

THE SENATE

Minutes

This paper presents the confirmed Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 6 February 2013 at The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes.

The Senate **approved** these Minutes as a correct record of the meeting on Wednesday 5 June 2013.

Fraser Woodburn
Secretary to the Committee

Julie Tayler
Working Secretary to the Committee
Email: j.d.tayler@open.ac.uk
Tel: 01908 332729

THE SENATE

Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 6 February 2013 at 2.00 pm
in the Hub Theatre, The Open University, Walton Hall.

Present:

1) Ex officio

Mr Martin Bean, Vice-Chancellor
Professor Alan Bassindale, Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)
Professor Musa Mihsein, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Professor Tim Blackman, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Scholarship and Quality)
Professor David Rowland, Dean, Faculty of Arts
Professor Rebecca Taylor, Dean, Faculty of Business and Law
Dr Sharon Ding, Dean, Faculty of Education and Language Studies
Professor Kevin Hetherington, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
Professor Anne De Roeck, Dean, Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology
Dr Christina Lloyd, Acting Director, Students
Professor Josie Taylor, Director of the Institute of Educational Technology
Mrs Nicky Whitsed, Director, Library Services
Ms Anne Howells, Director, Learning and Teaching Solutions

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts

Dr Ole Grell	Dr Lynda Prescott
Professor Suman Gupta	Professor John Wolffe
Dr Graham Harvey	

Faculty of Business & Law

Mr Phil Bates	Dr Sharon Slade
Mr Mike Phillips	

Faculty of Education and Language Studies

Dr Uwe Baumann	Professor Karen Littleton
Dr Jane Cullen	Dr Tim Lewis
Ms Felicity Harper	Mr Pete Smith
Dr Steven Hutchinson	

Faculty of Health and Social Care

Mrs Sue Cole	Miss Christine Taylor
Professor Monica Dowling	Dr Mary Twomey
Professor Jan Draper	

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Dr Leonor Barroca	Ms Maggie Holland
Dr David Bowers	Dr Tony Nixon
Professor Joyce Fortune	Dr Toby O'Neil
Mr Derek Goldrei	Mr Brendan Quinn

Faculty of Science

Dr John Baxter	Dr David Rothery
Dr Arlene Hunter	Dr Robert Saunders
Dr Nick Rogers	Dr Claire Turner

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Anastasia Economou	Dr Hugh Mackay
Dr Richard Heffernan	Mr Matt Staples
Dr Helen Kaye	

Institute of Educational Technology

Dr Robin Goodfellow	Professor Eileen Scanlon
Professor Agnes Kukulska-Hulme	

Other Central Units

Dr Liz Marr

3) Associate Lecturers

Dr Isobel Falconer	Dr Walter Pisarski
Mr Bruce Heil	Ms Janet Dyke (alternate)
Mr Stephen Pattinson	Mr Mike McNulty (alternate)

4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association

Mrs Marianne Cantieri	Mr David Humble
Ms Pippa Doran	Dr Sandra Summers
Ms Jacqui Horsburgh	Dr Barbara Tarling

5) Academic-related Staff

Mrs Liz Armitage	Mr Billy Khokhar
Ms Pat Atkins	Mr Tony O'Shea-Poon
Miss Karen Bradbury	Ms Clare Riding
Mr Mike Christensen	Ms Hilary Robertson
Mr Martin Ferns	Ms Gill Smith
Ms Sandi Guest	Mr Jake Yeo
Mr Martin Kenward	

6) Co-opted members

Mr John D'Arcy	Dr James Miller
Mr Christopher Goscomb	Professor Peter Scott
Dr David Knight	

In attendance

Dr Simon Bromley for Minutes 1 to 3

Apologies:

1) Ex officio

Mr Jeremy Roche, Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Care
Professor Hazel Rymer, Dean, Faculty of Science

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts

Dr Bob Wilkinson

Faculty of Business & Law

Ms Carmel McMahon

Mr Alessandro Saroli

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Professor Andy Lane

Dr Peter Robbins

Dr Nicholas Moss

Dr Mark Woodroffe

Faculty of Science

Professor Monica Grady

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Troy Cooper

Dr Raia Prokhovnik

3) Associate Lecturers

Mr Paddy Alton

Dr Roma Oakes

6) Co-opted members

Mrs Lynda Brady

Mr Rob Humphreys

In attendance

Mr Andrew Law

1 WELCOME

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed Professor Musa Mihsein, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic) to his first meeting of the Senate, and Dr Christina Lloyd in her capacity as Acting Director, Students. He also welcomed three new appointed members, Phil Bates and Brendan Quinn (academic and research staff), and Jacqui Horsburgh (student); and a co-opted member, Christopher Goscomb (graduate).

2 MINUTES

S-2013-01-M

- 2.1 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), Professor Alan Bassindale, said that he had been asked to correct the reference to the tripartite group (Minute 3.1), which stated that it was comprised of Learning and Teaching Solutions (LTS), the OU Students Association (OUSA) and the Learning and Teaching Office (LTO). The minute should state that the group comprised OU Walton Hall, OUSA and associate lecturer (AL) representatives. OU Walton Hall was represented by LTO, LTS, and Student Services.
- 2.2 Subject to this amendment, the Senate **approved** the minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on 17 October 2012.

3 MATTERS ARISING

S-2013-01-01

Widening Access and Success Strategy

- 3.1 Paragraphs 19 and 20 of the paper, concerning the provision for offender learners, referred to a further report. An AL member asked that the report be presented to the Senate to inform members of the action being taken. The Acting Director, Students, Dr Christina Lloyd, said that the report was being compiled for the Widening Access and Success Management Group. Once that Group had considered the report, then a paper could be put before the Senate.
- Action: CL**
- 3.2 Referring to the previous minutes (Minute 8.10), a member expressed concern that the Access to Success programme had been undersubscribed, particularly as many students had applied for financial assistance under the old scheme, and asked whether it had been well enough publicised. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Professor Musa Mishein, said that the Widening Access and Success Strategy (WASS) had now been moved to his portfolio. A WASS Management Group had been established, which he would chair, but it had yet to be convened. Issues such as why the University did not meet its targets for recruitment and what aspects could be improved would be discussed at the Group's first meeting.
- 3.3 In response to a query about the current funding situation, the Vice-Chancellor said that the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) had once again highlighted widening participation as a priority in its annual letter to the Higher Education Funding

Council for England (HEFCE). However, HEFCE and the Office for Fair Access (OFFA) were currently mid-way through a review, on behalf of BIS, that would produce recommendations for future action on widening participation, access and social mobility. In the short term, the University could be optimistic that funding would continue to be available and the anticipated reduction, from £38m to £29m, would not have a significant impact on the University's ability to deliver against the Strategy.

- 3.4 The member enquired about the future direction of the Strategy, as the Openings courses would soon be replaced by the more expensive Access modules. Dr Liz Marr, Director of the Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships (CICP), responded that the new Access modules, which would replace Openings in England, were not significantly more expensive (£625, rather than £615). The Access to Success scheme would still run, which would mean that modules would be available for as little as £25 to eligible students in England. Moreover, because the modules were worth 30 credits, they would qualify for a loan, which meant that students who were not eligible for the reduced price would be able to apply for a loan.

Global Direct

- 3.5 With reference to paragraphs 27 and 28, a member expressed concern that the Senate had not yet been given the opportunity to debate the tuition strategy for Global Direct, even though some modules were to be offered to Global Direct students from October 2013. The University Secretary, Fraser Woodburn, agreed that the Senate should discuss any proposals for changes to policy. However, as there were no changes to policy that would affect the October 2013 presentations, then the June 2013 meeting of the Senate would be a suitable time to discuss future changes. Dr Simon Bromley, Senior Product Manager, Business Development Unit – Global Direct, confirmed that the launch of Global Direct in October 2013 would not require any changes to the broad framework of existing tuition policies, although some amendments to tuition practice and operation might be necessary for particular modules and in relation to different qualifications. A paper was currently being prepared on the broader aspects of tuition for Global Direct that would involve departures from existing policy, and it was appropriate that this should be presented to the next meeting of the Senate. The Vice-Chancellor observed that the details were a matter for the faculties and that the Deans would make the final decision within the bounds of the policy.

Action: SH/SB

- 3.6 An AL member observed that a University-wide strategy, which recognised specific initiatives within a broader framework, was needed and it was of concern that such a paper had not been highlighted as a discussion item for the next meeting of the Senate. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), Professor Alan Bassindale, said that he, the acting Director, Students, Dr Christina Lloyd, the Assistant Director, (AL Support and Professional Development), Pat Atkins, and the Director, Teaching and Learning, Niall Sclater, were currently putting together a tuition 'strategy'. There were many issues about how tuition should be delivered in the future that needed further discussion, and a paper would be presented to the Senate once these had taken place.

Action: AB

- 3.7 The Senate **noted** the responses to the matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting.

4 REPORT FROM AND QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR

4.1 The Vice-Chancellor reported to the Senate on:

- a) the enthusiastic reception for the announcement at the end of 2012 of *Futurelearn*. The first courses would become available in the second half of 2013;
- b) the bestowing of a Regius Professorship on the Institute of Educational Technology (IET). The Senate congratulated Professor Eileen Scanlon and her team;
- c) the award of 'Best documentary' at the National Television Awards for *Frozen Planet*;
- d) the Times Higher Education award for most innovative teacher to Dr Mark Brandon;
- e) the launch of the *OU Anywhere* app at the end of January 2013 allowing students to access their study materials via their smartphone or tablet to study whenever or wherever they chose;
- f) the 50th anniversary of Harold Wilson's "White Heat of Technology" speech. It was fitting that the longest lasting legacy of that speech was The Open University.

4.2 A member commented that *FutureLearn* was an important and exciting development, and that having academics and ALs involved in selecting the material would be important to its success. The Vice-Chancellor said that this would be the responsibility of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic), the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), the Deans and the Director of the Open Media Unit, Andrew Law.

4.3 The University Secretary, Fraser Woodburn, reported on student numbers reminding members that the basis for the student number planning had been the UK Market Strategy, agreed by the Council in July 2011, and that this strategy underpinned the University's financial planning. In October 2012, student registrations for new regime students in England had been 4% under the target figure. These figures appeared to have been depressed by the late availability of student loans, as the figures in February were 16% above target, which meant that overall the student numbers for the year would be at or above the UK Market Strategy figures for new regime students in England.

4.4 Transitional student numbers in England had been 10% above target in October 2012, and were again 10% above target in February 2013. Consequently, the University expected the overall figures for the year for transitional students in England to be 10% higher than target. These numbers would feed into fees and the HEFCE grant in 2012/13.

4.5 Student numbers were also above target in Wales and Northern Ireland and were projected to stay above target for the year as a whole, but were slightly behind target in Scotland.

4.6 The University had planned an ambitious growth target of 20% for postgraduate students, but had taken no action to achieve this. Numbers were slightly down on last year, but the sector as a whole was not doing well, so maintaining its position was not necessarily a bad outcome for the University.

4.7 The expectation was that overall numbers for 2012/13 for the University as a whole would be close to the numbers for 2011/12. Given the change in the funding environment in England and the ripple effect across the UK, this was a welcome result.

- 4.8 A member observed that the student numbers were good news, but from a faculty perspective it had been difficult to manage staff resource in a period of considerable uncertainty. Some tutors had received letters to inform them that they were being made redundant, only to be asked later to take on an extra large group. There had been a period of great uncertainty and it was important to recognise that the University was only able to cope with these student numbers because of the flexibility of tutors during this time. Mr Woodburn responded that a communication was to be circulated to the University community within the next few days that would recognise the efforts of a range of staff, but particularly ALs.
- 4.9 A member commented that it was appropriate for the Senate to express its thanks to the Senior Management Team for helping the University to achieve this position. The OU should not be complacent; but given the uncertainty a year ago, the University had done very well. The Vice-Chancellor said that many members of the Senate could take some credit for this.
- 4.10 A member said that the challenge now for the University was one of retention and progression. The Vice-Chancellor said that the first challenge had been for the OU to remain economically viable with the new intake, but the central strategy remained that the University would do all it could to ensure that these students achieved their stated goals.

5 CURRICULUM AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE S-2013-01-02

The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC) held on 28 November 2012

6 LEARNING, TEACHING AND STUDENT SUPPORT COMMITTEE S-2013-01-03

- 6.1 Referring to paragraph 4, regarding the follow-up with students who had initially registered to study 120 points, a member said that many of these students had simply deferred some study from October to January, and would still have a large workload. Were these students being tracked in any way? The Acting Director, Students, Dr Christina Lloyd, said that she would investigate and report back to the June 2013 meeting of the Senate.

Action: CL

- 6.2 The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Student Support Committee (LTSSC) held on 3 December 2012.

7 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE S-2013-01-04

- 7.1 Referring to paragraph 17, a student member observed that it was the first time that such strong concerns had been expressed about a qualification (F61) and information on the action take to address these issues should be passed back to students. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Scholarship and Quality), Professor Tim Blackman, said that the matter had been one for concern. However, the issues had been resolved and an investigation was being carried out with the full support of the Faculty in order to understand how this had happened and why it had not been caught through the normal quality assurance processes, and that this report could be fed back to the Senate.

Action: TB

7.2 The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee held on 23 October 2012.

8 RESEARCH COMMITTEE S-2013-01-05

The Senate **noted** the report of the business of the Research Committee meeting held on 14 November 2012.

9 SENATE MEMBERSHIP PANEL S-2013-01-06

The Senate:

- a) **approved** the appointment of Ms Carmel McMahon, Faculty of Business and Law (FBL) to the Special Appeals Committee of the Senate until 31 August 2016;
- b) **noted** the matters for report from the meeting of the Senate Membership Panel (SMP) held on Thursday 22 November 2012.

10 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE S-2013-01-07

The Senate **noted**:

- a) the unconfirmed Minutes and Confidential minutes of the last meeting of the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee;
- b) the paper presented to SPRC on the conclusions of the 2012 Strategy Review and Refresh Process (SPRC-2012-04-01);
- c) the paper presented to SPRC on the UK Political Landscape and Funding Environment (SPRC-2012-04-03).

11 STUDENT CHARTER S-2013-01-08

11.1 Dr Christina Lloyd introduced the paper, informing the Senate of how the draft had been developed, both before and after the meeting of the Senate in October 2012, and outlining the breadth and depth of the consultation across a wide range of stakeholder groups. Dr Lloyd thanked the Working Group, in particular the Workstream Lead, Martin Jackson, and the Project Manager, Rachel Fryer.

11.2 The approval of the Charter would enable the University to proceed to define the detail: the Student Charter website would not only contain detailed statements of service, but also supporting statements on how the University would deliver on the member responsibilities. It was anticipated that the website would be ready by the end of July 2013, and launched alongside the Charter on 1 August 2013. There would be detailed plans for internal and external communications.

11.3 The President of the OUSA, Marianne Cantieri, said that the Student Charter, and the way in which it had evolved, had 'ignited a beacon' in the decision making process of the University, which it was hoped would light the way to future collaborations and consultations. As a student, a Senate member and as OUSA President and co-signatory to the document, Mrs Cantieri urged the Senate to approve the paper.

- 11.4 An AL member also acknowledged that associate lecturers had been given several opportunities to discuss the elements of the Charter and to provide feedback during the consultation process, and thanked the Vice-Chancellor and the Working Group for enabling them to take part in the process.
- 11.5 The Vice-Chancellor said that it had been a pleasure to co-sign the Charter and that he was delighted that it was seen as a beacon in the relationship that the University wanted to have with its students. The Charter set out what all members of the University could expect from one another with the same goal and purpose in mind.
- 11.6 The Senate **approved** the Student Charter.

12 ANNUAL REVIEW OF QUALITY

S-2013-01-09

- 12.1 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Scholarship and Quality), Professor Tim Blackman, said that it was the first time that the Senate had received an annual report from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC). The report presented key themes from the work of QAEC over the 2011/12 committee year and sought to assure the Senate that quality and standards in the OU were being effectively managed. The Committee's role included scrutinising Periodic Programme Reviews (PPRs), responding to consultations on the new UK Quality Code, ensuring that the changes currently taking place in the University did not have any unintended consequences for quality and standards and the effective transferral and mainstreaming of best practice and innovation. The Committee was constantly reminded of its responsibility to students by the government and the QAA. Elsewhere on the agenda, the Senate was being asked to approve the addition of a student member to the Committee, which was an important step forward in ensuring that students remained at the heart of the Committee's business.
- 12.2 Referring to paragraph 14, the President of the OU Students Association, Marianne Cantieri, said that the new QAA Quality Code had recommended that there should be student members of PPRs. However part-time students might find it difficult to be available for a review lasting 2-3 days. A member commented that students had been involved successfully in professional accreditations, as it was not always necessary for them to be present throughout. Professor Blackman thanked OUSA for their support with this difficult task. Mrs Cantieri also remarked that OUSA was keen to establish awareness and engagement with students in order to improve their satisfaction, and anything that could be done by any member of the University to support this would be very welcome.
- 12.3 The Dean of the Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology (MCT), Professor Anne de Roeck, welcomed the report, which highlighted a number of activities and issues, and demonstrated how they fitted together. For example, with reference to assessment, the University was in need of a programme level approach for academic misconduct, including plagiarism, as efforts to deal with this over time had resulted in significant resource issues within the faculties. The role of external examiners, and the effectiveness of how the University dealt with their reports and fed their comments back into the quality enhancement cycle, was another important issue.
- 12.4 A member said that it was helpful to be able to review the activity of one of the committees in the Senate substructure in such a consolidated manner and suggested it would be useful to have similar reports from other committees in the substructure. The University Secretary, Fraser Woodburn, said that this would be addressed during the discussion of the Annual Effectiveness Review (S-2013-01-10).
- 12.5 The Senate **noted** the annual report from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee on evidence from its 2011/12 meetings of the effectiveness of the University's

management of quality and standards.

13 SENATE ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

S-2013-01-10

- 13.1 The University Secretary, Fraser Woodburn, said that this was the first time that members of the Senate had been surveyed on the Senate's effectiveness, following a suggestion made during the discussion of the Annual Effectiveness Review (AER) 2010/11. It had been a useful exercise that should be repeated. There had not been an opportunity to prepare a written response to some of the issues raised, but such a response would be prepared for the next meeting of the Senate.

Action: FW

- 13.2 Overall, members appeared to be reasonably satisfied with the effectiveness of the Senate. The areas where members were less satisfied included the relationship with the Council, with SPRC and with the substructure.
- 13.3 Referring to an earlier comment (Min 12.4), Mr Woodburn said that QAEC was a different type of committee to the others in the substructure and it was appropriate that it produced an annual report. If the Senate was not satisfied with the current reporting from the other subcommittees, the introduction of an annual consolidated report from each of them might be a possible solution and would be considered. A level of concern had also been expressed about the quality of the papers, which to some extent was also related to the substructure reporting.
- 13.4 The following member comments were made:
- a) with reference to substructure reporting, that it was often difficult to identify the actual decisions made. For example, it was not helpful for a report to state that recommendations 1-5 from a paper had been accepted, if that paper was not visible to the reader;
 - b) that the Senate should trust members appointed to substructure committees to make the right decisions, so long as the committees had the right terms of reference and the Senate received adequate reports on the key decisions made;
 - c) in relation to whether actions were followed through in a timely manner, that more regular feedback was required. The Senate might make use of a blog or other mechanism to report when actions had been taken;
 - d) that University key performance indicators (KPIs) could be widened to facilitate academic decision making;
 - e) that with the change of focus from modules to programmes it would be helpful to review the information Senate required to track academic performance;
 - f) that Senate should consider whether strategies, such as the Curriculum Strategy, should be refreshed for a changed environment;
 - g) that further work was needed on the timing of committees in the substructure;
 - h) that satisfaction levels reported were of respondents, not members, and that whilst there had been good response rates from some categories there had not been from some others. Some quite critical qualitative comments from academic staff on how Senate worked in terms of influencing outcomes and holding the Executive to

account might have come across more strongly were it not that the views of academic staff were under-represented in the responses;

- i) that the survey should be conducted in the summer of members who had been in post during that year;
- j) that more could be done to edit the comments and to improve the presentation of the data. The Director of IET, Professor Josie Taylor, offered the services of IET;
- k) that it was also important to understand what other members of the University community thought about the Senate's effectiveness.

13.5 In response, Mr Woodburn commented:

- a) that there were KPIs associated with the University's strategic plan, but that these did not adequately cover matters of concern to the Senate and that previous Institutional Performance Reviews had not satisfactorily identified key issues for the Senate either. A fuller response would be included in the further report to the Senate;
- b) that assumptions could not be made on the views of non-respondents;
- c) that it was appropriate for much of the detailed work to be undertaken by committees in the substructure where there was greater expertise, but it was also necessary for the Senate to have the opportunity to challenge the outcomes of those discussions. This could not happen if reporting was inadequate;
- d) that the intention had been for the survey to go out earlier in the cycle, but there had been a delay due to staffing issues in the Governance Team;
- e) that Senate members were representative of their constituencies and were best placed to judge the effectiveness of Senate.

Action: FW

14 AWARD OF THE TITLE OF EMERITUS PROFESSOR

S-2013-01-11

The Senate **approved** a recommendation from the Chair and Readership Subcommittee that the title Emeritus Professor be award to Professor Paul Quintas, Faculty of Business and Law.

15 CODE OF PRACTICE FOR STUDENT ASSESSMENT

S-2013-01-12

- 15.1 Referring to the advice that the Code should not be read in isolation, but in conjunction with several other sets of regulations, codes and guidelines, the Dean of the Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology, Professor Anne de Roeck, said that there should be an overhaul of the student facing regulations. The University Secretary, Fraser Woodburn, responded that it was the intention to have a comprehensive overhaul of regulations once the new set of regulations coming out of the Student Experience Priority had been finalised. As of the beginning of 2013, the University's Secretary's Office had taken on some responsibility in this area, and it would be appointing a member of staff with expertise in writing regulations in plain words but in the meantime, it was necessary to approve the Code as it stood. The member further commented that there were some regulations that were not academic, but which were also student facing, and requested that the commitment to revise the regulations was also applied to these. Another member

said that, whilst it was necessary to be precise and watertight with regard to regulations, there was already considerable experience in the University, particularly in LTS, of editing and producing student facing intelligible material covering difficult concepts. It might be worth putting the regulations and other student facing documents through this type of process.

Action: FW

- 15.2 Professor de Roeck further commented that the amendment to SA2.5.4 had removed the reference to the discretion of the senior invigilator, yet there were other items where the use of such discretion remained, but without reference to any criteria that might be used. It also seemed perverse that SA2.5.4 stated that students who arrived late would be allowed into the examination room to complete the exam in the time remaining, but that the University had the right to refuse to accept the exam paper for marking.
- 15.3 Referring to SA6.2.4, which included the word 'normally' in relation to the capping of resit results, a member said that students should be made aware of what was 'normal' and what was 'abnormal', otherwise the word would cause problems.
- 15.4 The following comments were also made on regulations that had already been approved:
- a) referring to SA1.2 Submitting Assignments, a member suggested that it said "Unless it is specifically arranged otherwise, you must submit all parts of an assignment together *and by the due date*". There was nothing in this regulation that suggested that it might be possible to have an extension to the due date, whereas in the regulations concerning the end-of-module assessment tasks there was considerable detail about how a postponement might be granted in exceptional circumstances
 - b) with reference to SA1.5 Resubmitting assignments, clarification was required as to whether resubmission of an assignment was acceptable when it was for a different module, or whether resubmission would not be allowed for any assignment that had previously been submitted and marked.
 - c) in the light of Global Direct, SA2.4 Students overseas might require some review. This was supported by the President of OUSA, Marianne Cantieri.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that these points were noted and taken back to the Committee as part of an ongoing review, which would then propose some further amendments for a future meeting of the Senate.

Action: AB

- 15.5 The Senate **approved** the amended Code of Practice for Student Assessment, with the exception of SA6.2.4.

16 PHD PUBLISHED WORK REGULATIONS

S-2013-01-13

- 16.1 A member asked why the University insisted on the residency constraint on part-time students in the UK, when there had been successful postgraduate students from all over the world. The Vice-Chancellor said that this was not pertinent to the paper, so a full debate of this point would not be appropriate. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Scholarship and Quality), Professor Tim Blackman, said that this reflected a view in the University about the student experience and the role of the campus, but the matter would be referred to the Research Degrees Committee and a response provided to the next meeting of the Senate.

Action: TB

16.2 The Senate **approved** the proposed changes to the Regulations for the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by Published Work as set out in the appendix to the paper.

17 DOCTORATE IN EDUCATION REGULATIONS

S-2013-01-14

The Senate **approved** the proposed changes to the Regulations for the Doctorate in Education as set out in the paper.

18 CHANGES TO THE GENERAL QUALIFICATION REGULATIONS

S-2013-01-15

18.1 The following comments were made:

- a) referring to paragraph 5 of the paper and the amendment to GQR1.1.5, an AL member observed that the impact of the Access and Openings modules (Stage 0) being included within the specified time limit for completion of the qualification would disadvantage those students who chose to undertake them because they were under-prepared for Level 1, as these students would then have less time to undertake their Level 1, 2 and 3 modules compared to a student who was fully prepared;
- b) that there was potential for confusion between GQR 1.1.5, regarding the inclusion of Access or Openings modules, and GQR 2.2.1, which stated that students must commence their studies by enrolling on one or more specified modules at Level 1;
- c) that there was inconsistency between documents with instructions to students to print in the Code of Practice for Student Assessment (C-2013-01-12) but to refer to them online in these regulations;
- d) with reference to GQR 2.2.7 (a) ii, which said that there would be only one start date for the Level 2 module in each year, an associate lecturer member said that this would enable a student registering at Level 1 in February to register for their Level 2 modules before they had passed or undertaken their Level 1 module assessment. It might therefore be helpful to include further guidance in GQR 2.2.7 (a) iii regarding the submission of work;
- e) a student member observed that there had been substantial changes to regulations and policies over the past 12 months and it was important that these be communicated effectively to students, not only to make them aware of the amendments, but also to clarify which students they applied to.

18.2 In response the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), Professor Alan Bassindale, observed that there was a need to make sure that all of the University's regulations were clear and worked together, as a change in one document frequently impacted on another and agreed to:

- a) discuss the issue of the impact of including Access and Openings modules with the Acting Director, Students, Dr Christina Lloyd, and to report back to the Senate on actions taken to mitigate the risk to disadvantaged students;
- b) review GQR2.2.7. Students needed guidance through such complex regulations and this would be provided through Student Support Teams (SSTs). Students

would not be able to register for the next module within a qualification until they were in a position to progress.

Action: AB

- 18.3 The Vice-Chancellor suggested that he took Chair's action as appropriate to approve any amendments after the Senate meeting.
- 18.4 The Acting Director, Students, Dr Lloyd, said that the communications to transitional and continuing students were being carefully considered, and that where regulations were cited on StudentHome then it would be quite clear who those regulations applied to.
- 18.5 The Senate **approved** amendments to the General Qualification Regulations (Registered Undergraduate Qualifications) as set out in Appendix 1 to the paper, subject to the above amendments being approved by Chair's action, to take immediate effect.

19 RESTRUCTURING OF THE FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, COMPUTING AND TECHNOLOGY

S-2013-01-16

- 19.1 Referring to the names of the three new academic departments, a member asked why the decision had been taken not to include "Design" with "Engineering and Innovation", given the profile of the Design group. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Professor Musa Muhsein, replied that the proposals for departmental names had been through the appropriate processes, including external review and consideration by the Faculty Committee, and had not been chosen ad hoc.
- 19.2 The Dean of the Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology, Professor Anne de Roeck, said that the Faculty had made some difficult decisions, but had engaged positively with the restructuring process and shown a commitment to achieve the right outcome for all. It had taken two years to arrive at the decision, and the scale and difficulty of the restructuring demonstrated the value of due process, checked by governance, to ensure that there was academic debate, that issues were raised, options explored and tested, and there was convergence on an outcome of which everyone affected could take ownership.
- 19.3 The determination of the departmental names had been an integral part of the restructuring process, and the names proposed reflected the successful conclusion of that process. Departmental names needed to highlight more than their constituent disciplines; they had to reflect a community of peers with a common vision and direction. Strong external profiles for disciplines were important, but including the discipline in the departmental name was not necessarily the best way to achieve this. The Faculty recognised the value of its disciplines, and part of the restructuring plan was to put in place significant investment, including for the Design area. Support had been secured from Communications to strengthen the profile of high-flying disciplines through a new website and external engagement.
- 19.4 A member asked whether changes to the names of those programme committees associated with MCT's core areas were anticipated. Professor de Roeck said that changes to the names of programme committees were not planned, although there had been a recent change to include 'environment' in the undergraduate Design, Engineering and Environment programme. Discussions were currently taking place with Social Sciences around the impact of the reviews of the EDIS programme. The member said that it was the inclusion of 'environment' in the name of a programme committee that was giving his faculty some concern. The Vice-Chancellor suggested that this discussion was taken further outside of the Senate.

- 19.5 A prospective member of the new department observed that constituents of the new department would be people like Development, Policy and Practice, Systems, Design, Materials, Environmental Engineering, Technology Management and Communication. Each of these groups might have wanted to put their particular activities into the departmental name, which would have been longer than DDEM and which would have been unfortunate. As someone on the inside, the member did not feel uncomfortable with it and was glad to see it finally being resolved.
- 19.6 The Senate **approved** the recommendation that the Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology (MCT) be restructured into three academic departments as outlined in the paper. The names of the new departments will be:
- a) Computing and Communications
 - b) Engineering and Innovation
 - c) Mathematics and Statistics

20 COMMITTEE MATTERS

S-2013-01-17

The Senate:

- a) **approved** the recommendations for the constitutional changes to:
 - i) Curriculum and Validation Committee (Appendix 1)
 - ii) Qualifications Committee (Appendix 2)
 - iii) Validation Committee (Appendix 3)
 - iv) Research Degrees Examination Result Approval Committee (Appendix 4)
 - v) Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (Appendix 5)
- b) **noted** the matters for report set out in paragraphs 20 and 21 of the paper.

21 SENATE SUBSTRUCTURE ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

S-2013-01-18

The Senate **noted** the annual effectiveness reviews for the committee year 2011/2012 of the Honorary Degrees Committee and the Faculty of Health and Social Care Committee.

22 ACTION BY THE CHAIR

S-2013-01-19

The Senate **noted** the report on action taken by the Chair since the last meeting of the Senate to agree on behalf of the Senate the appointment of a new member to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

23 THE COUNCIL

S-2013-01-20

- 23.1 Referring to paragraph 36 of the report, a member asked for more clarity regarding the decision to reduce the OU's funded numbers in order to achieve parity with other HEI's in Northern Ireland. The University Secretary, Fraser Woodburn, responded that the OU

had been involved in the initial discussions with BIS and Department for Education and Learning in Northern Ireland (DELNI) where all parties had agreed on the amount of money that should be transferred, which had amounted to £6 million. However, the University had been excluded from the discussions on the actual amount to be transferred. BIS and DELNI had agreed that there was shortfall of £4 million because of the changes in funding in England, so only £2 million was transferred. BIS and DELNI each agreed to find £1.3 million, and BIS had asked the University to provide the remaining £1.3 million. This represented income that the University had lost and was unlikely to make up other than in the medium term. In order to deal with this situation, the University could either have reduced its funded numbers or reduced the unit of resource per student. In order to avoid a situation where the OU was funded on a different basis to the other HEI's in Northern Ireland, the preferred option was to reduce the funded numbers. By keeping to the DELNI agenda, the University would seek to increase funded numbers in the medium to long term. In the short term, it was not the intention to cap NI numbers, so there would not necessarily be any immediate impact on student numbers or ALs.

- 23.2 The Director, the OU in Ireland, John D'Arcy, said that the transfer had now taken place. The new NI Higher Education Strategy was a positive one for the OU. It was now part of a trio of universities, including Queens University Belfast and the University of Ulster. The OU was particularly recognised for the role it had to play in up-skilling, which was important for the Northern Ireland economy. The OU had to work through the current scenario, but as the Comprehensive Spending Review approached, the University would be in a good position to bid for growth.
- 23.3 The Senate **noted** the report on matters discussed at the meeting of the Council held on 27 November 2012.

24 FUTURE ITEMS OF BUSINESS

S-2013-01-21

- 24.1 Referring to the earlier remarks about the role of the Senate, a member said that it was surprising that the Senate would not be discussing current issues such as MOOCs, (Massive Open Online Courses), the enormous shift in student support from being based on geography to qualification, and the tuition strategy for Global Direct before June 2013. The University Secretary, Fraser Woodburn, said that it was unlikely that these items would be ready for discussion before June.
- 24.2 The reason for the change in the meeting arrangements for the Senate was that the University had lost the sense of a cycle of business. Now the meetings of the substructure, the Senate, SPRC and the Council were aligned. Moreover, there had never been much business for the April Senate and it was the least well attended of all the meetings. It was intended that the Senate would decide each February whether or not there are items for an April meeting, and if not that meeting would be cancelled.
- 24.3 The Vice-Chancellor asked the Senate to vote on the issue by show of hands. A substantial majority of the members of the Senate agreed that there was no requirement for a meeting of the Senate in April 2013
- 24.4 The Senate:
- a) **agreed** that there was no requirement for a meeting of the Senate in April 2013
 - b) **noted** the potential items for the agenda for the Senate meeting on 5 June 2013.

25 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Meetings will be held on the following dates:

Wednesday 5 June 2013

Wednesday 16 October 2013

26 GOODBYES AND THANK YOUS

On behalf of the Senate, the Vice-Chancellor thanked Liz Armitage, Director of Strategy (Planning and Resources), OUBS and an academic-related staff member, who was retiring from the University, for her contribution to the Senate and to the OU.

Fraser Woodburn
Secretary to the Committee

Julie Tayler
Working Secretary to the Committee
Email: j.d.tayler@open.ac.uk
Tel: 01908 332729

Attachments:

S-2013-01-M Appendix 1: Curriculum and Validation Committee

S-2013-01-M Appendix 2: Qualifications Committee

S-2013-01-M Appendix 3: Validation Committee

S-2013-01-M Appendix 4: Research Degrees Examination Result Approval Committee

S-2013-01-M Appendix 5: Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee

Key:

AB Professor Alan Bassindale
CL Dr Christina Lloyd
SB Simon Bromley
SH Steve Hill
TB Professor Tim Blackman
FW Fraser Woodburn

CURRICULUM AND VALIDATION COMMITTEECONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~01.08.2012~~06.02.2013**Purpose**

The Curriculum and Validation Committee is responsible to the Senate for strategy, policy and standards relating to curriculum and qualifications, including collaborative offerings, and associated and partner institutions; for monitoring the delivery and review in respect of qualifications based on occupational standards and to monitor the framework for the approval of qualifications of this type. It has delegated powers to approve assessment policy.

Terms of Reference***Legislation: setting policy and strategy frameworks, agreeing plans and priorities***

1. To promote the strategic objectives and priorities relating to the University's curriculum in consultation with central academic unit committees, and to recommend the strategy to the Senate for approval.
2. To determine frameworks and guidelines to achieve the agreed strategic objectives and priorities, for the examination assessment and classification of qualifications which involve taught modules (with the exception of research degrees and higher doctorates) acting on advice from the Learning Teaching and Student Support Committee where necessary.
3. To monitor and review the curriculum aspects of central academic unit plans, encouraging collaboration between central academic units and sub-units in their curriculum planning and development activities and setting the overarching terms of reference for the programme committees reporting to the central academic unit committees.
4. To delegate to the Qualifications Committee the approval of the introduction of all standard qualifications and their regulations, the approval of the withdrawal of all qualifications and their associated amended regulations, and the approval of amendments to existing qualifications and their regulations, where these conform with the University's Qualifications Framework and other existing policies, and to make recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.
5. To delegate to the Qualifications Committee the approval of new modules and packs recommending the frameworks and guidelines to the Senate for approval.
6. To approve the introduction of new non standard qualifications and their regulations, where these are referred to it by Qualifications Committee, where these conform with the University's Qualifications Framework and other existing policies, and to make recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.
7. To formulate and interpret regulations that apply to the qualifications of the University generally.
8. To approve, on the advice of the Curriculum Partnerships Committee, the introduction of partnerships, leading to an award of the University, and their quality and contractual frameworks and the closure of existing partnerships, and to make recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.

9. To approve, on the advice of the Validation Committee, partner or associate status for institutions, the terms of their approval, and where appropriate, the termination of their approval and to make recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.
10. To interpret and approve exceptions to the policies and regulations relating to examinations and assessment and qualifications.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

11. To monitor the implementation of policy on all matters within the Committee's remit, including collaborative arrangements, and to ensure that activities are monitored against the standards set.
12. To monitor the annual review of qualifications, and the annual review of curriculum partnerships and institutional partnerships to identify areas of the University's curriculum and qualifications structure requiring attention or development, and to draw these to the notice of appropriate officers and committees for review or development activities as appropriate.
13. To contribute to the Senate's annual academic review of the University.

Assuring Quality and Standards, including approving regulations

14. To ensure that standards are set for the qualifications, modules and assessment offered by the University, that they are consistent in standard and are compatible with those offered by other UK HEIs, that they support recognition by other organisations, and that they are in alignment with national and international qualification frameworks.
15. To approve recommendations for the recognition and inclusion in the qualifications of the University of modules and periods of study undertaken under the auspices both of the University and of other institutions.
16. To maintain and monitor the University's procedures for the monitoring and review of University qualifications based on occupational standards, ensuring that they are consistent and comparable to those awarded by other awarding bodies throughout the United Kingdom.

Advising other governance bodies or management

17. To advise relevant areas of the University of significant market opportunities which the market may present, in order to inform University strategy.
18. To advise the Senate on the introduction or withdrawal of specific categories of qualification.
19. To report to the Senate of new partnerships and new approved institutions (including refusal to approve) or any changes in the status of approval.

Making governance arrangements e.g. appointing to other committees

None

Matters of public record e.g. ratifying appointments of staff or external examiners

None

Judicial: deciding individual cases

None

Membership

1. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Chair, *ex officio*.
2. The deans of faculties or their nominees, and the Director of the Institute of Educational Technology or his/her nominee, *ex officio*.
3. The chairs of any committees reporting to the Committee.
4. The Director of Assessment Credit and Qualifications or nominee, *ex officio*.
5. One nominee of the Commercial Director, *ex officio*.
6. The Director of the Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships, or nominee, *ex officio*.
7. One nominee of the Director, Students.
8. One nominee of the Director of Marketing.
9. Four members of staff, elected by the Senate, of whom at least two shall be members of the central academic staff.
10. Two associate lecturers appointed by the Associate Lecturers Executive.
11. Two registered students appointed by the Open University Students' Association.
12. Four external members. These may be drawn from the following bodies: the University's partner institutions, external members of the Validation Committee, employers who are University partners, or external assessors. Members in this category are to be appointed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic) on the recommendation of University officers.
13. Such others as the Committee may co-opt up to a maximum of three, to include members with expertise as necessary in HE issues in Scotland, Ireland and Wales, if not otherwise elected or nominated.

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall meet in accordance with the University's Committee Timetable, not less than three times a year, and on such other occasions in the year as have been approved by the Senate. It shall report to each meeting of the Senate.
2. It shall be permitted to delegate tasks to a duly constituted executive committee or committees of itself; or to specific individuals; and may make rules relating to its own procedure, but should not further delegate powers delegated by the Senate without the Senate's agreement.
3. The Committee should designate a Deputy Chair. The Chair shall have executive authority to act on behalf of the Committee and any of its executive committees, in consultation with any body designated to assist in this capacity by the Committee.

S-2013-01-17 Appendix 1

4. The Committee shall review each year according to agreed University criteria how efficiently, effectively and economically it is working in respect of participation, the conduct of business and production of high quality decisions, the schedule of the review to allow for implementation of improvements from the beginning of the next committee year.
5. The Committee shall ensure that strategies, policies plans and priorities within its remit are compliant with relevant University-wide policies implemented or being developed, particularly those relating to equal opportunities, environmental management and health and safety.
6. The Chair shall have executive authority to act on the Committee's behalf, in consultation with the Secretary, ~~in particular for the approval of modules and pack~~

QUALIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~20.09.2012~~06.02.2013

Purpose

On behalf of the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC), to provide detailed scrutiny of proposals relating to individual qualifications, to approve the introduction of standard qualification proposals, and their regulations, to approve proposals to withdraw qualifications, and their amended regulations, to approve amendments to existing qualifications, to approve credit transfer schemes and to make recommendations to the CVC on the approval of non-standard qualifications, including where such qualifications involve a partnership dimension; where any aspect of the qualification is being funded from strategic/central funds; where the qualification is the first example of a new type of qualification; where the qualification has non-standard elements, or where the qualification is in a subject or sub-subject that is new to the University.

Terms of Reference

Legislation: setting policy and strategy frameworks, agreeing plans and priorities

1. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the introduction of individual taught qualifications, and their regulations, taking into account the QAA requirements relating to programme specifications, learning outcomes and subject benchmarking, the balance of such awards between Open University originated credit and credit originated outside the University, and taking into account of the University's validated programmes and qualifications; where appropriate, to refer proposals for classification schemes to the Assessment Policy Committee.
2. Following scrutiny, to approve new qualifications and their associated regulations where the proposals are standard.
3. To approve proposals for the withdrawal of individual taught qualifications, and amended regulations, ensuring that students are given reasonable notice of any changes.
4. To approve amendments to existing qualifications and their regulations.
5. To approve the introduction of new modules and packs.
6. To approve the award of general and specific credit, specific credit transfer schemes and, in consultation as appropriate with the Curriculum Partnerships Committee, collaborative credit agreements with other institutions, for the University's taught qualifications, which do not require regulatory changes.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

7. To monitor the demand for the University's taught qualifications and to receive an annual report on the number of qualifications made of each type.
8. To monitor the process for the annual review of qualifications.
9. To have oversight (on behalf of the Senate) of the award of credit to applicants and students towards the University's taught qualifications based on study undertaken outside the University in accordance with established regulations.

10. To receive regular reports on the approval of awards of general and specific credit and to monitor the annual review process for such awards.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

11. To monitor the University's procedures for the approval and review of its qualifications, ensuring that they are in accordance with the current guidance from the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA).
12. To keep under review the credit structures and requirements for the University's taught qualifications, having regard to the relationships between such qualifications, their comparability with the University's validated qualifications and the relevant national qualifications frameworks.
13. To make recommendations to the Curriculum and Validation Committee for new or revised general regulations, including credit transfer regulations, for the University's taught qualifications.

Advising other governance bodies or management

14. To make recommendations to the CVC on the approval of proposals for the introduction of individual taught qualifications, and their regulations, particularly where such qualifications involve a partnership dimension, where any aspect of the qualification is being funded from strategic/central funds; where the qualification is the first example of a new type of qualification; where the qualification has a non-standard element; or where the qualification is in a subject or sub-subject that is new to the University.
15. To identify and consider credit accumulation and transfer issues particularly those involving the status and recognition of the University's modules and qualifications arising from discussions with other institutions and from national and international developments, to co-ordinate the University's response to consultative documents and reports on such issues, and where appropriate to propose the introduction of new types of qualification or changes to existing curriculum policy to the CVC.

Membership

1. A Chair appointed by the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
2. One associate dean or equivalent with a relevant portfolio from each central academic unit (or the dean/director's nominee if no suitable portfolio exists).
3. The Director, Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships (CICP) or nominee, *ex officio*.
4. The Director of Assessment, Credit and Qualifications or nominee.
5. ~~The Head of Product and Service Development, or nominee~~ One member of the Communications Team, Student Services.
6. Two members of Student Services support staff, nominated by the Director, Students.
7. One member of staff based in Scotland, nominated by the Director, Scotland.
8. One member of the Learning and Teaching Office nominated by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)

~~89~~. Two registered students, one of whom should be a postgraduate student, appointed by the Open University Students' Association.

~~9~~10. One associate lecturer appointed by the Associate Lecturers Executive.

~~10~~11. Two external members ~~of the Validation Committee, nominated by that Committee.~~

~~11~~12. The Chair of the Credit Rating Panel, *ex officio*.

~~12~~13. The Head of the Learner Advisory Service or nominee.

Secretary

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall meet as and when required, and shall report at least annually to the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
2. The Chair of the Committee shall have executive authority to act on its behalf in consultation with its Secretary.
3. The Committee shall delegate to the Credit Rating Panel the authority to approve and review awards of general and specific credit.

VALIDATION COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~17.10.2012~~06.02.2013

Purpose

On behalf of the Curriculum and Validation Committee (CVC), to recommend policy on the approval of institutions and the validation and review of programmes, to propose the terms for the approval and review of specific institutions, and to validate and re-validate specific awards offered by such institutions.

Terms of Reference

Legislation: setting policy and strategy frameworks, agreeing plans and priorities

1. To approve the validation and re-validation of awards offered by associated and partner institutions, taking into account the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) requirements relating to programme specifications, learning outcomes and subject benchmarking, and taking account of the University's taught awards.
2. To approve the imposition of sanctions on associated and partner institutions where the quality and standards of an award are at risk, including the approval of the close of entry to a validated award.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

3. To monitor the appointment of external examiners at each meeting and to monitor the number of associated and partner institutions, the number of re-approvals, the number of validated awards and applications for re-validation, and student numbers on the University's validated awards and to receive an annual report on these items.
4. To monitor, in consultation with the Curriculum Partnerships Committee, the process for the annual review of validated awards, requiring evidence from associated and partner institutions of effective management of the quality of provision and of the academic standards, reporting to the CVC on the overall progression and completion statistics and referring any major issues arising from the reports to the CVC.
5. To monitor compliance with any conditions arising from the approval or re-approval of institutions, and the validation, re-validation or review of individual awards.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

6. To maintain and monitor the University's procedures for the approval of institutions as suitable for the conduct of programmes leading to Open University awards by validation or other means of approval, ensuring that the quality of learning opportunities and student support provided by the institution meet the University's standards.
7. To maintain and monitor the University's procedures for the validation and review of programmes, with reference to the current guidance from the QAA.
8. To maintain and monitor the procedures for the external examination of validated awards.
9. To keep under review the handbook for the University's validated awards, having regard to the relationships between such awards, their comparability with the University's taught qualifications and the relevant national qualifications frameworks.

10. To make recommendations to the Curriculum and Validation Committee for new or revised regulations for the University's validated awards.

Advising other governance bodies or management

11. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the approval of institutions, their re-approval and the terms of their approved status and to make recommendations to the CVC on their approval.
12. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the termination of the approval of an institution, ensuring that commitments to continuing students are protected to the completion of their studies, and to make recommendations to CVC on the termination of the approval.

Making governance arrangements e.g. appointing to other committees

13. To appoint one member of VALC to serve as a member of Curriculum Partnerships Committee.

~~14. To appoint two external members to serve as members of the Qualifications Committee.~~

Matters of public record e.g. ratifying appointments of staff or external examiners

None.

Judicial: deciding individual cases

~~14.~~ To delegate to the Director of the Centre for the Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships the responsibility with procedures approved by the Senate.

Membership

1. A Chair appointed by the Curriculum and Validation Committee
2. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
3. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) or nominee.
4. One nominee of the Director, Students
5. The Director, Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships
6. The Commercial Director, or nominee
7. The Head of Quality
8. Two members having experience in appropriate branches of industry or commerce or in appropriate professions, including members with experience in the field of occupational standards.
9. Three members from partner institutions of The Open University.
10. One representative of each of the central academic units of the University, normally at associate dean level.
11. Three members from other higher education establishments having suitable experience, for example of ensuring standards and quality assurance through peer validation.

12. One representative appointed by the Curriculum Partnerships Committee who is a member of that Committee.
13. Such other members as may be appointed by the Curriculum and Validation Committee up to a maximum of three.
14. Such others as the Committee may co-opt up to a maximum of three, to include members with expertise in HE issues including foundation degrees.

Members in Categories 8 to 11 to be appointed by the Chair of the Curriculum and Validation Committee on the advice of officers.

Secretary

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall meet as and when required, and shall report at least annually to the Curriculum and Validation Committee.
2. The Chair of the Committee shall have executive authority to act on its behalf in consultation with its Secretary.

RESEARCH DEGREES EXAMINATION RESULT APPROVAL COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~18.04.2012~~06.02.2013

Purpose

On behalf of the Research Degrees Committee to approve research degree examination results and the award of Open University research degrees and to make recommendations to Research Degrees Committee on matters of policy relating to examination policy.

Terms of Reference

Legislation, setting policy and strategy frameworks, agreeing plans and priorities

1. To make recommendations to the Research Degrees Committee about changes to research degree examination policy in response to external changes or good practice requirements.

Assuring quality and standards, including approving regulations

2. To approve the recommendations of examiners for examination results, and the award of Open University research degrees to individual students registered for such degrees.

Monitoring and reviewing actions and institutional performance

3. To monitor the implementation of institutional research degree examination policy on behalf of the Research Degrees Committee.
4. To monitor the maintenance of standards in the award of Open University research degrees.

Membership

1. A Chair appointed by the Research Degrees Committee.
2. A Deputy Chair appointed by the Research Degrees Committee.
3. The Chair of the Life and Biomolecular Sciences Management Group, *ex officio*.
- ~~4. The Chair of the Theology and Religious Studies Management Group, *ex officio*.~~
- ~~5.~~ 4. The Chair of the Architecture and Urbanism Management Group, *ex officio*.
- ~~5.~~ 6. The Chair of the Affiliated Research Centre Scrutiny Group, *ex officio*.
6. The associate dean (research) nominee from each central academic unit, *ex officio*.
- ~~7.~~ 6. Representative of the Knowledge Media Institute, *ex officio*.
- ~~7.~~ 8. One member, co-opted by the Committee, to advise on the result approval of the examination candidates registered in the Chair's subject area, should the Chair be drawn from existing Committee membership.

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall report to the Research Degrees Committee.
2. It shall normally meet twice a year.
3. The Chair, and by delegation the Deputy Chair, shall have executive authority to act on its behalf, in consultation with other nominated members, to approve examination results and the award of degrees in between meetings, to enable the timely issue of results.

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~20.09.2012~~06.02.2013

Purpose

Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee assures the Senate that quality assurance and enhancement arrangements are appropriately established and implemented, and oversees the University's engagement with external quality assurance processes.

Terms of Reference

Legislation: setting policy and strategy frameworks, agreeing plans and priorities

1. To maintain the University's quality assurance and quality enhancement strategy for approval by the Senate, to ensure that a strategic approach to quality is maintained and cross-University quality-related issues are properly addressed and satisfactorily resolved; and to assure the Senate accordingly.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

2. To approve and review the University's arrangements for the management of quality assurance and enhancement, including use of student monitoring and feedback, in accordance with University policy and in the context of external requirements and guidelines.
3. To contribute to the quality assurance frameworks for Higher Education.
4. To oversee the preparation for, and the institutional organisation of, external quality assurance processes, including reviews by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), and other Public and Statutory Bodies.
5. To approve plans for follow-up action to external quality assurance and enhancement processes and internal periodic review, and reports on the implementation and effectiveness of measures to address recommendations.

Assuring Quality and Standards, including approving regulations

Terms of reference 2 to 5 above are relevant to this core function.

Advising other governance bodies or management

6. To advise appropriate University committees on matters relating to academic quality.
7. To facilitate arrangements for the exchange of best practice on quality assurance and enhancement matters between units of the University and between the University and its accredited and associated institutions, and affiliated research centres.

Membership

1. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Scholarship and Quality), Chair, *ex officio*.
2. The Head of Quality, *ex officio*.
3. Six members appointed by the Senate on the recommendation of the Senate Membership Panel, of whom at least four shall be members of academic units (to include at least two centrally-based academics) and one external to the University. At least one of the internal members should be regionally/nationally-based. These members shall normally serve for a period of four years.
4. One registered student, appointed by the Open University Students' Association.

Mode of Operation

1. The Committee shall meet in accordance with the University's Committee Timetable, not less than three times a year, and on such other occasions in the year as have been approved by the Senate. It shall report to each meeting of the Senate.
2. It shall be permitted to delegate tasks to a duly constituted executive committee or committees of itself; or to specific individuals; and may make rules relating to its own procedure, but should not further delegate powers delegated by the Senate without the Senate's agreement.
3. The Committee should designate a Deputy Chair. The Chair shall have executive authority to act on behalf of the Committee and of its executive committees, in consultation with anybody designated to assist in this capacity by the Committee.
4. The Committee shall review each year according to agreed University criteria how efficiently, effectively and economically it is working in respect of participation, the conduct of business and production of high quality decisions, the schedule of the review to allow for implementation of improvements from the beginning of the next committee year.
5. The Committee shall ensure that strategies, policies, plans and priorities within its remit are compliant with relevant University-wide policies implemented or being developed, particularly those relating to equal opportunities, environmental management and health and safety.
6. The Chair shall have executive authority to act on the Committee's behalf, in consultation with the Secretary.