THE SENATE

Minutes

This paper presents the confirmed Minutes of the last meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 22 April 2015 at The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes.

The Senate **approved** these Minutes as a correct record of the meeting on Wednesday 10 June 2015, subject to the correction of a typographical error in Minute 9.7 (S-2015-03-M Minute 2).

Fraser Woodburn
University Secretary

Sue Thomas
Working Secretary to the Senate
Email: sue.thomas@open.ac.uk
Tel: 01908 655083

Attachment:

S-2015-02-M Appendix: The Senate Constitution Terms of Reference

THE SENATE

Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 22 April 2015 at 2.00pm
in the Hub Theatre, The Open University, Walton Hall.

PRESENT:

1) Ex officio

Professor Tim Blackman, Vice-Chancellor (Acting)
Professor Alan Bassindale, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research, Scholarship and Quality)
(Acting)
Professor Musa Mihsein, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Professor Belinda Tynan, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)
Professor Anne De Roeck, Dean, Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology
Professor Kevin Hetherington, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
Professor Mary Kellett, Dean, Faculty of Education and Language Studies
Dr Richard Brown, Dean, Faculty of Arts
Mr Jeremy Roche, Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Care
Professor Hazel Rymer, Dean, Faculty of Science
Professor Rebecca Taylor, Dean, Faculty of Business and Law
Mr Keith Zimmerman, Director, Students
Professor Patrick McAndrew, Director of the Institute of Educational Technology
Mrs Nicky Whitsed, Director, Library Services
Mr Chris Rooke, Director, Learning and Teaching Solutions

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

Faculty of Arts

Dr Cristina Chimisso	Professor John Wolffe
Dr Ole Grell	Dr Naoko Yamagata
Dr Lynda Prescott	

Faculty of Business & Law

Mr Mike Phillips	Dr Sharon Slade
Dr Kristen Reid	

Faculty of Education and Language Studies

Dr Uwe Baumann	Professor Regine Hampel
Dr Jane Cullen	Dr Tim Lewis
Mrs Annie Eardley	Mr Pete Smith

Faculty of Health and Social Care

Mrs Sue Cole	Miss Christine Taylor
Professor Jan Draper	Dr Mary Twomey
Mr Mick McCormick	

Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

Dr Leonor Barroca	Dr Toby O'Neil
Dr David Bowers	Mr Brendan Quinn
Professor Joyce Fortune	Dr Magnus Ramage

Dr Rachel Hilliam   Dr Hayley Ryder
Ms Maggie Holland

Faculty of Science

Dr John Baxter   Professor Hilary MacQueen
Professor Monica Grady   Professor David Rothery
Dr Janet Haresnape   Dr Claire Turner
Dr Arlëne Hunter

Faculty of Social Sciences

Dr Jacqueline Baxter   Dr Deborah Drake
Dr Troy Cooper   Dr Catriona Havard

Institute of Educational Technology

Dr Anne Adams   Mr Chris Edwards

Other Central Units

Dr Liz Marr

3) Associate Lecturers

Dr Fiona Aiken (alternate)   Mr Stephen Pattinson
Mrs Frances Chetwynd   Dr Walter Pisarski
Mr Bruce Heil   Dr Clare Spencer

4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association

Miss Ruth Tudor   Mr David Humble
Mr Josh Brumpton   Mr John Murphy
Ms Alison Kingan   Mr Jeferson de Oliveira

5) Academic-related Staff

Dr Donna Smith   Mr Michael Street
Mr Jake Yeo   Dr Christina Lloyd
Ms Pat Atkins   Mrs Joanne Smythe
Ms Clare Riding   Mr Simon Horrocks
Mr Phil Berry   Mr Billy Khokhar
Dr Victoria Crowe   Miss Barbara Poniatowska
Mr Mike Innes   Dr Linda Ward

6) Co-opted members

Mr Christopher Goscomb   Dr David Knight
Mr John D'Arcy   Dr James Miller
Mr Rob Humphreys

In attendance

Mr Fraser Woodburn, University Secretary
Mrs Dawn Turpin, Head of Governance
Ms Sue Thomas, Senior Manager, Governance
Miss Teresa Coyle, Manager, Governance

Observing

Mr Peter Horrocks, Vice-Chancellor designate
Mr Lucian Hudson, Director of Communications
Dr Jenny Stewart, Head of the Office of the Director, Students
Dr Sharon Ding, Academic Director, Business Development Unit (for minute 8)
Ms Nicola Terry, Senior Project Manager, Locations Analysis (for minute 9)

APOLOGIES:

1) Ex officio

Appointed

2) Central Academic Units

       Faculty of Arts

       Professor Graham Harvey

       Faculty of Business and Law

       Miss Carol Howells   Ms Carmel McMahon

       Faculty of Education and Language Studies

       Dr Indra Sinka

       Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology

       Professor Andy Lane   Dr Peter Robbins
       Dr Tony Nixon

       Faculty of Social Sciences

       Dr Anastasia Economou   Mr Matt Staples
       Dr Helen Kaye

       Institute of Educational Technology

       Professor Eileen Scanlon

3) Associate Lecturers

       Ms Janet Dyke

6) Co-opted members

       Professor Peter Scott

In attendance

       Mr Andrew Law

1   WELCOME

The Chair, Acting Vice-Chancellor, Professor Tim Blackman, welcomed Mr Peter Horrocks, Vice-Chancellor-Designate and Dr Deborah Drake, Faculty of Social Sciences to their first meeting of the Senate

2   MINUTES   S-2015-01-M

The Senate **approved** the minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 28 January 2015.

3   MATTERS ARISING   S-2015-02-01

The Senate **noted** the response to the matter arising from the last minutes.

4   REPORT FROM AND QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR

4.1   The Acting Vice-Chancellor, Professor Tim Blackman, introduced Mr Peter Horrocks, Vice-Chancellor-Designate, to the Senate. Mr Horrocks explained that he would begin his role as Vice-Chancellor on 5 May 2015 and was a spectator not a participant at this meeting. He looked forward to meeting members and working with them.

4.2   The Acting Vice-Chancellor reported on the following successes for the University and members of its staff and congratulated all those involved:

a)   the University's MBA was placed eighth globally and fourth in the UK in the QS Distance Online MBA Ranking. The MBA was also placed joint second out of 22 schools globally by CEO Magazine. The Business School also maintained its prestigious accreditation by The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business;

b)   after a two year review, the University had also retained its university-wide HR Excellence in Research Award from Vitae. This recognised the University's commitment to improving the working conditions and career development of its research staff;

c)   recognition of Tamsin Edwards, Lecturer in Environmental Sciences at the Suffrage Science 2015 event;

d)   confirmation of a €10m grant from the EU for the transnational Europlanet 2020 Research Infrastructure project, which the University was leading, with €1.2m coming directly to the OU;

e)   the impact of the Life-changing Learning campaign including an advertisement broadcast on Channel 4 and Sky on 16 March 2015. Many alumni had contacted the University after seeing the advertisement to say how much they identified with the scenes;

f)   the achievements of all the University's graduates who received their qualifications at the first few degree ceremonies of 2015. In particular, graduate David Molyneux who was awarded the Sir John Daniel prize for excellence in IT at the Dublin ceremony;

g)   a number of very successful conferences and events including the University Nuclear Technology Forum 2015 conference, the MK Future Cities conference, a Parliamentary reception in Scotland celebrating the Young Applicants in Schools Scheme.

4.3 Professor Blackman thanked the Senate for its support and reiterated that it had been a privilege to serve the University as Acting Vice-Chancellor.

5 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE S-2015-02-02

The Senate **noted** the unconfirmed Minutes from the meeting held on 19 February 2015.

6 SENATE MEMBERSHIP PANEL S-2014-02-03

The Senate **noted** the report on business conducted by the Senate Membership Panel (SMP) since the last meeting of the Senate.

7 RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING S-2015-02-04

7.1 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (PVC A) introduced the paper and explained that the Recognition of Prior Learning Policy (RPL) policy had been produced to provide university-level guidance for all forms of RPL within the University. There was currently no single policy document on RPL and the provision of information for students was fragmented. The policy re-stated current credit transfer practice and proposed new policy on "Direct Entry" to the University's directly taught qualifications. Dr Liz Marr, Director, Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships (CICP) added that mapping against the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) UK Quality Code for Higher Education Chapter B6 had also shown that the University needed to improve visibility of governance approval of the range of RPL modes within the University.

7.2 Dr Marr informed the Senate that as a result of late feedback in relation to section 7 of the policy relating to Appeals and Complaints, editorial amendments were required for clarification. These were as follows:

Section 7.1 Complaints regarding the RPL claims process follow the University Student Complaints Procedure.
Section 7.2 Decision-making responsibility for RPL rests with the Programme Director for the qualification the RPL claim has been made towards.
Section 7.3 An appeal against an RPL decision will follow the University Academic Appeals Procedure.

7.3 A member expressed his support for the policy but queried how students currently took advantage of the existing policies on the recognition of prior learning. He enquired how the University would publicise its policy to attract students who might have studied previously. Dr Marr confirmed that considerable work had been undertaken in understanding students' experiences of credit transfer to inform the drafting of the policy and guidance. This work had revealed that students who entered OU study following transfer of credit progressed more quickly and successfully than students starting with OU level 1 courses. She confirmed that the RPL project would be considering marketing initiatives in due course.

7.4 Another member commented that the policy would be useful but it did not include any references to badging or other forms of assessment of other forms of informal or non-formal learning. The Director, CICP, explained that recognition of these other forms of learning would form a later part of the project.

7.5 The Dean, Faculty of Maths, Computing and Technology (MCT) welcomed the policy and considered it to be an important step in the development from module to qualification based registration for the University. She queried whether Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning (RPEL) or Work Based Learning could be helpful in demonstrating employability.

The Director, CICP explained that it was not proposed to prescribe how such assessment should be conducted as this would vary according to the area of study.

7.6   An Associate Lecturer member expressed concern that students admitted to level 2 study via direct entry (section 6.3) might not be sufficiently able to cope with the demands of distance learning at that level. Dr Marr confirmed that research had not shown this to be a particular problem but agreed that students should be advised appropriately on their choices.   A priority was to develop an informative website for students.

7.7   Another member welcomed the policy and commented that it would be interesting to think more about why students entering at level 2 performed better overall. It would also be important to recognise, in approving the policy, the additional work for Faculties in contributing to the proposed bank of policy guidance and systems and processes to support the policy. The Director, CICP commented that direct entry students were very motivated to complete their studies. Dr Marr acknowledged additional work to identify precedent awards for direct entry to named degrees but this would have great benefit in the long term.

7.8   Another member expressed her support for the policy but was concerned that by permitting direct entry the University might be penalising OU students who had started a qualification from the beginning and had little option to deviate from a pre-determined pathway. The Director, CICP confirmed that pre-requisites for level 2 study would need to be satisfied and work was ongoing as to how to ensure these were met.

7.9   The Senate **approved** the policy for the Recognition of Prior Learning and the inclusion of the amendments proposed in minute 7.2.

8   GROWTH PLANS FOR OPEN UNIVERSITY WORLDWIDE'S INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES   S-2015-02-05

8.1   Dr Sharon Ding, Academic Director, Business Development Unit explained that in response to the Senate's request for an update, her presentation would provide an overview of Open University Worldwide's (OUW's) international growth activities. It would focus on the delivery of international growth delivered through two key business activities, the International Student Acquisitions business and the International Partnerships business.

8.2   Dr Ding informed the Senate that work within International Partnerships focussed on the licensing of the University's curriculum and the offer of other consultancy services if required such as marketing, recruitment and progression models. Work included targeting opportunities and developing existing partnerships though at present the University was fortunate to have many institutions approaching it for opportunities, so work focussed on developing those. The aim was to concentrate on targeting 'high value' opportunities to secure profitable, sustainable new partnerships and to exit from poorly performing partnerships. Dr Ding presented examples of the scale and reach of the University's partnerships which included the Arab OU operating in seven countries with 46,000 students, a large scale content licensing partnership with the University of Western Sydney and the Knowledge Transfer Partnerships in China with 200,000 students studying for local qualifications using OU resources and six million students using the OU module 'This is English'.

8.3   Work within International Student Acquisitions was targeted on key student segments in primary markets. Following extensive market research in 2013, work focussed primarily in Europe with 85% of students based there, and the target customer segment was working adults wanting a quality UK-accredited qualification, taught in English, with flexibility of study.   Activities centred on digital marketing and dynamic advertising with a focus on activities to engage enquirers, increase conversion rates and reduce the costs per enquiry currently £80 (reduced from £389). Dr Ding reported that international student acquisitions had risen by 5% in 2013/14 over the previous year.

8.4   A member asked for further details of the numbers of international students and clarification of the income gained from such activities to illustrate the sustainability of such activity. Dr Ding confirmed that in 2013-14 there were 3600 FTE international students. She emphasised that considerable effort was being undertaken to increase awareness of the OU brand internationally.

8.5   Another member commented that he disliked the use of the word "acquisition" in the business focussing on international students and felt it portrayed an undesirable attitude towards such students. An Associate Lecturer member commented that in the past, international students had been promised an equivalent student experience to UK students. He asked whether such a promise was still offered to international students, and if so, how it was offered to them. Another Associate Lecturer member enquired whether the creation of international partnerships resulted in more direct entry students. Another member commented that the cost per enquirer appeared very high despite the work undertaken to reduce it. The President, OUSA commented that she was unable to comment on the information as she had not had the opportunity to discuss it with other student representatives prior to the meeting.

8.6   The Dean, Faculty of MCT enquired whether the University would be looking at the balance between undergraduate and postgraduate international students as many other institutions had strong postgraduate markets overseas. The Dean, Faculty of Science commented that a significant number of students registered with FutureLearn were international and this indicated that their targeted advertising must have been successful. A representative of OUSA asked why the charts in the presentation showing the profile of international students included students from Great Britain.

8.7   Dr Ding assured the Senate that the term "acquisition" was an inward facing term and used for marketing and business purposes and not to students directly. She explained that efforts were concentrating on students in Europe to ensure they could be offered an equivalent student experience, and reference to this had been included in the Group Tuition Policy approved by the Senate in October 2014. In respect of the postgraduate and undergraduate markets, most marketing was currently generic and difficult to split between the two segments at present. In respect of international partnerships, Dr Ding clarified that arrangements were established with institutions and not individual students. Future plans were to continue with the activities identified and increase income for the University. Targets for 2015-16 had been revised with assistance from the University's Information Office and there was much to learn from the experiences of FutureLearn. She urged Faculties to contact her if they believed they had additional modules suitable for release internationally.

8.8   The Senate **noted** the paper and presentation on the Open University Worldwide's (OUW) international activities.

9   LOCATIONS ANALYSIS   **S-2015-02-06**

9.1   The Director, Students, Mr Keith Zimmerman, introduced the paper to the Senate and explained that he and Dr James Miller, Director, The OU in Scotland and Senior Accountable Executive for the Locations Analysis Project would present the report of phase 1 of the Locations Analysis project and an update on the planned consultation activities as part of phase 2 of the project to the Senate.

9.2   Dr Miller explained that a series of consultation meetings had begun following the issue of the report on the Locations Analysis to staff. He reminded members of the timeline to which the project team had worked and drew attention to the availability of a range of documents used during the compilation of the report on phase 1 of the analysis. He emphasised that the project was designed as an analysis of the requirements for regional

service delivery and how the strategic ambitions of the University could best be served by having a distributed network.   The project developed a number of sources of evidence in order to establish a set of options for the Vice Chancellor's Executive (VCE). This included a set of strategic ambitions which were aligned to the overall strategic aims and objectives of the University and a set of design principles against which any future configuration might be assessed.   A number of key insights were developed from the evidence and these were set out in paragraph 9 of the paper. Dr Miller explained that a set of scenarios were identified and from within these two potential options (i) status quo and (ii) reconfiguration were developed and were elaborated upon in the paper. Within option (ii) a set of three illustrations were developed to provide some baseline possibilities to be discussed as part of the next phase of the project.

9.3   Dr Miler reported that the next phase of the project would be undertaken as a parallel consultation and option appraisal to determine the impact of implementing the change and the business cases which would underpin the need for change. There would be numerous opportunities to contribute to this second phase and the aim was to be open and transparent throughout. A set of key questions were being finalised and would be available shortly on the project website for responses.   Dr Miller drew attention to themes emerging from the initial meetings and explained that the intention was to capture all these and make them available on the project website. He summarised that the next steps were to complete the series of meetings as set out in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (and replicated in paragraph 19 of the paper) and then to develop a set of more detailed options and undertake a formal appraisal of these and appropriate business plans for VCE to consider in September 2015. It was intended that final decisions would be made in the autumn.

9.4   A member drew attention to paragraph 9(c) which stated that the creation of Student Support Teams (SSTs) had removed any requirement that services needed to be located in the same geographical place as service users. She was concerned that this might be interpreted to mean all service users, whereas she believed that the intention was to highlight the removal of a geographic link between SSTs and students.   She also commented that the report highlighted the likely risks associated with large scale change including the loss of staff and their knowledge as well as impacts on morale. She asked whether consideration was being given to how the University would ascertain how many staff from each location might be willing to relocate to inform the measurement of risk. Dr Miller explained that some high level information was available following the closure of the East Grinstead office but further work would be carried out in consultation with Human Resources on this.

9.5   Another member enquired whether the non-UK student population and the delivery of their outstanding student experience had been considered. Mr Zimmerman explained that such students were supported from the University's Gateshead office and relevant expertise had been developed there. If any change in the provision of those services was recommended the risk of losing that expertise would need evaluation.

9.6   An Associate Lecturer representative commented that the rationale for the current distributed network configuration was historical. He believed the key challenge for the second phase of the project was to identify the rationale for a distributed network configuration and how functions such as widening participation and communication with students could be supported.   Mr Zimmerman emphasised that the project team was very interested to receive views as to what the future requirements of the University might be. This would be built into the set of questions for consideration.

9.7   Another member commented he believed that staff wished to engage fully in the review and wished to articulate their visions of student support. He believed that this opportunity should have been made available earlier in the process. He considered that the report implied there were no reasons for major change, particularly at a time of uncertainty with

the forthcoming general election and SSTs still in their early phase.   He saw no argument for inertia but saw advantages to maintaining the status quo position though supported exploration of potential innovative opportunities such as city centre locations.

9.8   A member welcomed the focus of the report on the student experience but believed there was a link to staff experiences too. He commented that the evidence in the report relating to costs was weak. He pointed out that the covering paper to the report contained a number of inconsistencies compared to the text of the report itself, for example in paragraphs 9(c) and 18. Mr Zimmerman acknowledged the inaccuracies in the covering paper. He urged staff to submit their views on the business requirements for activities in a distributed network. The project team had knowledge at a high level but it was essential they were informed on the details.

9.9   Another member welcomed the emphasis on the student experience. He was concerned however that the report underestimated the tacit knowledge amongst staff. He enquired as to how much knowledge had to be shared after the creation of SSTs and whether teams had to communicate extensively to ensure knowledge was shared. If staff left due to a major reconfiguration, such communication would be impossible. Mr Zimmerman explained that information was available following the creation of SSTs and this was identified in the themes emerging, however further case studies would be valuable.

9.10   A member drew attention to the benefits of regional and national links to research and enquired if these had been evaluated.   Mr Zimmerman confirmed that they had and would continue to be considered during phase 2 of the project. He hoped meetings with Faculties would provide this information but it would also be welcome from other sources. Dr Miller encouraged staff to consider the individual requirements of units for the future in a creative way.

9.11   A member commented that she was pleased to hear that account would be taken of experiences in connection with the closure of East Grinstead. She believed that the University lost a considerable amount of expertise as a result of the closure. If regions were to close the University could find itself back in the position it was 18 months ago when SSTs were launched. She also believed that Faculties such as the Faculty of Health and Social Care required a local presence to support practice based students. Dr Miller welcomed this example of articulating business requirements and urged other faculties to provide such information.   Another member drew attention to examples of partnerships locally which raised the profile of the University and created business opportunities.   She expressed concern over the suggestions that many functions could be carried out irrespective of location. She drew attention to the importance of supporting and developing Associate Lecturers and building a strong team spirit. She felt local knowledge was vital to organising suitable locations for day schools and this could not be provided from a distance. Mr Zimmerman acknowledged the helpful examples and confirmed that they would help the team to understand business requirements and structures.

9.12   The Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Care acknowledged the complexities and challenges for the University within the project and thanked the team for their openness and transparency during their work. He believed that the University required some form of distributed network and it was vital that plans for it were aligned to the future vision for the University. He felt colleagues must contribute to phase 2 of the project in a focussed way to help shape an excellent experience for students in creative ways. He also sought clarification as to whether the options for consideration would be presented to the Senate. Mr Zimmerman confirmed that a report would come back to the Senate for discussion.

9.13   A member commented that it might be valuable for graduates of the University to express a view during the consultation phase to present a different perspective. Mr Zimmerman confirmed that he would welcome input from graduates though commented they were a disparate group by nature to reach. The member urged the University to have as

innovative debate as possible on its future configuration. Dr Miller commented that the consultation meetings were aiming to do this and consideration would certainly be given to structuring them to emphasise this more.

9.14   Another member commented on the suggestion in option 2 of the paper that undergraduate and post graduate SSTs be aligned. He saw merit in bringing post graduate SSTs together to form a post graduate centre of excellence. Dr Miller explained that all options would be considered. The project would be focussing on identifying business functions and then setting a structure to deliver them. Another member reiterated the importance of local knowledge particularly when advising and assisting students with disabilities or special needs.

9.15   A member enquired whether the project team, in its thinking about the future vision for the University, would consider the actions of its competitors. Dr Miller confirmed that the team were benefitting from the analysis of competitors by the Strategy Unit thought it was difficult to find definitive information. He agreed that the University needed to be agile to respond to challenges.

9.16   A representative of OUSA supported the comment about the importance availability of local staff for students with disabilities and the ability to meet them face to face. Students' experiences were enhanced by Associate Lecturers who were part of a vibrant and supportive community. Another member sought clarification as to whether staff would be consulted on the options likely to be presented in the autumn. Mr Zimmerman confirmed that the details of consultation would be confirmed in due course as the options were developed.

9.17   The Senate **noted** the report on the Locations Analysis project.

10   FITNESS TO PRACTICE PROCEDURES   **S-2015-02-07**

10.1   An Associate Lecturer member commented that it would be essential that all Associate Lecturers were fully informed of the new procedures. He also drew attention to paragraph 8 on page 2 and queried the lack of reference to Northern Ireland.

10.2   Another member queried whether the University would be open to risk if issues arose over a student's fitness to practice beyond completion of their studies. The University Secretary confirmed that the University would not have any responsibility for a practitioner's conduct on completion of their studies.

10.3   Another Associate Lecturer member commented that the criteria for consideration of a postponement of a Review Meeting were very limited. He suggested that section 6.6 of the procedures be re-drafted to say that the criteria "included but were not limited to" the examples given.

10.4   The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) thanked members for their comments and agreed to look at the drafting suggestions proposed outside of the meeting.

10.5   The Senate **approved** the procedure for investigating and ensuring fitness to practise or suitability of students on professional programmes offered by the University, subject to minor editorial amendment.

**11   QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY HIGHER EDUCATION REVIEW 2015:
         UPDATE**   **S-2015-02-08**

The Senate **noted** the update on preparations for the 2015 Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) Review of The Open University.

12   EMERITUS PROFESSORS   S-2015-02-09

The Senate **approved** the recommendations from the Chair and Readership Subcommittee that the title Emeritus Professor was awarded to:

a)   Professor Joyce Fortune

b)   Professor Paddy Farrington

13   THE COUNCIL   S-2015-02-10

The Senate **noted** the report on matters discussed at the meeting of the Council held on 10 March 2015.

14   COMMITTEE MATTERS   S-2015-02-11

14.1   The Director, Institute of Educational Technology commented that the increase in the number of Associate Lecturer representatives serving on the Senate from six to seven, drawn one from each Faculty did not include representation from ALs working in IET. He acknowledged that this was a small number and did not wish to see the number of representatives increased to eight, but sought reassurance as to how the views of Associate Lecturers in IET would be presented at Senate.

14.2   The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) commented that this issue had been discussed during the consultation referred to in the paper.

14.3   An Associate Lecturer representative assured the Senate that Associate Lecturers in IET were members of the Associate Lecturers Assembly (ALA) and their views expressed there would be taken into account by the representatives on Senate.

14.4   The graduate co-opted member of the Senate queried the wording of membership category 6 of the Senate (in relation to the graduate member) and it was agreed that the Governance Team would look into this.

Action: Governance Team

14.5   The Senate:

a)   **approved** the constitutional membership change to the Senate effective from the 2015-2016 committee year, 1 September 2015 (Appendix);

b)   **noted** the change to the Associate Lecturers Executive (ALE) constitution reported in paragraph 2.

25   FUTURE ITEMS OF BUSINESS   S-2015-02-12

The Senate **noted** the potential items for the agenda for the Senate meeting in June 2015 subject to the inclusion of a further report on the Location Analysis.

27   DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

Meetings of the Senate will be held on the following dates:

Wednesday 10 June 2015
Wednesday 14 October 2015
Wednesday 27 January 2016

Fraser Woodburn
University Secretary

Sue Thomas
Working Secretary to the Senate
Email: sue.thomas@open.ac.uk
Tel: 01908 655083

Attachment:

S-2015-02-M Appendix: The Senate Constitution Terms of Reference

THE SENATE

CONSTITUTION UPDATED ~~*01.08.2012*~~*22.04.2015*

Purpose

The Senate is the academic authority of the University which, subject to the powers of the Council, is responsible for promoting the academic work of the University both in teaching and research. It oversees the University's academic management, including the curriculum and all aspects of quality and standards associated with the University as a degree-awarding body. It has the power to make regulations, including those which (subject to the approval of the Council) delegate any of its powers (marked 'D' below). Senate meetings concentrate on major issues of academic strategy, policy, priority and performance.

Terms of Reference

Degree Awarding Powers

The award of degrees to individuals (except for honorary degrees) has been delegated.

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

1. *Academic Strategy*. To approve academic strategies and policy frameworks (in particular in the areas of academic quality assurance, curriculum, assessment and qualifications including collaborative arrangements, learning teaching and student policy and research) and, where appropriate to recommend them to the Council.

Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance

2. *Academic Performance Review*: To review the academic performance of the University during the preceding year, and make recommendations on areas for performance improvement as appropriate to SPRC, committees of the Senate, and appropriate officers and managers. To receive regular reports from the Vice-Chancellor and to guide him/her in the execution of his/her responsibilities.

Assuring Quality and Standards, including approving regulations

3. Qualification*s*. To recommend to Council the institution or withdrawal of new types of degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic distinctions offered by the University or on its behalf as validated qualifications or jointly with other higher education institutions. To grant distinctions including Honorary Degrees.

4. *Regulations.* To regulate and control all teaching, courses of study and the conditions qualifying for admission to the various titles, degrees and other distinctions offered by the University or on its behalf as validated qualifications or jointly with other higher education institutions having the power to grant such qualifications. To regulate the admission of persons to courses of study and their continuance therein.

5. *Discipline.* To regulate the discipline of the University in accordance with a Code of Practice to be approved by the Council on the recommendation of the Senate. To take such steps as it thinks proper for supervising organisations of students.

Advising other governance bodies or management

6. *Advice and Recommendations to Council.* To advise the Council on the allocation of resources for teaching and research (Note: specific advice is delegated to SPRC). To recommend to the Council the institution of fellowships, scholarships, studentships, prizes and other aids to study and research. To propose to the Council new statutes which it shall be the duty of the Council to consider. To make recommendations or to express an opinion to the Council on any other matter of interest to the University and its affairs.

7. *Advice to SPRC.* To provide SPRC and Council with advice on the directions of academic strategy and policy, and provide SPRC with broad advice on the academic aspects of the University's strategic and development plans.

8. *Academic Shape and Size.* To recommend to the Council the establishment or abolition of new academic posts in the University (Note: the establishment of individual academic posts has been delegated. This term of reference is intended to cover major changes). To review from time to time the roles, duties and conditions of service of all members of the academic staff. To review from time to time the academic organisation of the University and advise the Council on the establishment, reorganisation or abolition of such academic bodies as may be required.

Making governance arrangements e.g. appointing to other committees

9. *Governance and Performance Review.* To appoint members of the Senate to be members of the Council and to appoint members of the Senate to be members of Senate committees. To review briefly each year the working of the Senate and its committees, and their working relationships with Council and SPRC, and to agree proposals for improvement including proposals for the establishment or disestablishment of Senate committees and proposals for changing the constitutions of existing Senate committees.

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

These powers have been delegated.

Judicial: deciding individual cases

These powers have been delegated.

Delegated Powers

D	To grant degrees and other academic distinctions to persons who shall have pursued in either the University or body approved by the University, a course of study approved by the Senate and shall have passed examinations, tests or other assessments of the University or body approved by the University.

	To determine what formalities shall attach to the conferment of degrees and other distinctions.

D	To regulate all University examinations, tests or other assessments, and to appoint examiners whether internal or external, for the various degrees and other distinctions offered by the University or on its behalf as validated qualifications, or jointly with other higher education institutions having the power to grant such qualifications, such regulation to be exercised in conjunction with other bodies in respect of validated and joint qualifications upon such terms and conditions as may be specified by the University.

D   To recognise such examinations and periods of study at such Universities and places of learning as the Senate may approve as equivalent to such examinations and periods of study in the University as the Senate may determine and to withdraw such recognition at any time.

D   To accept courses of study in any other institution which in the opinion of the Senate possesses the means of affording the proper instruction for such modules as equivalent to such courses of study in the University as the Senate may determine.

D   To appoint all members of the academic staff in accordance with procedures approved by the Council.

D   To expel any student guilty of grave misconduct after giving him an opportunity to appear personally and to be heard by the body established by the Code of Practice.

D   To revoke any degree or other distinction conferred by the University or jointly or as a validated qualification if the holder thereof has been convicted of a crime or for other good cause which renders him unfit to be a member or graduate of the University or body permitted by the University to act on its behalf.

Membership

1.0   *Ex officio* members

The Vice-Chancellor, Chair, *ex officio*
The Pro-Vice-Chancellors
The Deans of the Faculties
The Director, Students
The Director of the Institute of Educational Technology
The Director of Library Services
The Director of Learning and Teaching Solutions

Appointed members

2.0   A total of fifty seven representatives of the academic and research staff (with the exception of those in Category 1.0), elected as follows (numbers in brackets refer to the minimum number of regional/national staff):

Constituency	Numbers
Arts	6 (2)
FBL	5 (2)
FELS	7 (2)
FHSC	5 (1)
MCT	12 (4)
Science	7 (2)
Social Sciences	7 (2)
IET	3 (0)
Other central units*	1 (0)
Regional/National Centres**	4 (4)
TOTAL	57 (19)

*Currently BDU (Business Development Unit), CICP (Centre for Inclusion and Collaborative Partnerships), Development Office, Human Resources, KMi (Knowledge Media Institute), Research, Scholarship and Quality Office and Student Services
**Currently comprises national directors and some assistant directors

3.0 ~~Six~~ Seven associate lecturers, one per Faculty, appointed by and from the Associate Lecturers Executive.

4.0 Six Open University students appointed by The Open University Students Association.

5.0 Fourteen members of the academic-related staff of the University elected from amongst their number by such staff (with the exception of those in Category 1.0 and those who have a professional role in serving the Senate and the Council[*]) of whom four shall be members of CAU staff, six shall be members of Student Services staff (of whom three shall be based in a Regional/National Centre), and four shall be members of staff from other Units.

Co-opted members

6.0 Up to eight members, to include one graduate of the University, not undertaking studies in the University and not being in the regular employ of the University and not being elected through another category of the membership, following nomination by the OU Alumni Association, and (if not already included in the elected membership) one member drawn from the University's staff in each of Ireland, Scotland and Wales with specific expertise in HE policy matters.

In Attendance

Staff 'in attendance' would include the Secretary, plus the Director of Open Media Broadcasting in the Open Media Unit and the National Directors, if they are not members.

---

[*] Namely, the Secretary, the Head of Governance, the Senior Managers (Governance Team) and the Managers (Governance Team).