorates, making recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.
3. To oversee the processes for preparation approval and review of the research aspects of central academic unit plans, encouraging collaboration between central academic units and sub-units in their research activities.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

4. To monitor the implementation and operation of policy.
5. To monitor reports from Research Degrees Committee on research student and research degree matters.
6. To contribute to the Senate's annual academic review of the University.

Assuring Quality and Standards, including approving regulations

7. To ensure that standards are set for research activities within the context of external research quality monitoring including the forthcoming Research Excellence Framework.
8. To be responsible, via the Research Degrees Committee, for the recruitment, admission, registration, supervision and progress of research students, and for research degree and higher doctorate examinations.
9. To be responsible, via the Research Degrees Committee, for the approval of recommendations of examiners for research degrees and higher doctorates and the award of research degrees and higher doctorates.
10. To approve applications from organisations wishing to become affiliated research centres after guidance and recommendation from the Research Degrees Committee.

Advising other governance bodies or management

11. To advise the Senate, the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee and Central Academic Unit (CAU) Committees on all aspects of the development of research, and research degree activities in the University, including resources and priorities for strategic development.

Making governance arrangements e.g. appointing to other committees

12. To appoint the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Research Degrees Committee.
13. To appoint the regionally/nationally-based Senate representative of the Research Committee to the Research Degrees Committee.
14. To co-opt up to two members of the Research Degrees Committee.

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

Membership

1. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), Chair, *ex officio*.
2. The relevant associate deans or equivalent of faculties and schools, *ex officio*.
3. The Directors of the Research Centres, *ex officio*.
4. The Chair of the Affiliated Research Centres Management Group, *ex officio*
45. The Chairs of any committees reporting to the Committee.
56. Four representatives of the Senate, elected by the Senate, of whom at least one shall be a member of regionally/nationally-based staff.
67. One registered full-time research student and one registered part-time external student, appointed by the Open University Students Association.
78. Two members of the research staff elected by and from such staff.
89. A representative from an affiliated research centre.
910. The Research School Academic Co-ordinator, *ex officio*.
1011. A Dean or Director, to be nominated by the Deans and Directors Group.
1112. Such others as the Committee may co-opt up to a maximum of four.

Secretary

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 any body 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.

EXAMINATION AND ASSESSMENT BOARDS

| CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 01.09.201006.04.2011

Terms of Reference

1. Assessment by Controlled Means

- a) To prescribe a suitable form of controlled assessment within the policy approved by Senate for the particular qualification.
- b) To prepare such examination papers and associated marking guides as are required for each module presentation.
- c) To prepare such documentation as is required to deliver and mark other forms of controlled assessment for each module presentation.
- d) To advise on the conduct of the examination and of other forms of controlled assessment in consultation with the Assessment, Credit and Qualifications Division of Student Services.
- e) To nominate scriptmarkers for examination scripts for appointment by the University.
- f) To nominate markers for components examined by some means other than a written examination, for appointment by the University.
- g) To supervise the marking of examination scripts and arrange for their moderation under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.
- h) To supervise the marking of other assessment by controlled means and make arrangements for its moderation under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.
- i) To receive a report from the Assessment, Credit and Qualifications Division of Student Services on the conduct of examinations and other forms of controlled assessment.

2. Continuous Assessment (where appropriate)

- a) To supervise the marking of tutor-marked and computer-marked assignments and to make arrangements for their moderation under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.
- b) To consider reports on the monitoring of tutor-marked assignments.

3. Award of Results

- a) To recommend to the Senate the award of the degree or, for modular qualifications, the award of a credit for the module, including, where appropriate, a grade of pass to individual students under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.

- b) To consider the case of individual students whose performance places them on the borderline(s) for the module result statuses and to consider medical or other evidence under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.
- c) To undertake any other examination/assessment functions for a particular qualification.

4. Report and Recommendations

- a) To consider the report(s) made by the External Examiner(s) on the previous presentation of the module.
- b) To report to the Senate, via the minutes of the Qualification meeting, on the work of the Board, and to make recommendations for the conduct of the controlled assessment and the continuous assessment in the following presentation.

Membership

Such Boards shall have the following membership:

1. The Chair of the Module Team or nominee *ex officio*.

Note: in the case of a Board responsible for a group of modules, the Chair of one of the Module Teams concerned, as approved by the appropriate authority*.

2. Not less than two and a maximum of five internal examiners who shall normally be members of the University's full-time academic staff of lecturer status or above nominated by the appropriate Module Team(s) and appointed by the appropriate authority* preferably for a period of three years.

Note: (i) only one module co-ordinator, curriculum manager, research assistant, current associate lecturer, visiting academic or consultant of the University may be appointed as an internal examiner and he/she shall be ineligible for appointment as the Chair.

(ii) the number of internal examiners, in addition to the Chair, required on modules which are in re-sit presentation is one member drawn from the membership of the Board for the previous presentation.

3. Not less than one External Examiner nominated by the Module Team(s) on the recommendation of the appropriate authority* and appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Qualifications) under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate, on the recommendation of the Examinations and Assessment Committee. A special case will need to be made where it is proposed that more than one should be appointed.

Note: ~~In the case of Taught Higher Degrees, the Board may consist of the Programme Board for the Degree plus the External Examiners. In cases where this body becomes too large for the efficient conduct of business (eg more than ten examiners), then it shall be appropriate to establish a sub-group of the Programme Board to act as the Examination and Assessment Board for the Degree.~~

Modules being Developmentally Tested for credit

An examination and assessment board shall be appointed for the developmental testing for the award of module credit according to the regulations set out above.

| * The Committee of the Faculty ~~or School~~

EXAMINATION & ASSESSMENT BOARDS FOR THOSE MODULES WHICH ARE VERSIONS OF OPEN UNIVERSITY MODULES PRESENTED IN A FOREIGN COUNTRY IN COLLABORATION WITH ANOTHER INSTITUTION AND IN A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED 01.09.2010

Terms of Reference

1. Final Examination

- a) To receive the moderated examination paper and associated mark scheme from the Examination and Assessment Board for the parent module and to recommend to that Board for approval such modifications as maybe necessary for the sole purpose of contextualising the content.
- b) To advise on the conduct of the examination in consultation with the Assessment, Credit and Qualifications Division of Student Services and any appropriate authority within the collaborating institution.
- c) To nominate scriptmarkers for appointment by the appropriate authority.
- d) To supervise the marking of examination scripts and to make arrangements for their moderation under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.
- e) To consider and decide on borderline and special cases.
- f) To receive a report from the Assessment, Credit and Qualifications Division of Student Services and any appropriate authority within the collaborating institution on the conduct of the examinations.

2. Continuous Assessment

To supervise the marking of tutor marked and computer marked assignments and to make arrangements for their moderation under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.

3. Awards of Credits

- a) To recommend to the Senate the award of a credit for the module, including a grade of pass where appropriate, to individual students under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.
- b) To consider the case of individual students whose performance places them on a borderline for the module and to consider medical or other evidence under a Code of Practice approved by the Senate.

4. Annual Report

To submit an annual report to the Senate on the work of the Board together with recommendations for the conduct of the examination and assessment in the following year. (This is normally submitted to the Assessment Policy Committee in the first instance.)

Membership

1. ~~Chair to be a senior member of the full time academic staff of the collaborating institution.~~
2. ~~No less than two and no more than four examiners to be full time academic staff of the collaborating institution, directly involved in the presentation of the module and the assessment processes.~~
3. ~~One examiner to be the Chair of the Examination and Assessment Board of the parent module, or their nominee, who must be a full time member of the academic staff of the University.~~
4. ~~One external examiner, who shall not be a member of staff of the University or the collaborating institution and will be independent of both the production and presentation of the module, but who shall, by virtue of academic qualifications and experience, be capable of providing direct experience of relevant standards in other comparable institutions in the country concerned.~~

~~Secretary~~

EXAMINATION AND ASSESSMENT BOARDS

MEMBERSHIP LIST – UPDATED 01.09.2010

1. ~~Chair to be a senior member of the full time academic staff of the collaborating institution.~~
2. ~~No less than two and no more than four examiners to be full time academic staff of the collaborating institution, directly involved in the presentation of the module and the assessment processes.~~
3. ~~One examiner to be the Chair of the Examination and Assessment Board of the parent module, or their nominee, who must be a full time member of the academic staff of the University.~~
4. ~~One external examiner, who shall not be a member of staff of the University or the collaborating institution and will be independent of both the production and presentation of the module, but who shall, by virtue of academic qualifications and experience, be capable of providing direct experience of relevant standards in other comparable institutions in the country concerned.~~

Secretary