

## SENATE

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SENATE HELD 8 JUNE 2016

- Present: Prof J Vinney (Chair)  
Mr J Andrews; Ms M Barron; Mr G Beards; Dr M Bobeva; Dr E Borkoles; Prof J Fletcher;  
Mr A James; Dr F Knight; Ms J Mack (Secretary); Prof I MacRury; Prof C Maggs;  
Ms E Mayo-Ward (SUBU); Prof S McDougall; Prof T McIntyre-Bhatty; Prof S Page;  
Ms S Ponsford; Prof E Rosser; Ms C Schendel-Wilson (SUBU); Dr R Southern;  
Ms A Stevens; Prof S Tee; Dr H Thiel; Dr S White; Prof M Wilmore; Prof T Zhang
- In attendance: Prof M Bentley (Agenda Item 5.1); Mr D Foot (Agenda Item 5.1); Ms J Forster (Agenda Items 4.1 and 4.2); Ms M Frampton (Policy & Committees Officer); Prof V Hundley (Agenda Item 5.1); Dr A Main (Agenda Item 5.1); Mr G Rayment (Corporate Governance & Committee Manager)
- Apologies received: Dr R Gunstone; Dr M Board; Ms M Gray; Dr S Minocha; Mr K Pretty; Prof K Wilkes

**1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and apologies were noted as above.
- 1.2 The Chair welcomed Dr Fiona Knight to the meeting who was attending in her new role as Acting Head of the Research and Knowledge Exchange Office, covering Ms Julie Northam's role.

**2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24 FEBRUARY 2016****2.1 Matters Arising**

- 2.1.1 The minutes were approved as an accurate record.
- 2.1.2 With regards to the action listed in Section 2.5 of the previous minutes, Ms Mandi Barron had now joined the membership of the Academic Standards Committee.
- 2.1.3 Prof McIntyre-Bhatty noted that the PGR Code of Practice had been confirmed by the Graduate School Academic Board in October 2015.
- 2.1.4 Further to Prof McIntyre-Bhatty's email of 22 April 2016 regarding the Fair Access Agreement 2017/18, the Chair thanked Senators for the comments submitted. The Fair Access Agreement 2017/18 was submitted to the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) on 27 April 2016 and was promptly approved.

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

- 2.2.1 In October 2015, Senate approved the revised maximum registration period for full-time PhD students from 60 to 48 months in line with sector practice. The change of registration period was implemented from January 2016. In October 2015, Senate also asked the Graduate School to consider the alignment of Professional Doctorate registration periods.
- 2.2.2 Following sector comparison and benchmarking against sector publications, it was proposed that the current registration periods for Professional Doctorates for full-time and part-time provision should not be changed at present.
- 2.2.3 **Endorsed:** Senate endorsed the decision that there should be no change to Professional Doctorate registration periods.

### **3. REPORT OF ELECTRONIC SENATE MEETING 18 TO 25 MAY 2016**

- 3.1 **Noted:** The report of the Electronic Senate meeting of 18 to 25 May 2016 was noted.

### **4. VICE CHANCELLOR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

#### **4.1 BU 2018 and HE Sector Update**

4.1.1 The Green Paper Consultation had recently ended and the Higher Education White Paper was launched in May 2016. There were some exciting times ahead for the sector. With regards to the forthcoming EU Referendum on 23 June 2016, the Chair thanked SUBU for their work supporting and encouraging students to register to vote as many students would be away from the University by 23 June 2016.

4.1.2 A review of the Research Excellence Framework (REF) was launched in January 2016 led by Lord Stern. The review of REF would investigate different approaches to the evaluation of research performance and would provide options for REF in the future focusing on a simpler, lighter-touch method of research assessment that uses data and metrics more effectively. The outcome of the review was not expected until late summer.

4.1.3 Over the 2016/17 cycle of Senate meetings, further discussion would take place to help shape the next stage of BU's development, beyond BU2018. Further discussion would also take place over the 2016/17 academic year to consider the impact of the HE Bill and implementation of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). Consultations sessions were currently being held across BU and all staff were encouraged to engage and help shape the University's response to the year 2 TEF consultation.

4.1.4 In January 2016, the University had been included in the latest Times Higher Education Top 200 most international universities in the world and the University had also been confirmed as being within the Times Higher Education Top 150 universities in the world under 50 years old which were both major achievements. In terms of national ranking BU had dropped in both the Complete University Guide and the Guardian ranking.

4.1.5 Bournemouth University had recently been shortlisted in the Outstanding International Strategy category of the Times Higher Education Leadership and Management Awards 2016. The winners would be announced on 23 June 2016.

4.1.6 The Fusion Building 1 on Talbot Campus opened to students and staff on 6 June 2016 and the official opening would take place in September 2016. The building would be a key space for everyone to co-create and engage.

4.1.7 The University had recently completed the purchase of land the St Paul's site at Lansdowne and the site adjacent to Boundary Road at Talbot Campus. Planning applications for the Poole Gateway and Bournemouth Gateway buildings had now been submitted.

4.1.8 A series of successful Inaugural lectures had taken place with good attendance. The University was now in full festival season, starting with its Festival of Design and Technology on 17 June 2016, and ending with the Festival of Enterprise in July 2016. The profile of BU Festivals would be raised and widened internationally as was happening with the Festival of Learning which was due to start on 25 June 2016. The Global Festival of Learning was also being piloted with partners in China and Malaysia. Both the UK and International Festivals would run simultaneously and would promote Global Fusion much wider than previously.

#### **4.2 The Higher Education White Paper and the Higher Education and Research Bill**

4.2.1 The Higher Education White Paper "Success as a Knowledge Economy: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice" was published on 16 May 2016 and would be implemented through the Higher Education and Research Bill which had been announced in the Queen's speech.

4.2.2 The White Paper included the development of ideas for student protection from the Green Paper for fully fledged 'switching' arrangements for degrees. The University would be responding to this proposal in due course.

- 4.2.3 The Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) would be consulting on the future of the Destination of Leavers in Higher Education (DLHE) survey, which was expected to be expanded upon and may be joined with TEF moving forward. TEF and DLHE workshops would take place on 12, 14 and 19 June 2016. Further information was available on the staff intranet and Senators were encouraged to get involved in all of the consultation workshops, either by attendance at each workshop or by emailing the Chair.
- 4.2.4 Ms Forster explained the TEF implementation timeline. The areas which would be assessed were teaching quality, learning environment, student outcomes and learning gain and these areas were where the University needed to focus its attention. Senators were requested to engage with the consultation process and provide their academic input and expertise.
- 4.2.5 The proposed new DLHE metrics would be looking at new areas as well as the timing of when questions were asked. The new metrics could include:
- Student engagement (e.g. the United Kingdom Engagement Survey (UKES))
  - Wellbeing
  - Skills
  - NPS (Net promoter score)
  - Graduate enterprise
  - Attributes and skills for life
- 4.2.6 Prof Tee mentioned the Higher Education Academy (HEA) HEFCE survey which had picked up on the points listed above. The survey had included 50,000 students being asked about their academic experience. Students' responses determined that they were not concerned about class sizes but were more concerned about the number of hours spent being taught and the quality of teaching. This result emphasised the need for all teaching staff to engage with the HEA and to have teaching qualifications. This would be critical to the University moving forward.
- 4.2.7 Ms Schendel-Wilson commented that BU students were not attracted to research as much as their counterparts at more research-intensive institutions may be. Bournemouth University students had voiced that they wanted excellent teaching and valued professional practice and experience as highly as research.
- 4.2.8 Prof Maggs felt that good researchers made the best teachers and were able to communicate their passion for their subject and specialist knowledge to students. Many Bournemouth University academic staff members had written leading books in their fields of expertise and the newest research should be discussed and shared with students to show how research can be exciting. However, students felt that delivery was as important as content.
- 4.2.9 It was generally agreed that a strong focus on learning rather than delivery or teaching was key and that integrating research with education and professional practice was paramount.
- 4.2.10 Prof Wilmore questioned whether the University sufficiently emphasises the importance of learning outcomes and the capacity to be a learning researcher. Research as a capability of a graduate, highlights each student as being able to show an employer they have been through Higher Education and can solve problems. Prof Wilmore believed this was an area the University should be considering moving forward, and would shift the debate on a more positive ground to change the value of research to students.
- 4.2.11 Mr James reinforced Prof Wilmore's points to encourage undergraduate students to engage in research as this would clearly identify the differences between secondary school education and undergraduate students' education, as students had commented previously that their first year at university was not always sufficiently challenging.
- 4.3 Annual Review: Key Performance Indicators/Performance Indicators**
- 4.3.1 The report was presented to the Committee to provide information regarding the University's performance against the KPIs and PIs which are set out in BU2018.

- 4.3.2 KPI1 - Academic Strength, had continued to improve, and had increased by 1% to 71% overall in the latest KPI reporting period. This measure had improved over five consecutive periods, and had increased by 10% in the last 12 months. KPI1 was expected to have improved further when the July report was prepared for the University Board. Another area with positive improvement was PI6 - Academic staff with a teaching qualification and/or who are HEA Fellows. The latest figure which would most likely be available for the University Board report in July was expected to be 63%, which was an improvement of 2%.
- 4.3.3 Overall it was clear to see that performance was very positive against the University's strategy at both KPI level and PI level. The University was aware that some items were under-reported due to the level of academic staff engagement with Bournemouth Research Information and Networking (BRIAN). It was important that all academic staff were fully engaged in recording all activity on BRIAN. Now that the input of data into BRIAN was part of the appraisal process for academic staff, engagement with BRIAN should improve.
- 4.3.4 Dr Borkoles highlighted an area which could be improved upon. At present, the statistics show a lot less for co-creation with students than it should as the system does not allow the inclusion of co-creation undertaken with non-BU students. Dr Borkoles would like to have the opportunity to show information which confirms the University was co-creating with students overseas.
- 4.3.5 As the University moves forward to 2025, it would need to focus on areas where further gains could be made, such as PI6 - Academic staff with a teaching qualification and/or who are HEA fellows. Senators were reminded that the University would continue to aim for 100% for PI6.
- 4.3.6 Prof Rosser believed that some targets were not achievable and some had even been surpassed, therefore some historic information could be included in the KPI/PI information so that it was easy to see the progress and trajectory towards each target as all staff should be proud of the progress made for each KPI/PI. It was confirmed that KPI trajectories had formed the basis for delivery planning this year as sufficient data points now existed.
- 4.3.7 Prof Wilmore suggested that the University revisit the rules and targets set in order that any definitions could be modified as it appeared that a lot of good work was not being recorded, such as media and artefacts. Prof MacRury agreed and confirmed that there was a lot of good collaboration in media and at present the actual definition of the KPI/PI would need to be enhanced in order for the Faculty to show co-creation at a higher level. It was agreed that further discussion would be required if any PI definitions were to be amended.

#### **4.4 Global BU Update 2015/16 – Quarter 3**

- 4.4.1 Dr Minocha had recorded a short film to provide a Global BU Update for Quarter 3 as she was unable to attend the meeting.
- 4.4.2 The film showed students speaking about the voluntary work they had undertaken in Malaysia. The students explained how they had been nervous and anxious before they travelled, but upon arrival found the work to be extremely rewarding by helping communities who were less privileged. All of the students' experiences had helped to increase their employability and had also helped to boost their confidence. A number of students had continued with voluntary work within their own local communities since returning to the UK.
- 4.4.3 Quarter 3 had been another busy period for GlobalBU. The three key highlights of the quarter were:
- The launch and delivery of the pilot Global Talent Programme (GTP) in February 2016  
This project was aimed at nurturing and developing talent in students by equipping them with the skills needed to work in a global way, crossing physical and cultural boundaries ultimately delivering outstanding results. As of 13 April 2016, 187 students had engaged with the GTP pilot programme, with 165 students having attended one or more sessions.
  - The selection and approval of two further Hubs of Practice in India and China  
The Hubs would be supported via the Fusion Investment Fund (FIF). These Hubs of Practice were a key part of the University's Global Engagement Plan and would be instrumental in driving forward the vision for a Global BU.

- The confirmation of the Global Festival of Learning locations  
The University will be co-hosting the pilot events at Sias International University in China on 27 and 28 June 2016 and in Malaysia at Sunway University and Cyberjaya University on 29 and 30 June 2016. The Global Festivals of Learning would run simultaneously in Bournemouth, China and Malaysia.

4.4.4 Senators were requested to send any questions or feedback to Dr Minocha.

## **5. DISCUSSION**

### **5.1 Outcomes and Recommendations from the Graduate School Review**

- 5.1.1 The Chair welcomed Prof Bentley and Prof Hundley as Deputy Deans (Research and Professional Practice) and Mr Foot and Dr Main as members of the Academic Standards Committee.
- 5.1.2 Prof McIntyre-Bhatty explained that the University was in a period of increased PGR activity which would continue to grow. At present the Graduate School remit encompassed both Postgraduate Taught (PGT) and Postgraduate Research (PGR) students and through the Graduate School Review Panel discussions, one of the unequivocal outcomes was that the PGR student experience should be firmly embedded, owned and driven by Faculties.
- 5.1.3 A Panel had been formed which included three external and three internal Panel Members. The Panel would help the University understand how it intended to move forward now that it was entering a period of a much increased scale of PGR activity. If the University continued to meet its KPIs through to 2018, it was anticipated there would be over 800 PGR students studying at the University, which was a vastly different place to the University's position when the Graduate School was established.
- 5.1.4 Moving forward, the University would need to create an environment where PGR students felt they belonged and were valued as the highest level students. The locus of responsibility for PGR student completion must now reside with supervisory teams in Faculties and the academic drive associated with PGR experience must emanate from Faculties. The University needs to support the PGR community through a more nuanced service by Faculty and it also requires a model which matches the emergent academic maturity of the University and which would facilitate ownership and academic drive by Faculty. Prof McIntyre-Bhatty advised that when the University considers the recommendations of the report, there would be a need to understand the issues at both institutional and Faculty level.
- 5.1.5 It was proposed that the University would have two doctoral training schools broadly aligned to humanities and sciences, which would allow the University to reflect the heterogeneous nature of the student body and would provide a platform for academic discussion, inter-disciplinary work and the consideration of ethics and research conduct. Co-ordination, support and the management of policies and procedures would be the responsibility of a central administrative PGR office/doctoral college or similar, and it was also recommended that this should be transposed into the existing Academic Services department to sit alongside the Quality team. This would foster integration with the Student Record System (SRS).
- 5.1.6 Prof Zhang commented that she had not yet received the full Graduate School Review report but had been made aware of the recommendations. She agreed that it was timely for further discussion regarding research degree provision at the University as the landscape had changed quite significantly and this had been well documented in a recent publication regarding a change of structure for doctoral education. The main drivers for the change were REF which was important as it took into account the number of PhD student completions as part of the assessment of the research environment as well as Research Councils' concentration of funding on doctoral training centers following the Robert review and the new QAA codes for research degrees etc. Prof Zhang queried whether the title 'Graduate School Review' was accurate as the review was about PGR education at BU which was not the same.
- 5.1.7 Prof Zhang commented there was a need to understand the issues at both institution and Faculty level. At institution level, the issues to be considered were policy oversight and general research training, most importantly the University needs to know how to demonstrate its research ambition and the research culture. At Faculty level, the issues to be considered were support, in terms of disciplinary based cohort training, and timely completion.

- 5.1.8 Prof Zhang would like to understand better the evidence which supported the proposed model. Prof Zhang welcomed the emphasis on cohort based training at Faculty level Prof Zhang also felt that it was not clear at present how the new model would work and how it would enhance PGR leadership and encourage timely completions. It was also not yet clear how the central level structure would operate and whether it would be an office or doctoral college as they were very different. If the office sat within Academic Services, it was unclear whether this would be the best way to present the University in terms of ambition of research degrees in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, however it was common in pre-1992 institutions which were research intensive and had reputations of being research intensive. At present, it was also unclear whether academic leadership and oversight would be enhanced or maintained, as during the review it was recognised that the central function would need strong leadership.
- 5.1.9 The UKCGE report had highlighted the complexity of the Graduate School structure in the sector and it was noted that 'one size did not fit all'. Each model would carry certain risks, and it was now for the University to decide which model was most suitable for the University's journey. It was important that the good work put in place over the last few years would benefit the University moving forward and should not be lost.
- 5.1.10 Dr Southern requested more information regarding the nature of the issues with the current Graduate School structure and how the proposed model would address them. Dr Southern also queried the suggested alignment of the Faculty of Media & Communication (FMC) with the Faculty of Management (FM). The majority of PGR students in FMC were in more technical areas and were represented by doctoral engineering programmes with the University of Bath. Dr Southern suggested the University should be cautious about aligning PGR students into different groups.
- 5.1.11 Senators questioned the cost of implementing the proposals and what the proposed structure of each school would be. It was noted that approximately 60-70% of Graduate School students were studying traditional doctorates. If the taught doctorates amounted to approximately one third of Graduate School students, then it would be a smaller facility for Faculties to be looking after.
- 5.1.12 Prof Hundley stated that the opportunity to enhance research degree provision within the University was to be welcomed, but cautioned against making hasty decisions that would put barriers in the way of interdisciplinary working, as the Faculty of Health & Social Sciences (FHSS) has clinical doctorates which did not fit with the normal PhD; these clinical doctorates bring together diverse disciplines.
- 5.1.13 Prof Fletcher advised that the Graduate School Review was not a cost saving exercise. The economic value of PGRs was immeasurable and was not related to economics. The University was looking for ways to enhance PGR support across the institution.
- 5.1.14 The review was mostly related to student experience and ensuring that PGR students felt at home at Bournemouth University. PGR students have a great sense of community with themselves but not with the rest of the University, and it was important that PGR students have the best experience and feel connected to the University as a whole.
- 5.1.15 The structure proposed by the Panel was a drive towards centralisation, the creation of doctoral colleges and also the move to Faculty control of PGR students.
- 5.1.16 Dr Knight agreed there had been a lot of good points raised and reminded Senators that the Graduate School had originally been established due to the number of different approaches to managing PhDs as there was no consistency. Dr Knight noted that since the creation of the Graduate School, the number of students had increased from 125 in 2002, to around 700 today with almost the same number of research administrative support staff who support Faculties but do not supervise students. Dr Knight was concerned about the potential impact on Graduate School administrative support staff and asked that a timescale for any changes be communicated to staff at the earliest opportunity.
- 5.1.17 Ms Barron questioned why two doctoral schools were proposed. It was explained that historically the University had a Graduate School serving six schools which had provided consistency. There would be a risk in shifting towards doctoral training schools and the risk of having four schools would provide lack of consistency across the University. The benefit of having two schools would allow for the sharing of practice and would also provide checks and balances with improved consistency and student experience. The risks associated with two doctoral schools did exist, but were fewer than the risk of having four schools.

- 5.1.18 Prof Wilmore suggested that the University should be more relaxed about the institution's arrangements and new structures should be put in place which serve a useful purpose. When structures no longer serve their purpose, the University should move on and evolve.
- 5.1.19 The Chair thanked Senators for the discussion, the challenges and the proposals to move forward. The University needs to develop its research maturity and it also needs to increase its performance. The University would be making a number of evolutionary steps forward and placing more focus on research within Faculties in order to develop a successful PGR experience, completion and submission rate. The comments made and the views expressed during the discussion would be considered moving forward.

## ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

- 6.1 Review of 6M – Misconduct in Academic Research: Policy and Procedure (Proposed new title 6M – Research Misconduct: Policy and Procedure)**
- 6.1.1 A review of the current *6M – Misconduct in Academic Research: Policy and Procedure* (proposed new title *Research Misconduct*) had been carried out by a cross-University working group in conjunction with the University and College Union (UCU).
- 6.1.2 The Academic Standards Committee (ASC) considered the proposals on 25 May 2016, and members supported the recommended policy changes and gave in principle approval for the new procedure. ASC also supported the proposed updates to *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations* and noted the proposed changes to *8B - Research Ethics Code of Practice* to align these with the revised ARPP 6M.
- 6.1.3 Prof McDougall suggested that moving forward, further consideration should possibly be given to data transparency, and how the University makes its data and publications available to other people to scrutinise. Ms Netta Silvennoinen agreed to give this suggestion further consideration.
- 6.1.4 **Approved:** Senate approved the recommended policy changes to *6M – Misconduct in Academic Research: Policy and Procedure* as appropriate.
- 6.1.5 **Approved:** Senate approved the recommended minor changes to *6A – Standard Assessment Regulations (Taught Programmes and Research Awards)*.
- 6.1.6 **Noted:** Senate noted the procedural changes to *6M – Research Misconduct: Policy and Procedure*.
- 6.1.7 **Noted:** Senate noted the changes to *8B – Research Ethics Code of Practice* (The Research and Knowledge Exchange Office (RKEO) to report to the University Research Ethics Committee (UREC).

## 7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- 7.1 Faculty of Science and Technology Faculty Academic Board Minutes of 25 May 2016**
- 7.1.1 Prof Maggs advised that the Faculty of Science and Technology Faculty Academic Board were now dealing with routine business separately in order that the Faculty Academic Board members had more time to discuss Faculty business.
- 7.1.2 Ms Mack agreed to revisit the Faculty Academic Board Terms of Reference to ensure it remained fit for purpose.

<b>ACTION:</b>	Ms Mack agreed to revisit the Faculty Academic Board Terms of Reference to ensure it remained fit for purpose.
----------------	--

<b>ACTION BY:</b>	Ms Jacky Mack
-------------------	---------------

- 7.1.3 **Noted:** The minutes were noted.

## **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **8.1 Independent Review of Senate**

8.1.1 Ms Mack explained that the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) Higher Education Code of Governance requires that the University Board receives assurance that the University's academic governance was effective. In accordance with recommended good practice, an independent review of Senate would be commissioned to be undertaken over the Summer/Autumn 2016. A draft Terms of Reference for the review had been prepared and was presented to Senate.

8.1.2 An external review of the University Board and been undertaken recently with three recommendations being made with a view to further developing working relationships between the University Board and Senate. The recommendations would be considered at the next University Board meeting in July 2016.

8.1.3 **Approved:** Senate noted the plans for the review and approved the draft Terms of Reference.

8.1.4 The Chair thanked departing members Ms Amanda Stevens, Ms Chloe Schendel-Wilson and Ms Ellie Mayo-Ward for their challenging and constructive contributions to discussions during their tenure on Senate.

## **9. DATES OF THE NEXT MEETING:**

Electronic Senate – 9.00am on Wednesday 5 October 2016

Senate Meeting – 2.15pm on Wednesday 26 October 2016