

SENATE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SENATE HELD 2 NOVEMBER 2016

- Present: Prof J Vinney (**Chair**)
Mr J Andrews; Mr D Asaya; Ms M Barron; Mr G Beards; Dr M Board; Dr M Bobeva; Dr E Borkoles; Dr B Dyer; Prof J Fletcher; Ms M Gray; Ms J Houzer; Mr A James; Dr F Knight; Ms J Mack (Secretary); Prof C Maggs; Prof S McDougall; Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty; Ms S Ponsford; Prof E Rosser; Mr J Swanson; Prof M Wilmore; Prof T Zhang
- In attendance: Ms J Forster (Agenda Item 4.3); Ms M Frampton (Academic Quality Officer); Mr R Pottle (Agenda Item 4.2 and 5.1); Mr G Rayment (Corporate Governance & Committee Manager); Prof G Thomas (Agenda Item 5.1)
- Observer: Mr M Wood (Good Governance Institute)
- Apologies received: Dr S Minocha; Mr K Pretty; Prof I MacRury; Prof S Page; Dr R Southern; Prof S Tee, Dr S White

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed Senators to the meeting and apologies were noted as above.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed the new Elected Academic Staff Representatives: Dr Bryce Dyer (Faculty of Science and Technology) and Dr Fiona Knight (Professional Services). The Chair also welcomed Mr Asaya as the new President of the Students' Union and Mr Swanson as the new Vice President (Education) of the Students' Union.
- 1.3 At the last meeting on 8 June 2016, Senators approved the Terms of Reference for the Independent Review of Senate which was being undertaken by the Good Governance Institute. Mr Michael Wood would be observing the meeting and as part of the review a survey would be carried out with Senators in due course. Sub-committees of Senate would also be observed over the coming months and a report would then be submitted to the University Board to provide assurance that the University's academic governance was effective. The Chair welcomed Mr Wood to the meeting.

1.2 DECLARATIONS ON INTEREST

- 1.2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8 JUNE 2016**2.1 Matters Arising**

- 2.1.1 The minutes were approved as an accurate record with the exception of Section 4.2.11 on page 3 where it was agreed the word 'as' should be removed from the third line.
- 2.1.2 Ms Mack advised that the Faculty Academic Board Terms of Reference had been reviewed and discussed with Executive Deans to ensure they remained fit for purpose. It had been suggested by Executive Deans that the focus on research, knowledge exchange and professional practice could be strengthened, however, it was agreed that the Terms of Reference would be fully reviewed following the review of Senate and the outcome of the Graduate School review, as required.
- 2.1.3 Only one minor amendment had been made to the Faculty Academic Board Terms of Reference to update references to 'Dean' to read 'Executive Dean'. Prof Wilmore suggested the Terms of Reference listed towards the end of the agenda should also be similarly updated.
- 2.1.4 **Approved:** The updated Faculty Academic Board Terms of Reference were approved.

2.2 Senate Terms of Reference and Membership

- 2.2.1 Minor amendments had been made to job titles and there had been one amendment to the membership, which was the removal of the Principal of the Anglo-European College of Chiropractic (AECC) as a member, due to the AECC now having degree awarding powers. From September 2017, they would now be recruiting students to programmes under the AECC award. Due to their change in status, it was no longer appropriate for the Principal to be a member of Senate. Prof McIntyre-Bhatty confirmed that he had been corresponding with the Principal of the AECC on this and other transitional matters and the Principal understood why his membership had been reconsidered.
- 2.2.2 Prof Zhang advised that the Graduate School Academic Board should be added to the sub-committees section of the Senate Terms of Reference. It was agreed this would be added to the Terms of Reference.
- 2.2.3 The two new elected members of Senate had been added to the Senate Membership List.
- 2.2.4 **Approved:** The updated Senate Terms of Reference and Senate Membership List were recommended to the Board for approval subject to the amendments suggested.

3. REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SENATE OF 12 TO 19 OCTOBER 2016

- 3.1 **Noted:** The report of the Electronic Senate meeting of 12 to 19 October 2016 was noted.
- 3.2 The Chair noted one of the issues raised with regards to the start date of the 2016/17 academic year. In the response to the issue raised it was confirmed that the date was consistent with the start date in the 2015/16 academic year.

4. VICE CHANCELLOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 BU2018 and HE Sector Update

- 4.1.1 Following the EU referendum and the vote to leave the EU, the government had confirmed that Article 50 would be triggered next Spring, starting a two year negotiation period on the terms for Brexit. The government also announced that current EU students and those starting in the 2016/17 academic year would continue to receive loans and grants as they were eligible under current rules, for the whole of their period of study. This had recently been extended to cover the 2017/18 academic year. In the meantime, enrolments by EU students proceeded as normal and the University has not seen a reduction in planned numbers. It was early to state at present whether there would be an impact for applications next year, although the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) recently announced in their early data that there had been a 9% drop across the sector in EU applications for 2017 entry. The University's immediate priority was to reassure students and staff, and this had been communicated through a range of channels reiterating the University's ongoing commitment to its vision of global engagement and as a diverse and inclusive community.
- 4.1.2 As the academic year progressed, there would be more debates at Senate meetings and within the Executive, particularly around mobility for staff and students and research funding.
- 4.1.3 Following the appointment of the new Prime Minister, Theresa May, at the end of July 2016, Jo Johnson had remained the Minister for Universities, Science, Research and Innovation, with a dual reporting line to Justine Greening, Secretary of State for Education, and Greg Clark, Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. It was beneficial to Universities that one Minister was retained and it would be important moving forward to secure a link between the two Secretaries of State.
- 4.1.4 The recommendations from the review of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) led by Lord Stern were reported in July 2016 and generally the recommendations were widely welcomed and did not constitute a radical change to the previous REF2014. Some changes may be controversial, including proposals which the University supported, to include all research active staff in the REF and to stop academic staff being able to port their research to another university. If the recommendations become a reality, there would be another consultation later in the year with regards to how the proposals would be implemented. It was important that the effect of the changes did not encourage a

split between education and research, for example by encouraging institutions to employ staff on teaching-only contracts. Moving forward, with the changes taking place around the structure of Higher Education and the introduction of the Office for Students and UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), the University would monitor the changing HE landscape following the Stern Review consultation and the HE Bill which would be presented to the House of Lords.

- 4.1.5 Following the Comprehensive Spending Review in 2015, the Chancellor announced radical changes to NHS student bursaries. From 1 August 2017, NHS bursaries would be abolished for new nursing, midwifery and allied health students, and would be replaced with student loans. The University submitted its response to the Department of Health consultation on the proposed changes over the Summer, and also responded to the detailed questions by highlighting concerns about the potential impact on mature students. Some changes were made following responses from across the sector, and when the final policy was announced, there was more flexibility in funding for travel and hardship funding.
- 4.1.6 As a result of changes made to the numbers of universities included in league tables, and changes to some metrics used, the University's ranking in the Times Higher World University rankings had unfortunately fallen. The University was now included in the 601-800 group, having previously been in the 401-500 group last year. The University had however risen 20 places in The Times and Sunday Times Good University Guide 2017, which was due to a variety of factors including NSS, and the University's research, education and professional practice being highlighted as areas of particular strength. The University's Fusion vision was key to creating a fantastic student experience and this result had recognised the hard work and commitment of the University's community. The Guardian University League Table and the Complete University Guide were due to be published in May/June 2017.
- 4.1.7 Undergraduate admissions and enrolments remained strong in the 2016 cycle. Applications had been up 12%, and applications from ABB+ students had increased by 15%, against a flat sector and a demographic downturn. Postgraduate recruitment was still a challenge. The University was expecting to enrol just under 850 postgraduate students which was 20 students under target, however late applications were expected as well as the January intake of students. More than 100 of these postgraduate students were EU students and more than 400 were international students.
- 4.1.8 Since the last meeting in June, the Fusion Building had opened formally in September. The Chair would be pleased to receive feedback from Senators with regards to the building and how it was being used. Over the Summer, planning permission had been endorsed for both the Bournemouth and Poole Gateway buildings as well as infrastructure improvements at Talbot Campus. These buildings would provide fantastic new teaching, research and learning spaces at both Lansdowne and Talbot campuses.
- 4.1.9 Moving forward, discussions would continue at Senate meetings with regards to the work to be carried out to deliver the BU2018 Strategic Plan and the development of the BU2025 strategy. The Chair advised Senators that a joint Senate/University Board/University Leadership Team event would take place on 6 July 2017 (4.00pm to 7.00pm) to discuss and shape the BU2025 strategy. Formal invitations would follow.

4.2 National Student Survey (NSS) and Change to Future Surveys

- 4.2.1 The University's overall satisfaction score had improved by 3% to 82% this year following four years of relatively static performance, and was now at its highest ever level. Whilst this was positive, further improvements were necessary in order to close the 4% gap to the sector average of 86%. Along with overall satisfaction, every question area had increased in 2016 with Learning and Resources now 2% above the sector average and Personal Development now level with the sector average. Assessment and Feedback saw a 4% improvement to 70%, which in turn had closed the gap to the sector average from 7% to 4%. Senators were reminded that there was still more work to be carried out in this area.
- 4.2.2 At programme level, 32 programmes had improved overall satisfaction scores, whilst 14 had declined. 22 programmes were at or above the 86% sector average compared to 15 programmes last year. Volatility at programme level appeared to be reducing and more programmes were on an upward trend which had resulted in less of a spread of overall satisfaction scores across programmes. 12 programmes had scored overall below 80%, and 6 of these programmes ranged from 50% to 68%. The effect of these 6 programmes was significant and if these programmes were removed from the dataset, the University's overall satisfaction would achieve the sector average score of 86%.

- 4.2.3 For the 2017 NSS survey, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) would introduce substantial changes to the survey questionnaire based on the outcomes of the recent review which was published in August 2016. The survey would now consist of 27 questions in the main survey and the current optional banks would remain the same, with adjustments to address overlaps. It had been clear that the University was moving in the right direction, however a lot more work was required in order to improve further.
- 4.2.4 Overall, the University had improved in every category and next year the University would see improvements again with continued efforts. The University needs to keep its focus and attention of all elements moving forward, deliver on the University's vision statement and provide a challenging and stimulating environment for all students.

4.3 TEF Assessment – Year 2

- 4.3.1 The Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) had been driven by government concerns with regards to inconsistency in teaching across all universities as there had been concerns that research was being prioritised over teaching. The previous Prime Minister, David Cameron, wanted to double the proportion of people from disadvantaged backgrounds entering Higher Education from 13.6% in 2009 to 27.2% by 2020. TEF was not just about addressing Teaching Excellence but also about addressing Teaching Quality, the Learning Environment, Student Outcomes and Learning Gain.
- 4.3.2 Now that we had entered TEF Year 2, guidance had been published this week with regards to the University starting to work on its TEF application which would need to be submitted by the end of January 2017. Assessment would take place between February and May 2017, with the awards being announced in May 2017, and then TEF Year 3 would commence.
- 4.3.3 The first step of the process which would take place between January and May 2017 would involve Assessors reviewing a provider's core and split metrics and then forming an initial hypothesis of a rating based on performance against the metrics. The second step of the process would be Assessors looking at the provider's 15 page submission and testing the initial hypothesis to see whether there was anything that may lead to a different view of their initial rating. The final step of the process would be for Assessors to look holistically at their judgements against the criteria demonstrated by the metrics and the submission. Assessors would then consider whether their judgement remained the same or should be adjusted.
- 4.3.4 There had been a lot of debate around commendations. Some Universities believed there should not be any specified categories. Within the government's published consultation response, the University's submission had been quoted:

“Bournemouth University supports the use of commendations; however, we do not believe that there should be a set list of restricted categories. Panels should be able to award commendations where appropriate to reflect excellence. We do not believe that there should be any quota attached to these, as this would undermine the value of the commendation”.

- 4.3.5 In response to submissions received, the government had decided not to complicate the panel's task and award commendations this year, however this would be reviewed next year.
- 4.3.6 A further update with regards to TEF would be available at the next meeting of Senate in February 2017.

4.4 Global Engagement Update 2016-17 – Quarter One

- 4.4.1 Dr Minocha was unable to attend the meeting, however a detailed paper had been provided which gave an overview of global engagement activity in the first quarter of the 2016/17 academic year. The paper highlighted the increased focus on strategic partnerships and the importance of outward student mobility which remained a top priority.
- 4.4.2 The Global Talent Programme (GTP) had been launched and this brought together the University's central extra-curricular employability offer under a single banner, whilst complimenting the more departmental-specific offers in Faculties. To date, 360 students had registered for the GTP.

- 4.4.3 Dr Minocha had recorded a short film to provide a brief Global BU Update for Quarter 1 which also included highlights from the International Commencement Ceremony which took place on 23 September 2016. The event was attended by more than 500 new international students and 150 members of staff and key figures from the region.
- 4.4.4 Dr Borkoles questioned whether the University would be looking to introduce joint awards with other European institutions as she was aware of a European institution which was keen to develop joint awards. It was noted that BU does not support joint awards, but does support dual awards but that no proposals had been received from academic colleagues. Senators were requested to disseminate this information to colleagues.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Fair Access/Fair Access Agreement Management Group (FAAMG)

- 5.1.1 The Chair welcomed Prof Thomas and Mr Pottle. Prof Thomas has been leading Fair Access at the University and Mr Pottle had been analysing the data and would provide a short introduction to Fair Access.
- 5.1.2 Prof Maggs gave an overview of Fair Access data, starting with data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) and the Equality Challenge Unit for the last 10 years. The overall attainment (percentage graduating with a First or 2:1) had greatly increased over this period for all groups of students. By 2013/14, whereas this had risen to 75% for white students, it was only 50% for black students, which was an attainment gap. Over this same period, the percentage of students who were Black/Minority/Ethnic (BME) had seen a 33% increase, to 20% of the student body. HEFCE data showed that in 2013/14, regardless of entry qualifications, there was an attainment gap for BME students relative to white students.
- 5.1.3 With regards to BME academics, at a sector level 0.49% of Professors were black and of these, only 17 were women. There were also only 15 black academics in senior management roles in UK universities and they were not all UK domiciled. 92.4% of academics were white and there were very few black academics who were highly ranked. Proportionally, fewer BME and white female academic staff were Professors than white men, and proportionally UK white academics held far more professorial roles than UK black academics.
- 5.1.4 Moving forward, the University would need to break down its metrics by group as the TEF would not be using just NSS and Destination of Leavers in Higher Education (DLHE) data.
- 5.1.5 Mr Pottle talked through the Student Satisfaction data provided, explaining that mature students were generally more satisfied in the NSS than younger students, and non-white students were less satisfied than white students. Female students tended to be more satisfied in the NSS than male students, although the gap was continuing to close over time.
- 5.1.6 Some further characteristics which would be used in TEF were non-continuations. Those students who were non-white, mature or had declared a disability, were more likely to withdraw from University after their first year. Students with a disability were more likely to be unemployed six months after leaving university and female and white students were more likely to have secured employment.
- 5.1.7 With regards to full time undergraduate awards there was a clear relationship at institutional level between tariff points on entry and degree classification, although there was some variation by Faculty. In particular, mean tariff points on entry for students graduating with First Class and Upper Second Class degrees in the Faculty of Health & Social Sciences were lower than for other Faculties. Only 63% of BME students achieved a First Class or Upper Second Class degree in 2014/15 compared to 81% of non-BME students, and students with additional learning needs were also less likely to achieve a First Class or Upper Second Class degree. Data also showed that BME students were less likely to receive an offer at a university and also more likely to drop out of university.
- 5.1.8 Prof Maggs encouraged Senators to focus on the reality of all the information provided and to give some thought into how the University could start to encourage applications from BME students. Prof Maggs advised that at a recent seminar held by Gurnam Singh from Coventry University, speakers had spoken about the attainment gap and Decolonising the Curriculum, and what the cause of the attainment gap was. Those in attendance had agreed it was very complex and there was no clear answer. Some research had shown there was a clear difference between BME students and white

students in the way they interpret assignment briefs, and briefs which were not clearly written often discriminated against BME students as they dealt with information differently and deconstructed the question very differently in order to begin to understand it. This was one key area identified and it was important that assignment briefs were very clear so that it benefitted BME students specifically, but also all students.

- 5.1.9 Prof Thomas highlighted that from her perspective the University has an attainment differential although it was not very different from the sector. It was important the University increased its outreach target with the recruitment of BME students and ensured they have an excellent student experience whilst studying at University, ensured they succeeded and ensured the curriculum was accessible to all regardless of age, ability and colour. The University needed to create experiences that were positive and that each student could successfully engage with.
- 5.1.10 The assessment approach was an important issue for all to consider as well as the issue of transferability and to be able to understand and critique things was something all should consider. With regards to unconscious bias and anonymous marking, the University had tried to tackle both of these areas, however further progress was needed.
- 5.1.11 Prof Wilmore highlighted the NSS and Assessment, which was an area the University generally did not score well in. Prof Wilmore believed it was now the ideal time to decolonise and put the challenge of increasing BME attainment at the heart of the University's thinking, which would in turn expose the wider issue as a whole. The University needed to give some thought to how assessments were structured in order that all students benefited.
- 5.1.12 Mr Asaya had recently spoken to a group of black students, and the students highlighted that they were only taught by a handful of BME lecturers. Some of the students were not taught at all by BME lecturers. The students had commented that they would feel more confident to ask questions in class if they were taught by a BME lecturer. Mr Asaya believed the University should work on increasing the number of BME academic staff members. Ms Barron advised that she often receives feedback from students with disabilities commenting that assignment briefs had included double negatives or were too 'floral' which was very difficult for students with Asperger's Syndrome. The wording of assignment briefs needed to be written considering everyone regardless of background or disability. Mr Swanson agreed with Ms Barron stating that assignment briefs needed to be much clearer and academic staff should consider developing assignment briefs in partnership with students and to ensure that all students understand what was required of them.
- 5.1.13 The Chair thanked Prof Thomas, Prof Maggs and Mr Pottle for leading the discussion. Discussions with regards to Fair Access, Participation and assessment approaches would continue within the University, in particular at future Education and Student Experience Committee (ESEC) meetings. The Chair thanked Prof Maggs for agreeing to be the new Chair of the Fair Access Agreement Management Group.

6. ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

6.1 Senate Annual Report to the University Board 2015/16

- 6.1.1 The Senate Annual Report provided an overview of the work of Senate and its sub-committees and also provided assurance that the committees were fulfilling their delegated responsibilities. The report reflected on the nature and volume of work, particularly with the Academic Standards Committee and the Education & Student Experience Committee. In some cases, more narrative had been included on aspects linked to the assurance of quality and standards and continuous enhancement of the student experience. This was related to additional assurance statements that the University Board were required to sign off in December as part of the new requirements in the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) Annual Accountability return.
- 6.1.2 An updated version of the Senate Annual Report which would include hyper-links to the underpinning evidence would be presented to the University Board on 25 November 2016. The typographical error on page one would also be amended accordingly.
- 6.1.3 **Approved:** The Senate Annual Report 2015/16 was approved.

6.2 Prevent Duty Annual Report

6.2.1 The University's first Prevent Duty annual report was due to be submitted to the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) on 1 December 2016. The report summarised any relevant evidence which demonstrated the University's continuing active and effective implementation of the Prevent Duty.

6.2.2 **Approved:** The Prevent Duty Annual Report was approved.

6.3 BU Research Themes/Research Showcase 2016-2025

6.3.1 Research themes had been in place at the University for eleven years and were introduced to encourage activity across the then Academic Schools. The intended purpose of the themes had evolved over time. Cross Faculty and interdisciplinary collaboration was currently on a positive trajectory and it was felt that it was timely to revisit the themes.

6.3.2 The University proposed to have five themes which People, Centres and Institutes engaged with. The research and knowledge exchange themes would act as a showcase for the University's activities which impact on the world around us and would help steer the University's research support as we moved from 2012-2018 to 2018-2025.

6.3.3 Following a review of research activity within the current themes, the proposed themes would be:

- Business and Economic Sustainability
- Digital and Technological Futures
- Environment, Culture and Heritage
- Global Security
- Health and Wellbeing

6.3.4 Each Theme would have one academic leader who would be responsible for encouraging the disciplinary working within the theme, identifying opportunities for collaborative bids, motivating the members and driving the theme forwards. The Themes would be kept live and would be continually reviewed moving forward. The proposed Themes would also be discussed further at other University Committees as required, and may be developed further as Fusion and academic themes to underpin our longer term academic footprint.

6.3.5 Senators believed it would be difficult to promote the Themes to colleagues as it may mean having a label applied to their work and categorisation in an area which may seem far removed. The Themes had been discussed at a recent University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee meeting and Prof Fletcher had received a number of comments. Dr Dyer suggested that a series of Fusion events should be set up to encourage participation by colleagues. Following a suggestion by Dr Bobeva, Dr Knight agreed to include the Centre for Excellence in Learning in the list of Research Centres.

ACTION: Dr Knight agreed to include the Centre for Excellence in Learning in the list of Research Centres.

ACTION BY: Dr Fiona Knight

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Terms of Reference

7.1 Academic Standards Committee Terms of Reference

7.1.1 The Academic Standards Committee (ASC) Terms of Reference had been approved at the last meeting on 3 October 2016 with one minor amendment made with regards committee support to reflect the new Academic Quality team.

7.1.2 Senators noted that as the Anglo-European College of Chiropractic (AECC) Principal had been removed from the Senate Terms of Reference, it was suggested the AECC member be removed from the ASC membership.

7.1.3 Ms Mack agreed to make the suggested amendment to the ASC Terms of Reference. Prof McIntyre-Bhatty advised Senators that he had recently appointed a Deputy Chair to the Committee, Prof Vanora Hundley.

7.1.4 **Approved:** The Academic Standards Committee Terms of Reference were approved subject to the amendment suggested.

7.2 Education and Student Experience Committee Terms of Reference

7.2.1 The Education and Student Experience Committee (ESEC) Terms of Reference had been approved at the last meeting on 26 September 2016 with no substantive amendments.

7.2.2 Senators suggested amending the word 'non-academic' to 'professional support staff' in the Management and Support section of the Terms of Reference. Ms Mack agreed to make the suggested amendment to the ESEC Terms of Reference. Prof McIntyre-Bhatty advised Senators that he had recently appointed a Deputy Chair to the Committee, Prof Richard Stillman.

7.2.3 **Approved:** The Education and Student Experience Committee Terms of Reference were approved subject to the amendment suggested.

7.3 University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee Terms of Reference

7.3.1 No amendments had been made to the University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee Terms of Reference.

7.3.2 **Approved:** The University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee Terms of Reference were approved.

7.4 University Research Ethics Committee Terms of Reference

7.4.1 The University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) Terms of Reference had been approved at the last UREC meeting on 12 October 2016 with a minor amendment to the Committee membership. Ms Mack agreed to confirm the background to the membership change with the Committee Secretary. Senate did not approve the amendment. If required, the Terms of Reference would be re-presented to Senate for approval.

7.4.2 **Noted :** The University Research Ethics Committee Terms of Reference were noted in their previous format as following discussion it was established that no changes had been made.

Minutes of Research Committees

7.5 University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee minutes of 5 September 2016

7.5.1 **Noted:** The University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee minutes were noted.

7.6 University Research Ethics Committee minutes of 12 October 2016

7.6.1 **Noted:** The University Research Ethics Committee minutes were noted.

Faculty Academic Boards

7.7 Faculty of Health & Social Sciences Faculty Academic Board minutes of 11 October 2016

7.7.1 **Noted:** The Faculty of Health & Social Sciences Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted.

7.8 Faculty of Management Faculty Academic Board minutes of 12 October 2016

7.8.1 **Noted:** The Faculty of Management Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted.

7.9 Faculty of Media & Communication Faculty Academic Board minutes of 6 October 2016

7.9.1 **Noted:** The Faculty of Media & Communication Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted.

7.10 Faculty of Science & Technology Faculty Academic Board minutes of 6 October 2016

7.10.1 **Noted:** The Faculty of Science & Technology Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted.

7.10.2 Prof Maggs advised that there were no Student Representatives in attendance at the meeting as they had not yet been appointed. The change of date of the first Senate meeting to one week later should help with this in future.

7.10.3 It was noted that this year, the elections for Student Reps would take place earlier than previous years in order that Student Reps were in place earlier and therefore able for representation at meetings from the start of each academic year.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8.1 There was no other business.

9. DATES OF THE NEXT MEETING:

Electronic Senate – 9.00am on Wednesday 1st February 2017

Senate Meeting – 2.15pm on Wednesday 22nd February 2017