

SENATE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13TH JUNE 2018

Present

Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty (Chair)	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Prof K Appleton	Professoriate Representative (FST)
Ms M Barron	Head of Student Services
Mr M Barry	Professional Services Staff Representative
Dr M Bobeva	Faculty Academic Staff Representative (FM)
Dr B Dyer	Faculty Academic Staff Representative (FST)
Ms M Gray	Faculty Academic Staff Representative (FMC)
Mr A Hancox	Vice-President (Education) 2017/18, Students' Union
Mr A James	General Manager, Students' Union
Dr F Knight	Professional Services Staff Representative
Ms J Mack (Secretary)	Head of Academic Services
Dr D McCarthy	Faculty Academic Staff Representative (FM)
Prof D Mendis	Professoriate Representative (FMC)
Prof K Phalp	Executive Dean (FST) & Acting Executive Dean (FMC)
Prof T Rees	Professoriate Representative (FM)
Dr R Southern	Faculty Academic Staff Representative (FMC)
Prof S Tee	Executive Dean (FHSS) & Acting Executive Dean (FM)
Dr S White	Faculty Academic Staff Representative (FHSS)

In attendance

Mr A Child	Head of Academic Quality (AS) [Agenda Item 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3]
Ms M Frampton (Clerk)	Academic Quality Officer (AS)
Prof D Holley	Head of Centre for Excellence in Learning [Agenda Item 6.1]
Ms A Quinney	CEL Theme Leader [Agenda Item 6.1]
Dr S Thompson	Senior Lecturer in Corporate & Marketing Communications [Agenda Item 6.1]

Apologies

Prof J Vinney	Vice-Chancellor
Mr J Andrews	Chief Operating Officer
Mr D Asaya	President 2017/18, Students' Union
Mr G Beards	Director of Finance & Performance
Dr M Board	Faculty Academic Staff Representative (FHSS)
Prof J Fletcher	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research & Innovation)
Dr S Minocha	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement)
Ms J Northam	Head of Research & Knowledge Exchange Office
Mr K Pretty	Faculty Academic Staff Representative (FST)
Prof E Rosser	Professoriate Representative (FHSS)
Prof M Wilmore	Executive Dean (FMC)

17/012 APOLOGIES, WELCOMES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were noted as listed above and there were no declarations of interest.

17/013 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 28TH FEBRUARY 2018 (SEN-17-018)

17/014 Accuracy

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

17/015 **Matters Arising**

The action in Section 17/006 of the previous minutes had been responded to by Mr Andrews. A response was provided to the SU President on 11 April 2018.

17/016 **Access and Participation Plan 2019/20**

Ms Mack circulated the Access and Participation Plan 2019/20 by email to Senators on 27 April 2018 for comment as the submission deadline was outside of the cycle of Senate meetings. The Access and Participation Plan 2019/20 was endorsed by Senate, and was subsequently approved at the University Board meeting on 4 May 2018.

17/017 **REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SENATE MEETING OF 9 TO 16 MAY 2018 (SEN-17-019)**

The report of the Electronic Senate meeting of 9 to 16 May 2018 was noted.

Noted

Ms Barron was pleased to see the recognition and positive comments made during the Electronic Senate meeting regarding students' access to medical and wellbeing support. Ms Barron confirmed the Service Level Agreement would be revisited next year as the volume of students using the service had increased considerably which had been supported by the University doubling its investment over the past three years.

Academic staff should direct any student who may need to use the Student Wellbeing Service to Student Engagement Officers within each Faculty, although within the Faculty of Health & Social Sciences (FHSS), it was noted that Academic Advisers were the first point of contact. Ms Barron confirmed that she also holds monthly update sessions to advise staff of the support available to students as well as publishing a booklet online and in hard copy.

Following a review by Dorset Healthcare, the sexual health clinic had moved away from the Talbot Campus Medical Centre and was now available at the Royal Bournemouth Hospital. Mr Hancox would share this information within SUBU more widely.

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

17/018 **HE Sector and BU Update**

This year the University had to apply to register with the Office for Students (OfS). With the introduction of the OfS, new areas were required to be reported on and the University was also now required to demonstrate how students received importation information, and how the University was compliant with the Competition & Markets Authority (CMA) guidance. Another requirement was for a Student Protection Plan, where BU was required to explain how it would protect students, for example, in relation to programme closure. Feedback from the OfS was expected in September 2018.

Following a recent internal audit of CMA compliance, the final report confirmed the University had received substantial assurance, which put the University in a strong position.

The Government's Review of Post-18 Education and Funding was ongoing, and expected to report in 2019. An interim report may be available at the end of 2018. There had been a significant movement by the National Union of Students (NUS) and Universities UK (UUK) to ask for the reintroduction of maintenance grants, which had been echoed by the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee. This was also an area that BU had supported. The University also submitted a response to the call for evidence for the Post-18 Education and Funding Review where BU cited its own evidence on maintenance costs for students.

The Department for Education was undertaking a review of TEF subject level pilots. Informal feedback suggested that neither of the two Models being piloted had been well received by HEIs, and the Models were not practicable. The subject level TEF consultation had recently closed and the University had suggested that neither Model A or B were practical and that subject level TEF should not be required for those programmes with a Professional & Statutory Body (PSRB) accreditation. BU had also proposed a longer timeframe for TEF assessments and also suggested that the system of awarding Gold, Silver and Bronze TEF awards should be replaced with a two tier system. The next annual rolling cycle of TEF results had been released (TEF Year 3) and broadly, of the Universities who had participated, institutions that were TEF Silver had moved to TEF Gold and those who were TEF Bronze had moved to TEF Silver. This was causing some comment within the

sector.

Internally, a mock subject level TEF exercise was underway and preparations were now in place for the REF 2021 submission. A key decision point for BU was coming up in July 2018 in relation to inclusivity and the proportion of staff entered into the REF. 29% of academic staff were submitted for REF 2014, and the proportion was expected to be significantly higher for the next REF. A report on our proposed approach to entering staff would need to be submitted to Research England.

Following approval of the BU2025 Strategic Plan a number of planning days with the wider leadership team across the University had taken place to discuss implementation of the BU2025 Strategic Plan. This would be discussed later in the meeting, including proposed changes to the Senate committee structure. Changes were also being proposed in relation to the executive committees, for example risk management would be subsumed within ULT.

In recently published university rankings, the University had largely been slightly down. In the Complete University Guide we had dropped 9 places, and in the Guardian University League Table we had dropped 4 places. The University had retained its place as one of the best new universities in the world remaining in the QS Young 150 for the third consecutive year. BU entered the Times Higher Education (THE) Top 200 league table for young universities for the first time in 2016 and we retained our place in 2018 albeit dropping to the 150-200 band.

The construction of the Poole and Bournemouth Gateway Buildings was progressing well, with both on budget and on schedule.

17/019 **Annual Review of Key Performance Indicators/Performance Indicators** (SEN-17-020)

The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were presented. It was noted that this would be the last time the information would appear in this format as it would be superseded by the new BU2025 KPI format. Overall there had been achievements across a broad swathe of high level indicators. Academic Strength had started at 43% at the beginning of the plan period, and had finished at an uncapped level of 108% which showed a significant level of achievement for staff. Another achievement was the number of academic staff who were now HEA Fellows which had increased to 74%. All staff should be very proud of the work carried out over the last six years.

DISCUSSION/DEBATE

17/020 **BU2025 Implementation**

Professor McIntyre-Bhatty, Professor Tee and Professor Phalp provided an overview of the work that staff had contributed to over the last eighteen months which looked forward to 2025 and beyond. There would now be a heavy focus on achieving the plan Outcomes. The Vision and Values would set the tone for the journey towards 2025. There were 100 actions in the plan and decisions would need to be made with regards to how the actions would all be implemented.

There had been a lot of discussion regarding Strategic Investment Areas (SIA) which had been informed by a good deal of analysis. The key areas of future growth and funding would focus on:

- Animation, Simulation & Visualisation
- Medical Science
- Sustainability/ Low-carbon Technology/ Materials Science
- Assistive Technology

Throughout BU there were pockets of excellence linked these areas already in place, and Medical Science was an area the University had not previously fully engaged with. All four areas identified for future growth would be cross-Faculty and cross-discipline. An early win, already realised in terms of funding was related to Medical Visualisation and this would bring together more than one of the SIAs.

The Medical Science investment area was an area that Professor Tee had been mostly involved with and which was the most developed at this stage. Medical Science was a key area where the government would be likely to invest. National and local stakeholder engagement indicated a great desire to invest in provision in this area and as the University was building expertise in this area it was noted that the University would continue to invest in new staff and new initiatives in the area of Medical Science in order to drive scale, capacity and impact. The BU2025 Strategic Plan refers to impact many times and Medical Science was one area where the University could have great impact.

The investment areas were built from different foundations within the University, and moving forward the University would need to be more opportunistic and be aware of government and international agendas. It was important to recognise that the four areas would likely find different trajectories and different stages of maturity and, as a result, attract investment from different sources and at different times.

The University's vision was to be a leading university in the four strategic areas and take an interdisciplinary approach. There may be a need to introduce new departments and review the portfolio to decide where programmes should reside within departmental structures. Discussions were taking place to determine which programmes would align to a potential Medical Science department and would also support research.

The new Research Performance & Management Committee would be a key committee to bring together a number of important research areas to meet the requirements for the next REF and beyond. Over time, the University would need to have improved oversight of research and would need to drill down to departmental performance.

Work had already started looking at the University's portfolio and the Strategic Investment Areas to ensure the portfolio would be resilient and perform well. Using the honeycomb model, work would continue on bringing groups of staff together in order to reduce single points of failure and this would require the different groups to think collaboratively and cohesively to help to build the University's performance.

Members questioned how the new Research Performance & Management Committee would interact with the REF Committee already in place. In terms of research performance, an increased level of oversight was required with a number of discussions taking place at ULT meetings and within departments. Moving forward, departments would become more responsible for their KPIs, and research targets would be set which would be informed by the sector. The new committee would take a more holistic view across the University. The membership and terms of reference for the new committee was yet to be developed, although it was anticipated the membership would include members of UET and Executive Deans. The Committee was reminded there was an expectation that all staff were 'fused' and it was important to improve research performance. Over the period of BU2025, more colleagues would need to contribute to Fusion and to research. The REF Committee would continue to work forward the University's REF submission and related preparations and would report through to the Research Performance & Management Committee.

It was clear that a significant amount of change would be taking place, and Ms Gray questioned when the implementation plans would start to take effect. If the University goes ahead with department changes a consultation process would need to take place with all affected staff. Although a timeline was not currently available, the University would need to make progress fairly quickly as it was important for all staff to start work on the new KPIs. Members noted there was already some readiness and acceptance of change. Although the new Senate committee structure would commence from September 2018, any new departments would take longer to implement. From August 2018 the University would be working to the new Strategic Plan and it would need to be more agile to ensure we begin to see some progress.

It was suggested that when changes were communicated to staff, there should be an appropriate narrative to explain why the change was placing more emphasis on research as many staff members wanted to find their place in the Strategic Investment Areas and should be afforded opportunities to contribute and join the new strategic journey for the University.

Dr Dyer suggested delaying the start of the current appraisal cycle for two or three months in order that staff could then be aligned from the start of the 2018/19 academic year rather than having to delay for a full year. This suggestion would be given further consideration.

Overall the discussion had been very helpful and the University would need to think carefully about inclusivity and would need to understand and use staff expertise to ensure BU was well-placed. More detail would follow when the Implementation Plan was in place. So far, the BU2025 journey had been very positive and it was important to ensure the next steps continued to be optimistic and positive.

ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

17/021 **Assessment for Fusion: ARPP 6C – Principles of Assessment Design: Policy** (SEN-17-021)

Professor Holley, Ms Quinney and Dr Thompson joined the meeting to advise Senators of the proposed changes to the *ARPP 6C - Principles of Assessment Design: Policy*. A working group had been set up to review and revise assessment and feedback and to support improving the student experience. The working group had drawn on good practice from across the sector and also consulted with Professor Dai Hounsell, Visiting Professor to the Centre for Excellence in Learning (CEL) who was a world leading expert in assessment and feedback practices in Higher Education. The University would need to become more creative with more technological assessments being introduced as future students would increasingly be working in virtual worlds. The work carried out would also respond to Higher Education Academy (HEA) analysis as they had stated that Universities needed a radical redesign of assessment regulations which was timely for BU. SUBU were supportive of the proposals and further work with Student Reps would take place to help communicate some of the proposed changes when CEL were in a position to share information in a more celebratory way.

Professor Appleton advised that there had been some concerns with the proposed changes within the Faculty of Science & Technology (FST) as some staff believed the new suggestions may have been overly prescriptive and may have been better referred to as recommendations rather than requirements. Professor Appleton was reminded that within the documentation there was a statement that all Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements would be accommodated. Programme Leaders would need to provide specific evidence of PSRB requirements in such cases. Ms Gray commented that the Faculty of Media & Communication (FMC) was already carrying out innovative assessments and the Faculty did not always use standard essays as assessment. As CEL starts to work with Faculties, good practice would be shared more widely across the University.

Dr Dyer was concerned that there may be a lack of understanding of the assessments needed in some disciplines therefore further work would be required in order to encourage improved levels of engagement as some practice-led programmes were unsure where they fitted with the proposed changes. Dr Dyer suggested that Faculties would need more guidance moving forward with regards to what 3,000 word equivalences would actually mean. CEL had carried out extensive research and examined many different types of assessments to identify the types of assessments that were taking place across the University and at other Universities across the UK and globally in order to build a good picture for a range of disciplines. CEL proposed to engage External Examiners and Subject Librarians in their work in order to understand what types of assessments have been seen across the UK as this would frame our conversations more positively and assist with moving forward.

CEL would be working with Faculties to put together their assessments and to work with staff to develop the guidelines which would form part of the toolkit under development.

Senate approved the changes to *ARPP 6C - Principles of Assessment Design: Policy*.

Approved

17/022 **Foundation Year Certificate: Assessment Regulations** (SEN-17-022)

Mr Child introduced the paper which listed the proposed changes to Academic Regulations and Policies to support the introduction of Level 3 Assessment Regulations. The proposed changes would maintain academic standards for new Level 3 provision in development with partner colleges and the Level 3 award would be titled Foundation Year Certificate.

Senate approved the changes to the Assessment Regulations.

Approved

17/023 **Mitigating Circumstances: Review of Policy and Procedure** (SEN-17-023)

ARPP 6J – Mitigating Circumstances: Policy had been retitled as *ARPP 6J – Exceptional Circumstances including Extensions: Policy and Procedure*. The policy had recently been reviewed by Academic Quality to help address the challenges faced within Faculties. The changes made aimed to create further consistency across Faculties and to provide much stronger signposting within the policy.

Senate approved the revisions to *ARPP 6J – Mitigating Circumstances: Policy*.

Approved

17/024 **ARPP 6A – Standard Assessment Regulations: Postgraduate Research Degrees** (SEN-17-024)

For some time, all students registering for the award of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) were initially enrolled onto an MPhil programme and then transferred onto a PhD programme when the student had demonstrated their ability to complete a PhD thesis in a timely manner, and by successfully undertaking a Transfer Examination.

After September 2013, the regulations were changed so that candidates could register directly for the award of PhD in order to comply with changes to UKVI regulations and to improve the accuracy of the calculations of PhD completion rates. A working group was set up to discuss all of the options and concluded the requirement for a mid-point formal examination was no longer a standard component of a PhD programme and proposed the current formal Transfer Examination be replaced by an informal but equally academically rigorous Major Review progression point. These recommended changes had been approved by the University Research Degrees Committee (URDC) and the Academic Standards Committee.

The Committee referred to Section 3.3 of the paper and queried whether students would still have the opportunity to reflect on their progress and to provide an outline of work carried out to date. Dr Bobeva echoed this, commenting that students should have opportunities to carry out a critical analysis and reflection of their work to date. Dr Knight agreed that the guidance on the process and academic requirements of the Major Review progression point would be reviewed on an annual basis as part of the annual update of *ARPP 8A Code of Practice for Research Degrees*.

Dr White queried whether a Major Review panel would need to have two Independent Academics as well as an Independent Chair. Dr Knight advised that practice was mixed across the sector. Following a discussion, the Committee approved the changes to *ARPP 6A – Standard Assessment Regulations: Postgraduate Research Degrees*. The presence of an Independent Chair on a Major Review panel would need further academic debate by URDC.

Senate approved the changes to *ARPP 6A – Standard Assessment Regulations: Postgraduate Research Degrees*.

Approved

17/025 **BU2025 Senate Committee Alignment** (SEN-17-025)

At a previous Senate meeting, members were advised the Senate committee structure would be reviewed. Whilst there were some major changes proposed in relation to reporting committees to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) and the Education & Student Experience Committee (ESEC), the core remit of the committees reporting directly to Senate would not significantly change and the key responsibilities of the committees would still be discharged.

It was proposed to merge the remit of ASC and ESEC and to form a new Academic Standards and Education Committee. This would facilitate a more holistic and integrated remit. This new structure would also be reflected at Faculty level e.g. merging FASC and FESEC meetings. In order to manage the key business of the committees, e-meetings would be introduced.

In previous discussions in relation to BU2025 it was clear that consideration should be given to how departments feature in the formal deliberative committee structure. Therefore it was proposed to introduce a new Department Committee for deliberative discussions at department level before moving on to Faculty level. There would be no substantive changes to the Research Committees.

Following approval by Senate, Terms of Reference would be prepared for the two new committees and these would shortly be circulated by email to Senators for approval in time to be presented at the next University Board meeting on 6 July 2018. Upon receipt of Board approval, the new committee structure would be implemented for the 2018/19 academic year.

Mr Hancox was concerned that the merging of ASC and ESEC and the removal of the Student Voice Committee would impact on student voice and student feedback. Ms Mack explained that existing programme management channels would feed directly to Department Committees which would then feed through the committee structure. The student experience would be included in the Department Committee Terms of Reference. Overall members agreed with the merging of ASC and ESEC as there was some overlap in business.

Student Forums had been removed from the formal committee structure, and it was noted that issues raised may typically be a combination of executive and deliberative matters. It was suggested that the University Leadership Team should possibly take more responsibility for hearing the student voice. The Committee agreed that discussions around student experience would still need to take place, but possibly did not need to be a committee in its own right. It was noted by SUBU representatives that ensuring student voice and feedback was appropriately represented in the structure was key. It was agreed that the review of existing student feedback mechanisms and channels noted in the paper would address this.

Ms Mack agreed to circulate updated information and the Terms of Reference for the two new committees to members in time to be submitted for consideration by the University Board on 6 July 2018.

Approved

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Minutes of Standing Committees

- 17/026 Education & Student Experience Committee minutes of 9 May 2018 (SEN-17-026)
The Education & Student Experience Committee minutes were noted. **Noted**
- 17/027 University Research Ethics Committee minutes of 2 May 2018 (SEN-17-027)
The University Research Ethics Committee minutes were noted. **Noted**
- 17/028 Faculty of Health & Social Sciences Faculty Academic Board minutes of 15 May 2018 (SEN-17-028)
The Faculty of Health & Social Sciences Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted. **Noted**
- 17/029 Faculty of Management Faculty Academic Board minutes of 16 May 2018 (SEN-17-029)
The Faculty of Management Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted. **Noted**
- 17/030 Faculty of Media & Communication Faculty Academic Board minutes of 2 May 2018 (SEN-17-030)
The Faculty of Media & Communication Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted. **Noted**
- 17/031 Faculty of Science & Technology – Faculty Academic Board minutes of 17 May 2018 (SEN-17-031)
The Faculty of Science & Technology Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted. **Noted**

17/032 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair noted there were a number of Senators who would no longer be part of the Senate membership at the end of the 2017/18 academic year. The Chair gave thanks to Professor John Fletcher, Professor Michael Wilmore and Professor Elizabeth Rosser for their work on Senate and their valuable contributions.

The Chair also thanked Daniel Asaya, SU President, and Alex Hancox, SU Vice-President (Education) for their contributions to Senate as they were both ending their term as full time Sabbatical Officers.

Six elected Faculty Academic Representatives were also ending their term of Senate. The Chair gave thanks to Keith Pretty, Dr Milena Bobeva, Dr Michele Board, Dr Sara White, Dr Richard Southern and Melanie Gray for their sustained contributions at Senate meetings.

17/033 DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next Electronic Senate meeting would start at 9.00am on Wednesday 3rd October 2018

The next Senate meeting will take place at 2.15pm on Wednesday 31st October 2018 in the Board Room.