# BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY CONFIRMED

**SENATE**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON 22 FEBRUARY 2017**

Present: Prof J Vinney (**Chair**)

Ms M Barron; Mr G Beards; Dr M Board; Dr M Bobeva; Prof J Fletcher; Ms M Gray;

Mr A James; Ms J Mack (Secretary); Prof S McDougall; Dr S Minocha; Ms J Northam;

Ms S Ponsford; Mr K Pretty; Prof E Rosser; Dr R Southern; Mr J Swanson; Prof S Tee; Dr S White; Prof M Wilmore; Prof T Zhang

In attendance: Ms J Forster; Ms M Frampton (Academic Quality Officer)

Observers: Ms K Bennett (Academic Quality Officer); Ms C Killingback

Apologies received: Mr D Asaya; Mr J Andrews; Dr E Borkoles; Dr B Dyer; Ms J Houzer; Dr F Knight;

 Prof I MacRury; Prof C Maggs; Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty; Mr G Rayment (Corporate Governance & Committee Manager)

**1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

1.1 The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and apologies were noted as above.

1.2 The Chair welcomed Ms Katherine Bennett from Academic Quality and Ms Clare Killingback from the Faculty of Health & Social Sciences who were both observing the meeting.

**2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2 NOVEMBER 2016**

**2.1 Matters Arising**

2.1.1 The minutes were approved as an accurate record.

2.1.2 Following on from the November meeting which was observed by Mr Michael Wood of the Good Governance Institute, Senators were advised that the Senate Governance Review report would be on the Senate agenda for the meeting taking place on 7 June 2017.

2.1.3 The Chair reminded Senators of the action which arose at the November meeting when Dr Knight had agreed to include the Centre for Excellence in Learning (CEL) in the list of Research Centres. Since the November meeting, Professor Gail Thomas and Professor Tim McIntyre-Bhatty had discussed the suggestion, however it was felt that CEL was not an ‘academic’ department and all of the UoA25 activities were filtered through the Faculty of Media and Communication and there would be no benefit to CEL having Research Centre status at present. The Deputy Head of CEL and her colleagues wished to pass on their thanks to Senators for suggesting that CEL be listed as a Research Centre.

**2.2 Declarations of Interest**

2.2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

**2.3 Graduate School Review Update**

2.3.1 The consultation ended on 5 December 2016 and meetings had taken place with all staff impacted. The new model would include the introduction of Doctoral Schools and it was anticipated this would be implemented by 1 April 2017.

**2.4 Ratification of Chair’s Action – Amendments to *ARPP 2A – Awards of Bournemouth University: Policy***

2.4.1 In December 2016, the Chair was requested to approve changes to *ARPP 2A – Awards of Bournemouth University: Policy.* The ‘Honorary Master’ award had been removed from the Policy and a new award - ‘Honorary Fellow of Bournemouth University’ was now included in the Policy.

2.4.2 **Ratified:** Senate ratified the amendments made to *ARPP 2A – Awards of Bournemouth University: Policy.*

**3. REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SENATE OF 1 TO 8 FEBRUARY 2017**

3.1 The Chair noted the comments made during the Electronic Senate meeting and confirmed that all comments had been responded to appropriately.

3.2 **Noted:** The report of the Electronic Senate meeting of 1 to 8 February 2017 was noted.

**4. VICE CHANCELLOR’S COMMUNICATIONS**

**4.1 BU2018 and HE Sector Update**

4.1.1 This item was discussed alongside the BU2025 agenda item below.

**4.2 BU2025**

4.2.1 Prof Vinney provided a presentation which gave an overview of the University’s BU2018 journey since 2004 and how the University proposed to evolve, develop and grow towards BU2025. With just one year remaining of the BU2018 journey it was important the focus remained on BU2018 targets.

4.2.2 Before 2004 the University was very focused on growing the vocational courses that it had offered since becoming a university in 1992. Between 2005 and 2010 the focus shifted onto research, a new University logo was created and the Executive Business Centre was created which would support a drive to deliver executive education. By 2010, the main focus was shaping a new vision for the University up to 2018 and setting some new BU values. The formation of the University’s 2018 vision was the start of the next part of the University’s journey.

4.2.3 Since 2012, the vision of the University has been to create a stimulating, challenging and rewarding university experience in a world-class learning community. The University aims to share its unique fusion of excellent education, research and professional practice and inspire all students, graduates and staff to enrich the world.

4.2.4 Moving forward, the next few years would be very interesting for Higher Education with issues such as Brexit, the implementation of the Stern Review, pressures around tuition fees and the Industrial Strategy consultation. There was also a Higher Education and Research Bill going through Parliament which contemplates that some universities might exit the market, as well as new Higher Education providers receiving degree awarding powers. The Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) referred to links between teaching and research and how the student experience was enriched by student exposure to research and professional practice. The Stern Review and the Research Excellence Framework (REF) Consultation also referred to links between teaching and research. Prof Vinney said that, with that in mind, Fusion was the right model to take the University forward and provide opportunities to craft a distinct presence in the sector.

4.2.5 Prof Vinney noted that in 2012 there had also been a number of challenging changes on the horizon – there was a White Paper and the Browne report regarding the review of tuition fees, the deregulation of student numbers and REF2014 appeared. At that time there were concerns that tuition fees would drive students to study at European universities and take up apprenticeships instead. The University had been able to meet these challenges, and Prof Vinney was confident the University would meet the current challenges and would be able to confidently move forward to the next level.

4.2.6 Prof Vinney said that in 2025, students would expect to receive world-class, consistently high quality learning, receive value for money, receive a return on their investment and start to build their careers and skills whilst studying at University. Staff would be developed, rewarded and recognised for high performance and all staff would be fully engaged in the path taken by the University. The University would also ensure that it delivered impact and added value for society.

4.2.7 The competitive environment in 2025 would be challenging. Lots of political uncertainty could be expected, the economic situation of the UK was also uncertain and there would be continuing regulatory scrutiny. Competition from other Higher Education providers would increase and there might be market failures. There had recently been a lot of discussion around new products such as degree apprenticeships, Institutes of Technology and two year degrees coming into effect as we get closer to 2025, increasingly students would be requiring instant feedback and transparency. This would all form the academic landscape to take forward to 2025.

4.2.8 In summary, the University has in recent years made good progress in transforming the student experience, NSS scores have started to improve and student numbers have grown since 2012. More recently the University has created Faculties, Departments, Institutes and Centres as well as increasing leadership capabilities, building a strong brand and profile, as well as strengthening our financial performance.

4.2.9 The Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) used, but was not solely reliant on metrics. Employment rates for the University were almost in line with the sector and many graduates had achieved highly skilled employment, however the University was still slightly behind the TEF benchmark. The average starting salary for a BU graduate was above sector average. Dr Minocha and Ms Barron would be working together to achieve a greater impact in these areas moving forward through the Global Talent and Employability working group, looking particularly at the placement year and extra-curricular and co-curricular activities. This focus should result in the University leading the sector in all of the areas discussed.

4.2.10 Prof Vinney proposed that the vision set for 2018 would transition smoothly into ‘business as usual’. The BU2018 vision could become the University’s mission.

4.2.11 Professor Vinney listed the Fusion Themes which were: Business and Economic Sustainability, Digital and Technological Futures, Environment, Culture and Heritage, Global Security and Health and Wellbeing. These Themes had been discussed at Senate meetings previously having been originally proposed as Research Themes. At future Senate meetings, the potential of the Fusion Themes would be explored further in order to consider how BU could use them to build a leading reputation around the world.

4.2.12 Key drivers for excellent student experience were highlighted as being ‘Quality and Consistency’, ‘Teams and Resilience’ and ‘Talent and Performance’. ‘Quality and Consistency’ would be vital to deliver excellent student experience in an ever changing world. In order to deliver a high level of quality the University would require high performing talent and operating in teams with high levels of resilience.

4.2.13 In summary, with the focus on its intellectual capital, the University needed to continue to build a world-leading reputation in its Fusion Themes and create an excellent and distinctive Fusion student experience. All students would need to have a fusion experience, which could be demonstrated through outcomes and metrics. The focus on blended experiences, blended flexible learning and personalised student support would continue, as well as a focus on building on our partnerships regionally, nationally and globally and making our partnerships work for the University.

4.2.14 Over the last ten years the University’s overall average ranking in the University League Tables had remained around the same although individual rankings had changed, especially as the methodology changed. The University’s Key Performance Indicator (KPI) was an aggregate of three league tables and the University was currently ranked 66th. Within the coming years, it was hoped the University would move into the Top 50 of the Complete University Guide as the University had grown, was financially robust and was an improving brand globally. Areas which would need further improvement were student satisfaction levels, graduate prospects and student to staff ratio (SSR). It was noted that in order a move to 16:1 SSR would cost approximately an extra £5 million per year.

4.2.15 Mr Pretty questioned what caused the University the most uncertainty and whether Brexit would be an issue moving forward. Prof Vinney advised that the University does have a lower proportion of EU students than the sector average. Brexit would contribute to the challenges facing the University, potentially affecting student recruitment and research funding. Professor Fletcher believed there were lots of opportunities in these areas. Dr Minocha advised that one area the sector was working on post-Brexit was building relationships with Commonwealth countries. The University had been working in this area for some time, and many competitor institutions were only just starting to look at this area.

4.2.16 Ms Gray believed the future plans were appropriate and ambitious and that they were an innovative evolution of the University, building on the Fusion model. Prof Rosser advised that academic strength had improved considerably as the University had invested hugely in professoriate staff, and TEF and REF played to the strengths of Fusion. It was important that professoriate staff were involved in the new workload planning framework moving forward.

4.2.17 Mr Swanson understood the evolution of Fusion and how the University was working towards Fusion, however he was unsure whether students actually recognised Fusion and the role of research in education. With the launch of BU2025, this would be the perfect opportunity to re-energise and promote Fusion to students as it would result in improved employment prospects.

4.2.18 Dr Bobeva had been involved in programme reviews and had seen the amendment of units to create Fusion units. Fusion was about integration and celebrating, creating and sharing and it was suggested that the Festivals of Learning should be built into the academic calendar and it would then be prominent to students and would allow a whole week to celebrate Fusion across the University. Senators agreed that moving forward all programmes should include Fusion units.

4.2.19 Prof Vinney explained that as Fusion moved into the next stage of its evolution, the University would be able to differentiate itself in the market. Fusion Investment Funding (FIF) of approximately £1.5 million was previously put in place in order to embed Fusion and impact and had been built into the University planning. This funding had remained in place for five or six years and it was suggested that the University now needed to think about how the funding was used in order to achieve maximum impact. Moving forward, a strategic investment fund would be discussed across the institution and by the University Board.

4.2.20 Prof Tee suggested the University should further promote Fusion to local and regional employers and spread a consistent message about the Fusion model as in the past, some very good feedback had been received from employers which stated how wonderful Bournemouth University students were.

4.2.21 Over the coming months there would be a number of events, meetings and Away Days to discuss Themes. These Themes would be discussed at the next meeting of Senate and a consultation for a new plan would be put into place by February 2018.

**5. DISCUSSION**

**5.1 Global BU Update for Quarter 2**

5.1.1 Dr Minocha introduced the Global BU update for Quarter 2 which included the key highlights of the last quarter and set out the key priorities for the next period.

5.1.2 With regards to PI7 (Students engaged in exchange and mobility in their programme (%)) and mobility, there had been a lot of movement in data and activity during the last quarter to around 4%, from a starting point at 0.7%. The University was aiming for a target of 20%, so there was still some way to go.

5.1.3 Work had also been carried out during Quarter 1 across the University with the launch of the Global Talent Programme. The total number of students now enrolled was approximately 530, which was an increase to the figure stated within the report. The challenge now would be to convert students into achieving the Global Development Award.

5.1.4 Prof Wilmore suggested it may be worth the University investing the £5 million (suggested earlier in the meeting related to the student - staff ratio) on mobility if the University could meet the Global Engagement target. Prof Wilmore proposed that all students in their first year could compete for a prize which was suggested as possibly being one semester overseas entirely paid for by the University.

5.1.5 Prof Rosser advised that student exchanges were continually a challenge in the Faculty of Health & Social Sciences due to student funding. The teams in FHSS were working hard in this area and trying to advertise virtual exchanges so that students could co-study with small groups of similar students overseas to discuss similar studies/employment in countries around the world. This type of student exchange would still contribute towards the University’s KPI. Dr Minocha reminded Senators that all experiences should be noted within Faculties. A Global Summit was due to take place during the summer as a pilot event which would generate exposure to student exchange without students having to travel and would also give students an appetite for going abroad which could be measured separately and tracked as each student’s own indicator.

5.1.6 Ms Gray questioned whether global Fusion could be further embedded into curriculum design and revalidation. Prof Tee agreed with the suggested redesigning of all programmes to have a global view of health and social care and further thought should be given to having a revalidation process that looked at a more globally focused curricula rather than locally focused. It was noted that the Employability Group had been looking at this area some time ago and there was now an opportunity to bring this together in a holistic way and to shift mind-sets moving forward.

**5.2 Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) Year 2 Narrative Submission**

5.2.1 Following the update on the changes to the quality assurance framework in HE and the introduction of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), the University has participated in TEF year 2 and the required fifteen page narrative to provide further evidence alongside a pre-defined set of data metrics was submitted on 26 January 2017.

5.2.2 There was a defined process for evaluation of TEF submissions by the TEF Panel. The outcomes would be notified to institutions by late May 2017. As metric data were averaged over three years, the impact of NSS put the University in a Bronze position based on metrics alone, however the University had firmly and positively put a case in the narrative that the University was Silver. On several occasions, Prof Husbands, the Chair of the TEF panel, had stated that the NSS should not be over-weighted by assessors in the TEF assessment process.

5.2.3 Ms Mack reminded Senators the paper was confidential to Senate and was not for sharing.

5.2.4 Dr Southern was pleased to see a good combination of qualitative and quantitative information included in the submission but could not see any link to the previous TEF submission and he believed that reviewers of the TEF would be looking for a trajectory showing where the University had started and how the University had addressed issues previously submitted. Dr Southern also expected to see evidence of any planned improvements and policies put into place, so that for the next stage of TEF, there would evidence of successes and failures.

5.2.5 Ms Mack reminded Senators that this was the University’s first TEF submission. The guidance had made it very clear that the Panel did not want a focus on future plans, the emphasis was on current impact and outcomes for students. Ms Mack explained that TEF was very different from the REF. The submission was very honest and showed areas where the University had not performed as well as expected, and in May 2017 when all submissions were published, all Universities would be scrutinising submissions made by other HEIs. Senators were reassured that TEF Year 3 metrics would reveal a much improved picture for the University provided that NSS performance continued to improve.

5.2.6 Prof Tee commended the excellent data provided within the submission which would have been very difficult to gather. Ms Mack confirmed that any information that could be provided by Faculties which would assist with the TEF Year 3 submission would be appreciated. The Steering Group would be considering any immediate ‘quick wins’ in the current academic year and also looking at medium term priorities. It was now important for the University to develop its own data and analysis. Prof Rosser congratulated the Steering Group for completing the submission in such a short timeframe.

5.2.7 Ms Mack then handed over to Ms Forster who provided further information on the next stages of the TEF.

5.2.8 Ms Forster opened her TEF presentation by advising that TEF Panels would look at metrics to get an initial view, the Panel would then look at the submission as a whole.

5.2.9 For TEF Year 1, any institution with a positive QAA outcome in July 2016 had qualified. An opt-out process had taken place and those institutions that had qualified for TEF Year 1 could increase their tuition fees by inflation in September 2017. TEF Year 2 started with written evidence being submitted, or HEIs opting out in January 2017. Between February and May 2017 assessments would take place and the awards would be announced in May 2017. At this point HEIs that had qualified would be able to increase their fees by inflation from September 2018. TEF Year 3 would use 2017 NSS scores and a consultation would take place on lessons learned so far in May 2017. In Year 3, tuition fee caps would vary (with effect from September 2019) according to whether an institution was ranked Gold, Silver or Bronze. Institutions ranked Silver and Gold would be able to increase fees up to the inflation amount, Bronze by 50% of the inflation amount. For those students starting in 2019 and 2020, there would be differential fees amongst institutions. TEF in Year 3 would include a pilot of subject level TEF and from Year 4 Postgraduate Taught students would be included in TEF.

5.2.10 There was an on-going informal consultation on the subject level TEF pilot. Discussions were taking place about the definition of a ‘subject’. Each department has its own approach as student experiences and learning opportunities were different across subjects. Resources and the role of professional practice and research were very different, and outcomes for students vary by discipline. These things were all very different for good academic and other reasons, e.g. PSRB requirements.

5.2.11 One option that was being considered was to use broad categories such as: Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Sciences; Engineering; Science; Social Science; Business & Law and Arts & Humanities. Alternatively, subject based categories could be 40 to 60 subjects based on JACS or its replacement (Common Aggregation Hierarchy). To encourage common terminology and common structures it was preferable to use Units of Assessment, as it would be sensible to have terminology and structures working together.

5.2.12 From 2017 the NSS questions would be changing and it was very likely that learning opportunities would be included in the survey. Ms Forster noted that the University should score well for this question.

5.2.13 The consultation of subject level TEF was informal and the University had written to the Department of Education. There should also be a pilot of an accredited subject to see how much these subjects could be exempted from separate assessment in the TEF.

5.2.14 With the increasing need for significantly more data being available to write documents such as the TEF submission, the University would need to address and be able to provide significant amounts of data moving forward. It was suggested that the University would need to improve its information management and start to use better systems in order to provide more data. It was envisaged that the level of data that would be required over the next two to three years would increase dramatically.

5.2.15 Dr Bobeva suggested that it would be sensible to cascade TEF categories and assessment categories to Faculties. Moving forward, Academic Quality would play a major role in standardising the methods of reporting information. Ms Mack confirmed that work had already started on looking at this area and also looking at Fusion coming through the programme approval process and also looking to see how annual monitoring could be reframed in a holistic way around TEF. The time was now right to look at these areas of work to commence in the 2016/17 monitoring cycle.

5.2.16 Dr Minocha believed the University needed to focus on Year 3 and Year 4 now as this was where real impact could be delivered as the University would then have two years of real data available. The challenge would be to impact two sets of intakes ahead of Year 4 and start discussions immediately e.g. PTES completion rates were low and with starting work strategically now, could help the University to overtake the competition.

**5.3 Research Excellence Framework (REF) Consultation**

5.3.1 Following the publication of Lord Stern’s independent review of the REF which was published in July 2016, 12 recommendations were made on the future shape of the REF exercise. The recommendations were reviewed in late 2016 and HEFCE published proposals to amend the REF to incorporate the 12 recommendations. The HEFCE proposals were now open for consultation with the sector and the University would be submitting an institutional response before the 17 March 2017 deadline.

5.3.2 The consultation was open to HEIs and other groups and organisations with an interest in the conduct, quality, funding or use of research. Some of those people taking part felt they would like to take outputs with them to other institutions however some institutions wanted to be able to claim the value of the outputs. The response put together as an institution listed the key research activity proposals submitted.

5.3.3 The key proposals were:

* All research-active staff to be submitted;
* Staff to be submitted to UoAs based on HESA cost centres;
* The decoupling of staff from outputs;
* Outputs will no longer be portable across institutions;
* All outputs must be available in open access form (with some exceptions);
* Impact will have a broader definition;
* Institutional-level assessment of environment and impact.

5.3.4 The University was looking to submit over 1,000 outputs and it was noted that some research intensive institutions would be submitting outputs which may impact the University’s performance. A lot of work had been carried out with UoA teams in Faculties by working through the questions which had been very broad and dense.

5.3.5 There were some very significant challenges, in particular those staff with research in their role. If greater inclusivity was achieved in the Research & Knowledge Exchange Office, the University would perform considerably better. Senators were reminded on the importance of spreading the message that everyone was engaged in research.

5.3.6 A discussion took place around the introduction of writing weeks as a number of Senators had found it impossible to be able to write as workloads did not allow. If writing weeks were introduced, the time would need to be comparable across Faculties and collaboration would need to take place with regards to the weeks allocated to writing weeks.

**6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

 **Minutes of Standing Committees**

**6.1** **Education & Student Experience Committee minutes of 17 January 2017**

6.1.1 **Noted:** The Education & Student Experience Committee minutes were noted.

 **Minutes of Research Committees**

**6.2 University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee minutes of 16 January 2017**

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

**6.3 University Research Ethics Committee minutes of 18 January 2017**

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

 **Faculty Academic Boards**

**6.4 Faculty of Health and Social Sciences Faculty Academic Board minutes of 2 February 2017**

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

**6.5 Faculty of Management Faculty Academic Board minutes of 8 February 2017**

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

**6.6 Faculty of Media and Communication Faculty Academic Board minutes of 1 February 2017**

6.6.1 **Noted:** The Faculty of Media and Communication Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted.

**6.7 Faculty of Science and Technology Faculty Academic Board minutes of 2 February 2017**

6.7.1 **Noted:** The Faculty of Science and Technology Faculty Academic Board minutes were noted.

**6.8 Graduate School Academic Board minutes of 18 January 2017**

6.8.1 **Noted:** The Graduate School Academic Board minutes were noted.

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

7.1 There was no other business.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **8.** | **DATES OF THE NEXT MEETING:** |
|  | Electronic Senate – 9.00am on Wednesday 17 May 2017Senate Meeting – 2.15pm on Wednesday 7 June 2017 |