BOURNEMOUTH UNIVERSITY   **CONFIRMED**

SENATE

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON 3 JUNE 2015

Present:	Prof J Vinney (**Chair**) Mr C Allen; Mr J Andrews; Mr G Beards; Dr C Bond; Dr C Chapleo; Prof J Fletcher; Ms J Forster; Dr R Gunstone; Mr A James [Agenda Items 1 to 5]; Mr S Jukes; Ms J Mack (Secretary); Prof C Maggs; Ms E Mayo-Ward (SUBU) [Agenda Items 1 to 5]; Prof S McDougall; Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty; Dr S Minocha; Ms J Quest; Prof E Rosser; Dr H Thiel; Prof G Thomas; Prof K Wilkes; Prof T Zhang
In attendance:	Ms R Collins [Agenda Item 4]; Ms J Davey [Agenda Item 5]; Dr L Farquharson [Agenda Item 5]; Ms M Frampton (Policy & Committees Officer); Mr T Hearing [Agenda Item 5]; Mr G Rayment (Corporate Governance & Committee Manager)
Apologies received:	Ms M Barron; Prof I MacRury; Prof A Mullineux; Prof S Page; Ms C Schendel-Wilson (SUBU); Ms A Stevens

1.   WELCOMES, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

1.2   The Chair also welcomed Prof Christine Maggs in her role as Executive Dean of the Faculty of Science & Technology.

1.3   Mr Clive Allen, Dr Carol Bond, Dr Chris Chapleo and Ms Jill Quest were attending their last meeting of Senate as Elected Members as they had reached the end of their terms of office (although Ms Quest and Dr Chapleo were free to stand for re-election for a second term). The Chair gave thanks for their valuable contribution to Senate and advised that elections would take place late Summer/early Autumn 2015.

2.   MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2015

The minutes of 25 February 2015 were approved as an accurate record.

Ms Mack provided an update to Section 2.1.3 – Classification, listed on page 5 of the previous minutes. The new classification bands would now be implemented with effect from the 2016/17 academic year, rather than the 2015/16 academic year, in order to coincide with the introduction of SITS. This decision would not have any impact on students.

2.1   Matters Arising

2.1.1   Item 6.1 – Annual Review of Assessment Regulations and *6L – Implementation of the Regulations* - Section 2.1.2 – Submission of Coursework, Regulation 6A Section 9.1 – 9.2
This item would be discussed under Agenda Item 2.2.

2.1.2   Item 6.2 – *Integrated Masters Assessment Regulations* and *2A – Awards of Bournemouth University: Policy* incorporating change and new titles relating to Integrated Masters Awards - Section 3.1 – *2A – Awards of the University: Policy*
This item would be discussed under Agenda Item 2.2.

2.1.3   Section 8 – Any Other Business – Pay Progression Form
Mr Andrews and Prof Fletcher had been advised of the difficulties encountered by academic staff in completing the Standard Academic Profile (SAP). The matter had been discussed at the Embedding Fusion Steering Group and further discussion would take place with Mr Philip Downes to introduce an electronic version of the SAP.

It was anticipated the new electronic SAP Form would be available before October 2015. A number of onerous sections of the current form had not been included in the new form. It was noted that the form currently in use should still be completed if the new electronic form had not been finalised before October 2015.

2.1.4 Section 8 – Any Other Business
Mr Andrews advised that a lot of work had been carried out to locate additional working space for the Faculty of Science and Technology (SciTech). In the interim, SciTech had been allocated office space which had been vacated by the Students' Union. Mr Andrews would look into Prof Magg's request that further resources be provided to complete the refurbishment of the allocated space available to SciTech.

ACTION:	Mr Andrews to consider options available for further refurbishment of the ex-SUBU offices now allocated to SciTech.
ACTION BY:	Chief Operating Officer

2.2 Ratification of Chair's Actions

2.2.1 Fair Access Agreement
The 2016/17 Fair Access Agreement was circulated to Senators on 8 April 2015 for comment and approval. One amendment suggested by Senators, to correct an out-of-date reference to inflationary fee increases, had been made and it had now been submitted to the Office of Fair Access (OFFA). A response from OFFA was expected in early July 2015.

Approved: Senate approved the 2016/17 Fair Access Agreement.

2.2.2 Clarification of Section 9 – Submission of Coursework of *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations (all awards)*
The papers which clarified Section 9 of *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations (all awards)* regarding the late submission of coursework had been included in the electronic Senate meeting papers for approval.

Approved: Senate approved the clarified wording of Section 9 – Submission of Coursework of *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations (all awards).*

2.2.3 Award Titles for Integrated Masters Programmes
The papers which confirmed the new award titles for Integrated Masters programmes in *2A – Awards of the University* had been included in the electronic Senate meeting papers for approval.

Approved: Senate approved the amended wording of *2A – Awards of Bournemouth University,* and approved the proposal that all future Integrated Masters award titles would include 'with Honours' in the award title.

3. REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SENATE MEETING OF 13 TO 20 MAY 2015

3.1 The report of the Electronic Senate meeting of 13 to 20 May 2015 was noted.

4. REVIEW OF CODE OF PRACTICE ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH

4.1 The Education Act 1986 required the University to issue and keep updated a Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech. The University's current Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech was last reviewed in July 2012. The revised document took account of Universities UK (UUK) Guidance on External Speakers in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and the University's responsibilities under anti-terrorism legislation.

4.2 The updated Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech would also be reviewed by the University's Audit Risk and Governance Committee on 30 June 2015 and their recommendations would be made to the University Board for approval on 10 July 2015.

4.3 **Noted:** Senate noted the revised Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech.

5.   DEBATE

5.1   Academic Leadership

5.1.1   Prof McIntyre-Bhatty introduced those colleagues who would join the debate. Within the Faculty Development Consultation (FDC), opinions had been requested regarding programme and framework leadership as when programme leadership was discussed within the University, the terminology used could be very mixed.

5.1.2   The FDC had agreed that programme leadership was important and should be valued. The discussion held by FDC had resulted in agreement that programmes should be allocated to Departments and it was suggested that programmes should replace frameworks, although Masters frameworks should be retained.

5.1.3   Senators were requested to consider programmes and education and to give some thought to the three points below:

- We no longer require frameworks within the programme and departmental leadership structure of Bournemouth University
- What should we expect from our Professoriate within Departments in terms of direct roles and in terms of academic leadership?
- What is the role of the Professoriate, enacted through the Dean's Advisory Group(s) both within and across Faculties?

5.1.4   As a new member of BU academic staff, Prof Maggs initially was not familiar with frameworks and she believed they could be seen to be contradictory in relation to grants and could also be confusing to external examiners. Prof Maggs was pleased to hear that the University was considering moving towards Programme Leaders as these roles held the most responsibility for the University's programmes.

5.1.5   Upon joining the University in 2006, Mr Hearing was sceptical about frameworks and had initially been involved in leading the PG Media framework which had consisted of seven programmes. In the case of PG Media, the framework had benefitted the co-ordination and collaboration of students in the framework, and this had allowed the University to manage resource allocation and all aspects of students' learning in a co-ordinated way. It was noted that this had not worked at undergraduate level as it had been limiting with regards to the programmes brought into frameworks. Further thought should be given to the levels of recruitment required and how the University would manage small cohorts. Mr Hearing believed that shared ownership of students across frameworks would work well as students would benefit hugely and they would enjoy the shared delivery of speakers.

5.1.6   The title of Programme Leader was believed to be the correct title for a staff member who had leadership responsibilities. However, further thought should be given to the title of Framework Leader as they were seen to be the key person to effectively drive a framework forward. Further thought should also be given to teaching and subject management. Historically, the University had Subject Leaders, which had been a useful way to bridge teaching, research and professional practice and who could manage and motivate.

5.1.7   Within the Faculty of Health & Social Sciences (HSS), Heads of Departments were not yet in place. Frameworks had developed over time and had allowed cross-teaching and the Framework Leader role had developed into a key leadership role.

5.1.8   Within the ex-Business School area of the University, the Framework Leader's role had become very complex and staff received a large amount of queries relating to many different types of programmes. In the case of the former Business School, the role of a Head of Department was vital. With the introduction of a good structure, a large number of Framework Leaders should be in place who would feed into the Head of Department. The Head of Department role would then be more strategic. Moving forward there were a lot of ideas to think about with regards to Framework Leaders and whether Framework Leaders would still be required at postgraduate level. Dr Farquharson would like the Professoriate to become more involved in decision making. It was suggested that the introduction of an Advisory Group who could make decisions and communicate with Faculty Executive Teams regularly would be beneficial to Faculties as they would be a form of communication between the Professoriate and Heads of Department.

5.1.9 Mr Allen agreed with the discussion so far and concurred there was a difference between undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. A Programme Leader was the person who held together the essence of the programme. Having Programme Leaders in place at undergraduate level tended to work very well as Programme Leaders could mentor each other. It was noted that at Masters level in the ex-School of Tourism, that Framework Leaders would often gather all students from one framework in one lecture theatre which was very useful as many students were international students who had similar questions.

5.1.10 Dr Bond suggested that a structure should be put into place which addresses expertise and knowledge, and education delivery and structures, which could be neatly aligned and possibly spread across more than one Faculty. Dr Bond advised that frameworks addressed education delivery in some cases better than others and a framework of small programmes would be a sensible idea. Whatever the final model agreed upon, the model would need to be flexible and should also have the ability to integrate the need for academic knowledge and programme delivery. Succession planning was very pertinent and could be used to build academic expertise in each area.

5.1.11 Mr Jukes believed that there was too much emphasis on the terminology used within the University. Historically, there had been an attempt to bring programmes together. This now happened naturally within the University. Mr Jukes believed that the introduction of a suite of programmes with common projects would work well.

5.1.12 Prof Rosser advised that within HSS, Framework Leaders bring together innovation and group practice and carry out a lot of people management. Framework Leaders were valuable members of staff. Programme Leaders were focused on their programmes and need to be able to address a lot of issues and work closely with the programme group. This develops excellence across the programme. Prof Rosser meets regularly with Framework and Programme Leaders and the synergy worked well within HSS, Prof Rosser was an advocate of retaining Framework Leaders. Mr Jukes commented that Prof Rosser's description of HSS Framework Leaders was similar to the Head of Department role within the ex-Media School, which therefore referred back to the use of terminology within the University.

5.1.13 Prof Thomas agreed with Prof Rosser confirming that Framework Leaders worked well within HSS and it was critical to have matrix structures e.g. Deputy Deans and Heads of Department as these roles provided many opportunities to share good practice.

5.1.14 Prof Rosser explained that research suggested that some Professors had become divorced from teaching, and others had to balance their portfolio with engagement with programmes and research. Stakeholders believed that the Professoriate should be embedded within programmes in Faculties, as students would welcome the opportunity to work and learn from the Professoriate.

5.1.15 Mr Wilkes added that a good Programme Leader was extremely valuable to a programme, although generally, Programme Leaders did not tend to feel valued. Programme Leaders should be selected very carefully as they had a significant influence on a programme.

5.1.16 Dr Gunstone suggested that the University could carry out some research to examine the framework/programme structures currently in place in other HEIs. Some more established universities had roles in place such as Head of Teaching, Head of Year, Head of Education or Head of Research which could be given consideration at BU.

5.1.17 Prof Maggs commented that the Deans' Advisory Groups should be more broadly constituted without a fixed membership in order that issues could be addressed as they arise by the appropriate staff members. The Group would not have Terms of Reference in place, as the meetings would be informal. A recent Deans' Advisory Group meeting which the Chair had observed had been constructive with very useful discussion taking place. It was suggested that some Professors would be very successful as Research Leaders and it was important that Professors were recognised as being as diverse as academic staff.

5.1.18 Dr Minocha suggested that the University was at the stage where it could give consideration to shared leadership across various roles in Professional Services and academic areas. It had now been identified that some titles, language and terminology had reached the end of their 'shelf life' and the University now had an ideal opportunity to provide clarity about Fusion in action and provide Fusion leadership in a structured way. Dr Bond agreed with Dr Minocha's

comments, but added that she believed that structures could either facilitate or hinder some staff members and there had been difficulties in the past whereby it had been problematic locating the appropriate person to make a decision.

5.1.19 Prof McIntyre-Bhatty drew the discussion to a close advising that further thought was still required around the role of the Professoriate in relation to academic leadership and academic citizenship in Departments. All Professors were very different and had an abundance of expertise to lead Faculties and Departments effectively. The discussion would now continue at Deans' Forum meetings and then at Executive level as well as more broadly.

6. VICE CHANCELLOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

6.1 BU 2018 and HE Sector Update

6.1.1 The fourth round of delivery planning had recently been completed and the budgets for 2015/16 were being finalised. A clear financial plan and vision was in place and the priority now was to maintain levels of both intellectual and physical investment and to seek to make a healthy surplus.

6.1.2 The 2015/16 academic year would be the first year of deregulation of student numbers and therefore the University would need to adapt to the external climate. The University would be building its finances in such a way that it would be resilient moving forward.

6.1.3 KPI6 (League table composite rank) indicated that the University aimed to be within the Top 50 of the composite League Tables rank. KPI6 was a composite of all three University League Tables (The Guardian University League Table, the Complete University Guide and the Sunday Times University League Table). The University had risen 8 places to 63rd in the 2016 Guardian University League Table and had also risen 11 places to 54th in the 2016 Complete University Guide League Table, to a high of 54th nationally. The 2015 NSS results were due to be published in August 2015 and the Sunday Times University League Table results would be available in September 2015.

6.1.4 The Chair highlighted that the response rate for the latest NSS survey was around 80% which was an excellent result, and the Chair thanked those who had been involved with this achievement. The increased response rate would hopefully have a positive effect on the University's NSS results for 2015.

6.1.5 It was anticipated that global engagement will continue to provide opportunities but the political environment around visas and net migration will remain challenging over the next few years and UK Universities would continue to lobby the Government. It was understood that options were also being considered for a teaching equivalent to the REF, although no details were yet available.

6.1.6 There was potentially some good news for research, but was science/STEMM-focused, however this included a continued risk of potential increases in research concentration. This would be an ongoing challenge to the University.

6.1.7 It was anticipated there would be funding cuts to the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) budget in the forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review. The recent Queen's Speech had focused on the delivery of manifesto pledges without reference to Higher Education (HE). The HE Bill had not yet been ruled out but certainly was not a Government priority at present.

6.1.8 The EU referendum was expected to take place before 2017, and could be as early as May 2016. National lobbying and a major public campaign was underway to represent universities. If the referendum resulted in the UK withdrawing from the EU, this would be detrimental for HE overall.

6.1.9 A pilot study had been undertaken by the Higher Education Academy (HEA) which involved 21 diverse providers who performed a retrospective data modelling exercise on 2012/13 student achievement outcomes using a common Grade Point Average (GPA) system. The results of the pilot study had recently been published in a report.

6.1.10   The GPA system would have benefits to UK HE in terms of greater granularity in awards, international recognition, and the potential to encourage student motivation and engagement. Several universities, including Oxford Brookes and University College London were already using the GPA system alongside the traditional degree classification. The HEA would carry out further consultation across the sector and with employers and professional, statutory and regulatory bodies.

6.1.11   The HEA GPA Report recommended that a single GPA scale for UK HE should be adopted by all UK providers. The scale would run from 0.0 up to 4.25 for the equivalent of A+ or over 75%. A dual system may be put in place for approximately 5 years which would report on both GPA and Honours Degree Classification (HDC) outcomes. A review would then take place to look at the adoption of GPA. The Chair encouraged Senators to read the HEA GPA Report.

6.1.12   In the 2014 Autumn Statement, the Government had announced its intention to introduce a new loan system for Postgraduate Taught (PGT) students. The loan would be available to anyone under the age of 30 who was accepted to study a PGT Masters course. The loan would be an income contingent loan of up to £10,000. At the 2015 Budget, the Government had also announced its intention to introduce income contingent loans of up to £25,000 for Postgraduate Research students. These announcements would hopefully provide the University with many postgraduate opportunities.

6.1.13   Dr Gunstone questioned whether there had been any changes to the University's analysis of risk and whether the overall climate appeared to be improving. Prof McIntyre-Bhatty advised that the University reviewed the risk register quarterly and there had been no changes to the data captured in the risk register as all risks had been foreseeable, however the changes in total deregulation would be monitored moving forward.

6.1.14   Mr Jukes noted that there was some anticipation that fees may increase post-General Election. Mr Jukes suggested that sustainability of the current system should be fixed before further changes were made.

6.2   Key Performance Indicators

6.2.1   Prof McIntyre-Bhatty introduced the latest KPI Report (May 2015) which summarised performance against the KPIs and PIs which had been set out in BU2018. An updated KPI Report would be presented to the University Board on 10 July 2015, however significant fluctuations between the May and July report were not anticipated. It was noted that the next KPI Report presented to Senate would be listed by Faculty rather than School.

6.2.2   In comparison to the KPI Report presented to Senate in June 2014, there had been increases in the numbers of staff with doctorates, as well as an increase in the number of academic staff who were now HEA Fellows, although it was noted there were some staff members who were in the process of gaining HEA Fellowship. There had also been some variations in KPI1 (Academic Strength), although there was still progress to be made in achieving the target of 100%.

6.2.3   Another substantial change had been in KPI7 (Student/Staff Ratio). The changes made to Student/Staff Ratio over the last two years in terms of the University's achievement, had helped to deliver everything the University had hoped to achieve as part of BU2018.

6.2.4   Prof Rosser was pleased to see the increase in number of academic staff with doctorates (KPI8), although she was concerned that a time may come when the figure would not increase to the 70% target due to the fact that some academic staff may have been studying for a doctorate for some time. Prof Rosser questioned whether this was seen to be an issue within the University as the energy being invested in these staff members was not giving the best outcomes. Senators were advised that these issues should be managed by Faculties, who should also give consideration to trajectories within departments.

6.3   Global Engagement Plan

6.3.1   The final draft of the Global Engagement Plan (GEP) was presented to Senate for input and feedback before finalisation and the formal launch in the 2015/16 academic year. The GEP was an extraction of various global strands within BU2018 which had been combined into a cohesive format which would shape the University's direction of travel for delivering the global vision, values and targets. The overarching plan would be supported by several detailed three-year operational plans which would articulate how the principles set out in the GEP would be delivered across the University.

6.3.2   A great deal of engagement had taken place which had helped to create the GEP and Dr Minocha thanked Senators for their engagement.

6.3.3   Dr Minocha confirmed that the confidential section of the report was Appendix 6 shown on pages 70 and 71 of the Senate papers, and there was also a large proportion of commercially sensitive information throughout the GEP (e.g. recruitment data, etc). The paper also included the feedback received from a number of workshops and discussions which had taken place, and also referred to the KPI dashboard and the three indicators of performance related to global activity. The suggestions which had been received at the workshops would be further discussed by various Committees moving forward. Dr Minocha agreed to circulate a suitably redacted version of the GEP to Deans which could be disseminated to Faculty Executive Teams.

ACTION:	Dr Minocha would circulate a suitably redacted version of the Global Engagement Plan to Deans which could be disseminated to Faculty Executive Teams.
ACTION BY:	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Global Engagement)

6.3.4   Senators were requested to provide any comments or suggestions regarding the GEP to Dr Minocha by 30 June 2015, in order the GEP could be finalised by July 2015.

ACTION:	Senators were requested to provide any comments or suggestions regarding the GEP to Dr Minocha by 30 June 2015.
ACTION BY:	Senators

6.3.5   Prof Zhang commented that the figure of 133 full time overseas postgraduate research students quoted in Objective 5 on page 46 of the Senate papers would increase as it was an objective for the Graduate School to grow postgraduate student numbers.

6.3.6   The GEP had mentioned that the University wished to introduce international partners who had similar values to BU. Dr Minocha confirmed that discussion was currently taking place regarding this issue within Hubs of Practice and a lot of feedback was being received from staff members. Moving forward, the GEP would be converted into a smaller digestible version for all staff to view.

7.   OTHER REPORTS

7.1   Proposed Changes to *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations: Postgraduate Research Degrees*

7.1.1   Postgraduate Research student numbers had been growing substantially over the past few years. The Graduate School had been working on a range of initiatives to look at PhD registration, and in turn had also looked at registration periods for other research degrees. Sector benchmarking, mainly through Alliance Group universities' research degrees had suggested that the University should reduce its maximum registration period for PhD students from 60 months to 48 months for full time students. MRes full time degrees currently had a 12 month minimum registration period. It was suggested that the maximum registration period for an MRes degree should be increased from 12 to 18 months, and MRes part time registration should be increased from 24 to 36 months. Prof Zhang explained that the rationale behind the proposals was to enable timely completion within a realistic timeframe.

7.1.2 Dr Bond commented that the maximum periods of registration listed within Section 4.1 of the report were not consistent as the proposed maximum registration for a full time PhD student was 48 months, when the current maximum registration for a DProf student was 60 months. It was also noted that the registration period for a part time EngD student was not listed. Prof Zhang explained that the EngD degree was not currently approved as a part-time programme. Some Senators felt, however, that the policy should still contain provision for a part-time programme should one be approved in future. Prof Zhang advised that the Professional Doctorate programmes were individual programmes which had been validated in previous years, and only the updated information was being presented to Senators.

7.1.3 Senators commented that both the MRes and MPhil registration periods for full time and part time students were both less than full time and part time PhD students and it was suggested that all Postgraduate Research degrees registration periods should be consistent. It was noted that students could apply for extensions or suspensions for special circumstances.

7.1.4 Mr Jukes suggested that PGR awards and Professional Doctorates be brought in line with the sector, although it was noted within Appendix 1 that there appeared to be a lot of variation of registration periods across various HEIs.

7.1.5 Prof Zhang commented that with the exception of PhD awards, all of the other awards listed within Section 4.1 had been validated separately and it was not possible to amend the University's regulation to apply across the board within a short period of time. Each Programme Leader would need to revisit each of the awards.

7.1.6 Prof Zhang agreed to carry out further sector benchmarking regarding each PGR award in order that further discussion could take place with the Students' Union, the Academic Standards Committee and Senate. Prof Zhang would also provide overall clarity of the regulations, specifically regarding the length of each award's registration period. It was agreed that the Chair would be advised of any time critical elements and if necessary approval would be sought out-of-committee.

ACTION:	The Graduate School Research Degrees Committee was requested to carry out further sector benchmarking for the registration period of each PGR award, and provide overall clarity of the regulations, specifically regarding the length of each award's registration period
ACTION BY:	Prof T Zhang

7.2 <u>Review of Senate Membership and Terms of Reference</u>

7.2.1 Senators had previously been advised of the proposed review of Senate membership following the implementation of the new Faculty structure. The proposed structure had ensured that the academic voice would not be diminished. A summary of the proposed total Senate membership was included on page 4 of the report.

7.2.2 It was recommended that from 2015/16, Senate membership would be amended to comprise 2 elected academic staff representatives from each Faculty, plus one appointed Professoriate representative. This would increase membership from Faculties to 12 in total and would provide an even ratio to the number of staff in Faculties. The Head of the Research & Knowledge Exchange Office would join Senate in order to add particular expertise on matters of research and knowledge exchange.

7.2.3 Senate currently had two Professoriate representatives from the Faculty of Management, therefore it was proposed that, having only been appointed this year, Prof Page would continue as representative for the Faculty of Management, with Prof Mullineux, as the longest serving member, standing down. All other Professoriate appointments remained unchanged and would run until 2016/17.

7.2.4 Elections would take place late Summer/early Autumn 2015 for two Elected Members for all Faculties. The Faculty of Science & Technology only required one new Elected Member as Dr Gunstone's term of office runs until 2016/17.

7.2.5 **Approved:** Senate approved the proposed membership changes and agreed that elections would take place in time for new appointments to commence in 2015/16.

7.2.6 **Approved:** Senate agreed that the Senate Terms of Reference reflected the proposed changes, and were recommended to the Board for approval.

7.3 Revisions to Senate Committee Structure

7.3.1 Following the academic restructuring, the Senate Committee structure had been reviewed to ensure it remained fit for purpose. Two new committees were proposed, the Faculty Education and Student Experience Committees (FESEC) which would report to the Education and Student Experience Committee (ESEC), and a Faculty Research Degrees Committee (FRDC) which would report to the Faculty Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee. The Terms of Reference for each new committee would be drafted for approval by the ESEC and University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee respectively.

7.3.2 The Terms of Reference for Faculty Academic Boards (FAB) had been reviewed and revised to include updated terminology which reflected current practice and the new secondary reporting line with the FESECs. The revised indicative agenda for FABs was in development and would be disseminated with the updated Terms of Reference.

7.3.3 **Approved:** Senate approved the revised Senate Committees Structure.

7.3.4 **Approved:** Senate approved the revised Faculty Academic Board Terms of Reference.

8. **ROUTINE COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

   Minutes of Standing Committees

8.1 Faculty of Health & Social Sciences (unconfirmed), 6 May 2015

   The minutes were **noted.**

8.2 Faculty of Media & Communication (unconfirmed), 29 April 2015

   The minutes were **noted.**

8.3 University Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee (unconfirmed), 6 May 2015

   The minutes were **noted.**

9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

9.1 Dr Bond questioned whether the Fusion Investment Fund competitive funding strands available to staff included a study leave strand. Prof McIntyre-Bhatty advised that study leave was now dealt with as sabbatical leave and approved at Faculty level through the existing process. Further details were available in the Staff Handbook and the Academic Study Leave: Policy and Procedure should be referred to for local decision making.

9.2 The Chair thanked Mr Clive Allen, Dr Carol Bond, Dr Chris Chapleo and Ms Jill Quest for their membership of Senate and also for their challenging and constructive contributions to discussions.

10. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

   Electronic Senate – 9.00am, Wednesday 7 October 2015
   Live meeting – 2.15pm, Wednesday 28 October 2015