


**THE SENATE**
**Minutes of the meeting of the Senate held on Wednesday 27 January 2010  
in the Old Lecture Theatre**
**Present:**
**1) Ex officio**

Mr Martin Bean, Vice-Chancellor  
 Professor Brigid Heywood, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise)  
 Professor Denise Kirkpatrick, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality)  
 Professor Alan Tait, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards)  
 Professor David Vincent, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and External Affairs)  
 (Present, minutes 1 - 13)  
 Dr Sharon Ding, Dean, Faculty of Education and Language Studies  
 Professor Chris Earl, Dean, Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology  
 Professor James Fleck, Dean, Open University Business School  
 Professor Dot Miell, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences  
 Professor Phil Potts, Dean, Faculty of Science  
 Mr Jeremy Roche, Alternate for Dean, Faculty of Health and Social Care  
 Professor David Rowland, Dean, Faculty of Arts  
 Ms Anne Howells, Director of Learning and Teaching Solutions  
 Professor Josie Taylor, Director, Institute of Educational Technology  
 Mrs Nicky Whitsed, Director, Library Services

**Appointed**
**2) Central Academic Units**
**Faculty of Arts**

Professor Richard Allen  
 Dr Lynda Prescott

Dr Robert Wilkinson

**Faculty of Education and Language Studies**

Dr Jane Cullen  
 Professor Mary Kellett  
 Dr Frank Monaghan

Mr Pete Smith  
 Dr Peter Twining

**Faculty of Health and Social Care**

Mrs Sue Cole  
 Dr Sarah Earle

Dr Verina Waights  
 Dr Jackie Watts

**Faculty of Mathematics, Computing and Technology**

Professor Anne de Roeck  
 Dr Judy Ekins  
 Professor Joyce Fortune  
 Mr Derek Goldrei  
 Professor Uwe Grimm  
 Professor Hazel Johnson

Mr Anthony Meehan  
 Dr Tony Nixon  
 Dr Toby O'Neil  
 Dr Sally Organ  
 Ms Linda Robson  
 Dr Helen Yanacopulos

**Faculty of Social Sciences**

Mr Robert Clifton	Dr Martin Le Voi
Dr Troy Cooper	Dr Diane Watson
Dr Timothy Jordan	Professor Sophie Watson
Dr Bob Kelly	

**Faculty of Science**

Mr Robin Harding	Dr Peter Skelton
Professor Simon Kelley	Dr Terry Watson

**Open University Business School**

Mrs Keren Bright	Ms Lin Smith
Dr Jacky Holloway	Mr Richard Wheatcroft
Ms Carmel McMahon	

**Institute of Educational Technology**

Dr Robin Goodfellow	Mr Alan Woodley
Professor Eileen Scanlon	

**Other Central Units**

Dr Derek Child

**Regional/National Centres**

Ms Celia Cohen	Dr Liz Manning
Dr Rosemary Hamilton	

**3) Associate Lecturers**

Mr Paddy Alton	Mr Dave Horan
Dr Isobel Falconer	Dr Michael Isherwood
Mr Bruce Heil	Mr Eoin Woodman (alternate)

**4) Students Appointed by Open University Students Association**

Mrs Roz Evans	Mr Derek Naysmith
Mrs Nikki Hadjipanteli	Ms Sandra Summers (alternate)
Ms Laura Murphy (alternate)	Mrs Barbara Tarling

**5) Academic-related Staff**

Ms Pat Atkins	Mrs Bethan Norfor
Mrs Carole Baume	Ms Hilary Robertson
Dr Juliet Bishop	Mr Ian Roddis
Mr Ray Brown	Mrs Gill Smith
Mrs Lynda Juma	Ms Beverley Stewart
Dr Christina Lloyd	Ms Elaine Walker

**6) Co-opted members**

Mr Andy Harding	Mrs Veronica Summers
Mr Rob Humphreys	Mr Peter Syme

**In attendance**

Mr Fraser Woodburn, University Secretary (Present, minutes 1 - 13)  
 Ms Jane Duffield, Senior Assistant Secretary (Central Secretariat)  
 Mrs Julie Tayler, Assistant Secretary (Central Secretariat)  
 Dr Sally Crompton, Head of Open Broadcasting Unit  
 Mrs Angela Taylor, Acting Director, Open University Validation Services  
 Dr Tracy Carlton, Head of Product And Service Development  
 Mr Miles Hedges, Finance Director



**1 WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed some new members to their first meeting of the Senate: Mrs Keren Bright, who was a representative from the OU Business School (OUBS), and Mr Derek Naysmith and Mrs Nicki Hadjipanteli, who had been appointed by the OU Students Association (OUSA).

**2 MINUTES**

S/09/4/1

The Senate approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 14 October 2009.

**3 MATTERS ARISING****Scholarship**

- 3.1 A member asked what progress had been made in the establishment of frameworks for the professional development of scholarship and what academic input had been sought. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), Professor Brigid Heywood, replied that a series of working groups were in formation to which the Deans were contributing. Dr Sharon Ding, Dean of the Faculty of Education and Language Studies, was looking at workload planning in a group consisting of academic members and other staff.

**Widening Participation Recruitment Targets**

S/10/1/Matters Arising

- 3.2 At its meeting on 24 June 2009, during the debate on the Institutional Performance Review, the Senate had agreed that the decision that the measure of the number and proportion of students from black and ethnic minority (BME) backgrounds be removed should be reviewed. The Director, Students, Mr Will Swann, had provided a paper in response to this request.
- 3.3 A member said that there was much in the paper to reassure the Senate, particularly with respect to the trends illustrated in the bar charts. However, the paper did not pick up the issue, which was that the University should have a target for the recruitment of BME students. The paper implied that the OU's target for BME students should be equivalent to the BME population as a proportion of the overall population, in which case the target had been reached. However, the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) statistics showed that BME groups had seen the biggest overall increases in unemployment. In this regard, the OU should have a more ambitious target for BME recruitment.
- 3.4 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards), Professor Alan Tait, responded that the Senate had approved the revised targets at its meeting in January 2009. The OU was now focusing its concern and its resource on retention and attainment targets on low socio-economic groups and BME students. If there was now a separate proposition, it should come to the Senate via the Learning, Teaching and Student Support Committee (LTSSC).
- 3.5 A member from the Equality and Diversity Office reassured the Senate that the BME groups had not been abandoned. The decision not to pursue this target was because it was no longer fundable by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) as part of the Widening Participation (WP) policy. However, the University's new equality scheme and action plans, which had been published in December 2009 and was being launched on 16 February 2010, did include targets to increase the number of students from BME backgrounds. The Marketing Business Plan also included clear actions to work on courses that under-recruited.

- 3.6 Professor Tait remarked that a new proposal could go through LTSSC. The Director, Students and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality), who jointly chaired this committee, would take this forward.

**Action: WS/DK**

#### **Fees 2010/11**

- 3.7 Referring to the confidential minute 1.3, the President, OUSA, said that she looked forward to receiving information from the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and External Affairs), Professor David Vincent, with regard to the make up of the fees for European students.

**Action: DV**

## **4 REPORT FROM AND QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR**

### **4.1 iTunes U**

The Vice-Chancellor reported that there continued to be good news from all quarters of the University, which demonstrated the University's success in linking informal and formal learning. The number of downloads on iTunes U had recently hit the 13 million mark and the OU was currently averaging 351,000 downloads a week. Since the launch in 2008, over 1.3 million visitors had downloaded files, 88% of whom were from outside the UK.

### **4.2 OpenLearn**

During the previous week, the OpenLearn site had welcomed its 10 millionth visitor. More than 8,000 learning hours in 12 subject areas were now available on the site, with material from access to postgraduate level. Study units varied in length from 3 to 50 hours of learning. Since its launch in October 2006, OpenLearn had attracted 8 million unique visitors, 80 per cent of whom had been new to the OU. This had resulted in 13,000 OU course registrations, proving that the link between informal and formal learning was not just theoretical. The OU was leading the way in restoring aspiration and providing the means to achieve it.

### **4.3 Queen's Anniversary Prize for TESSA**

The ground-breaking Teacher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa (TESSA) programme was one of 20 winners of the prestigious Queen's Anniversary Prize. The Prize recognised exceptional contributions by institutions in the higher and further education sectors to the wider community and proved that the OU could take initiatives like OpenLearn and apply them across the world. The Vice-Chancellor was honoured to be accompanying the OU team, and some of the African teachers and students involved in the project, to accept this award from the Queen at Buckingham Palace in February.

### **4.4 UNICEF award for HEAT**

The University's Health Education and Training (HEAT) programme, and its partners had been awarded \$4 million by UNICEF to help train Ethiopia's 31,000 rural community health workers. The workers would be trained in supporting women in childbirth and in treating common childhood illnesses including pneumonia; and would help Ethiopia meet the Millennium Development Goals, to reduce child mortality by two-thirds and maternal mortality by three-quarters by 2015.

The Vice-Chancellor offered his congratulations to all involved in these projects and thanked the OU community for keeping the University at the forefront of Higher Education (HE) and a thought leader in its field.

#### 4.5 Higher Ambitions and the political agenda

The Government framework document, *Higher Ambitions*, had been published in November 2009, and recognised the critical role that part-time undergraduate study had in helping to create the range of choice and responsiveness that a modern higher education system needs. The report said:

*“In order to attract a greater diversity of students, more part-time study, more vocationally-based foundation degrees, more work-based study and more study whilst living at home must be made available .... The next phase of expansion in HE will hinge on providing opportunities for different types of people to study in a wider range of ways than in the past. The focus will, therefore, be on a greater diversity of models of learning: part-time, work-based, foundation degrees, and studying whilst at home.”*

The OU had taken something that was traditionally on the fringe of higher education and made it key to HE. It had become increasingly transparent in the University’s continuing and active dialogue with members of the Conservative, Liberal Democrat and Labour parties, that the OU had been clearly identified by all parties as playing a unique role in HE and more specifically as having a significant contribution to make in the UK’s economic recovery.

#### 4.6 Independent Review of Higher Education and Student Finance

The Universities Secretary, Lord Mandelson, had announced the commencement of the Independent Review of Higher Education Funding and Student Finance on 9 November 2009. Lord Browne of Madingley had been appointed as Chair of the Review, which had the full support of both the Conservative and the Labour parties.

Lord Browne, a cross-bench peer, had been joined by a number of leading figures from the student body, academia and business sectors to “analyse the challenges and opportunities facing higher education, and their implications for student financing and support.” The Review would consider the balance of contributions from tax payers, students, graduates and employers. Its primary recommendations will be around fees and student support for full-time, part-time, undergraduate and postgraduate students. Both parties were likely to endorse the recommendations of the review, whatever the outcome of the next election,

Currently, there was a significant funding gap between full-time and part-time provision, which had widened as a direct result of the introduction of variable fees for full-time students. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and External Affairs), Professor David Vincent, together with staff in the Strategy Unit, had drafted an excellent joint submission to the Review with Birkbeck College, the key messages of which were that part-time higher education:

- provides the diversity and flexibility of provision that students require;
- facilitates the necessary re-skilling and up-skilling the UK workforce; and
- allows more people from non-traditional backgrounds to enter higher education.

As part of this Review, the Vice-Chancellor and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and External Affairs), would be giving oral evidence at a hearing on 29 January 2010 and would be taking the opportunity to put the strong case for increased support for part-time students and to ensure that the part-time agenda was at the centre of the panel’s thinking.

#### 4.7 Reduced funding for HE

The University was still facing significant cuts in government funding. Pre-budget drafts showed reductions of some 15 - 20 per cent between 2010 and 2015.

The Vice-Chancellor's Executive (VCE) would be taking the necessary steps to deal with these fresh challenges as they arose. However, the University was in a very strong position to meet these challenges. Student numbers were at record levels; the finances were solid, and the University had time to make decisions in a thoughtful and strategic manner.

- 4.8 Referring to the Vice-Chancellor's attendance at three major party conferences, a member asked which parties he considered these to be. The Conservatives, Liberals and Labour were all English parties, and the views of the Scottish, Irish and Welsh political parties were also important. The Vice-Chancellor responded that this was an important and valid point. However, he assured the Senate that he had met with all the relevant funding councils and political bodies during his tour of the regions and nations.

**5 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE S/10/1/1**  
**Meeting on 28 October 2009**

The Senate **noted** the unconfirmed minutes from the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Resources Committee (SPRC) held on 28 October 2009.

**6 CURRICULUM, AWARDS AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE S/10/1/2**  
**Meeting on 24 November 2009**

The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Curriculum, Awards and Validation Committee (CAVC) held on 24 November 2009.

**7 LEARNING, TEACHING AND STUDENT SUPPORT COMMITTEE S/10/1/3**  
**Meeting on 30 November 2009**

- 7.1 With reference to item 3.2 regarding the Award Based Services Programme, a member was concerned that the processes had been divided into five individual strands, three of which were closely inter-related. Success in developing the Personal Route Planning Tool (PRPT) was dependent on managing qualification intentions and course choice. The member asked how the three individual strands would interact so that the projects were achievable. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality), Professor Denise Kirkpatrick, said that she would report back to the member and to the Senate.

**Action: DK**

- 7.2 The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Learning, Teaching and Student Support Committee (LTSSC) held on 30 November 2009.

**8 RESEARCH COMMITTEE S/10/1/4**  
**Meeting on 2 December 2009**

The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Research Committee (RC) held on 2 December 2009.

**9 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE S/10/1/5**  
**Meeting on 4 November 2009**

The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) held on 4 November 2009.

**10 SENATE MEMBERSHIP PANEL S/10/1/6**  
**Meeting on 25 November 2009**

- 10.1 Referring to paragraphs 5 to 7 of the report, a member observed that the two alternative methods for making the Senate meetings available audio-visually under consideration were not mutually exclusive. Web-casting and recording the Senate meetings via Stadium would

make the business of the Senate more transparent. However, video-conferencing might also be considered in due course and it would be useful to conduct a cost-benefit analysis to see whether time and cost savings could be made by members who normally travelled in from the regional and national centres. Several members supported this view.

- 10.2 A member asked for clarification as to whether members of the Senate who were watching proceedings via a web-cast would be considered to be present or not. The University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, pointed out that members at the end of a web-cast would be unable to participate in the debate. A student member commented that members of the Open University Students Association (OUSA) had successfully participated in meetings using Skype. Another member added that video links and email had supported long-distance meetings in her faculty. The Vice-Chancellor agreed that the University should continue look at cost-effective ways to conduct its meetings.

**Action: CS**

- 10.3 The Senate **noted** the report of the meeting of the Senate Membership Panel (SMP) held on 2 December 2009.

## **11 CENTRAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

**S/10/1/7**

- 11.1 The University Secretary, Mr Fraser Woodburn, observed that the paper asked the Senate to review the findings of the Central Disciplinary Committee (CDC) report and agree further action as necessary. However, the paper itself did not suggest or recommend action and the contents were essentially for the Senate to note. If there were any specific items that members wished to raise, they would be noted and brought to the attention of the Director, Students and the CDC.
- 11.2 Referring to Table 3 in paragraph 18 of the report, a member remarked that the number of penalties imposed had almost doubled and asked whether this was a worrying trend or whether it represented a conscious attempt to tighten up standards. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards), Professor Alan Tait, said that it showed that plagiarism was more widespread in HE, but also that the University was becoming more effective at using software to detect it. The member said that it was not the increase in detection, but the disproportionate number of penalties imposed that was an issue for concern. Professor Tait thought that the use of software might have made the University more confident in its conclusions and so more penalties had been applied.
- 11.3 Another member suggested that there was a different way of looking at the figures. The issue was not the number of penalties, but the effectiveness of the mechanism for dealing with offences once they had been identified. The figures shown as percentages in Table 1 indicated that the number of penalties as a percentage of offences had been in decline since 2005/06, which coincided with the introduction of detection software. This suggested that the University was fighting a losing battle against the number of cases put through the process and the number of penalties imposed.
- 11.4 A member reminded the Senate of the recent major plagiarism project, which had led to the introduction of Academic Conduct Officers (ACOs) in faculties, and in regions and nations. This structure had effectively been implemented in 2009/10, but the CDC report was historic. The project had been on-going during 2008/09 and this had led to greater knowledge and understanding of how to deal with plagiarism. This might in turn have resulted in not only the serious cases being referred to CDC, but also those that may previously have been dealt with elsewhere. Consequently, the number of penalties had also increased.
- 11.5 An associate lecturer member said that the associate lecturers (ALs) were uncertain how to deal with plagiarism. Staff development on the processes involved would be helpful.



- 11.6 Referring to paragraph 5, a student member requested that students who sat on panels should also be consulted by the Review Group when considering development plans for the CDC and the review of the Code of Practice for Student Discipline.
- 11.7 Another member suggested that it was incumbent on academics to consider making projects plagiarism proof. In the modern world of fluid text, it was natural for students to build their assignments with cut and paste techniques, but this had led to an acceptance of using other people's work without proper reference. It was important that the University not only detected and punished plagiarism, but also helped students to avoid it and give due acknowledgement to other work.
- 11.8 The Professor Tait, said that the plagiarism project had produced two major streams of thinking. The first was a recognition that much plagiarism was due to students' misunderstanding of how to acknowledge sources and had resulted in new materials that provided greater clarity. The second was the ACO structure, which had strengthened the University's ability to act on plagiarism, but had also led to the identification of a greater number of cases.
- 11.9 The Senate **noted** the annual report of the Central Disciplinary Committee.

## **12 FINANCE, INCLUDING ACTION PLANS**

S/10/1/8

- 12.1 The Finance Director, Mr Miles Hedges, presented the paper, which considered issues affecting the financial position in 2009/10 and beyond. Paper S/10/1/19 gave a report on the Council discussion of this paper in November 2009, which had also been considered by SPRC in October 2009. The information contained in the paper was commercially sensitive and its confidentiality should be retained after the meeting of the Senate.
- 12.2 Since the meeting of the Council in November 2009, the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) had made an announcement about grant funding for HEFCE, which implied further funding cuts. This would have a small negative impact on the OU. There might be a bigger effect on capital funding, but the University had done well in terms of bringing forward its capital spend and consequently many of the buildings on the Milton Keynes campus and in the regions and nations were in the top two quality categories.
- 12.3 Mr Hedges emphasised that the University was entering this period of uncertainty with a strong balance sheet. It was in a position to deal with the issues that were known and had time to adjust carefully to any further changes that the government might impose.
- 12.4 Referring to the comments he made at the last meeting of SPRC, a member reinforced his view that there was a danger of planning for the worst case. The Higher Ambitions paper included positive messages for the OU. The Minister had commented that better support for mature students was part of the strategy, as were the needs of part-time students. The member had also attended a local meeting of the Cabinet and, in response to a written question, had been told that "the government has said that the impact of the ELQ policy should be reviewed annually by HEFCE". This suggested that once the impact of the policy took effect, it might not be permanent, and that the government might come to realise that the policy was too crude.
- 12.5 A member remarked that paragraph 2.5 of the report from the Council (S/10/1/19) recorded that "all changes should be made on pedagogic and not just on financial grounds" and paragraph 5.5 c of the SPRC report (S/10/1/1) noted concern about the "pedagogic implications" of the efficiency savings. It was important for there to be a shared understanding of what the financial changes meant in terms of pedagogy and it would be useful for the Senate to be presented with this information at a future meeting. The Vice-Chancellor assured the Senate that the impact of cuts in the expense reduction categories

on pedagogy would be regularly reported to the Senate and that the quality of the OU provision would continue to be a high priority.

- 12.6 The member commented that the Finance paper provided the analysis for further risks not incorporated into the 2009 financial forecast tables, but not the initial risk analysis. If the Senate was to consider the risks and make meaningful comments about them, it would be helpful to have the earlier analysis too. The incompleteness of the risk assessment process at an operational level had been highlighted in the Council report (S/10/1/19, para 4.2). It would be a matter for concern if the University was to move ahead with the proposed changes without this in place. The Vice-Chancellor said that the first risk assessment would be made accessible to members of the Senate, unless there was good reason not to do so.

**Action: MH**

- 12.7 The member said that the need to maintain a strong balance sheet and surpluses was generally understood, but enquired whether it was necessary to achieve a surplus every year during the next 4 years when the University was facing such a difficult situation. The Vice-Chancellor said that the management of surpluses would be reviewed in line with reductions in the levels of funding.

**Action: MH**

- 12.8 Referring to paragraph 8, an associate lecturer member commented that Openings courses were a great means of recruiting students. Students often needed to study two such courses, before moving onto a higher programme. Discontinuing University funded fee waivers for continuing students taking these courses might result in a loss greater than £0.6 million.

- 12.9 A member referred to the table in paragraph 17 of the paper. There were some specific amounts associated with strategic and restructuring costs, but there were no details as to how this money would be used. Mr Hedges said that these amounts were the sums that the University could use should there be a need for further strategic developments that were not accounted for in the current budgets, or for the costs of restructuring if the necessary cost reductions could not be achieved through natural wastage. The OU was still in the process of putting the plans together and currently there were no specific proposals. If it became necessary to make such decisions, the pros and cons would be considered in the light of the comments made.

- 12.10 The Vice-Chancellor thanked Mr Hedges and said that the University's finances were in good hands.

- 12.11 The Senate **noted** the projected impact on the University's financial position in 2009/10 of the latest information on funding, student recruitment and other factors.

### **13 FAREWELLS**

On behalf of the Senate, the Chair said goodbye to Professor Shirley Reveley, Dean of the Faculty of Health and Social Care and Mr Peter Syme OBE, Director of The Open University in Scotland, who were both retiring from the OU. The Chair also said farewell Professor Dot Miell, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, who was leaving the University to take up the post of Vice-Principal and Head of College of Humanities and Social Science at the University of Edinburgh.

### **14 REVISED OU FUTURES**

**S/10/1/9**

- 14.1 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and External Affairs), Professor David Vincent, introduced the paper, which was the outcome of a now established annual process of reviewing *OU Futures*. Although members were right to point out the many strengths of the

University and the way in which public policy was moving in the OU's direction, it was necessary to remind the Senate that, of all the significant universities in the UK, the OU was the most dependent on public funding and the associated student fees, and was therefore most at risk in the crisis of public funding that was approaching.

- 14.2 The document took the existing strategic framework and tried to develop a more sharply focussed, better articulated and more clearly sequenced programme of activity. There were three distinct phases to that activity: first, reducing cost, improving effectiveness and strengthening competitiveness; second, identifying and exploiting new opportunities in existing markets; and third, identifying and entering new markets to grow income. At all points the University would be engaging with all three phases, but the proportion of effort devoted to each would shift over time. In the near future, reducing cost and associated activities would be the main focus of attention, but the OU was already beginning work on identifying and exploiting new opportunities, and was also currently working on developing a new strategy for entering new markets. In each phase there were focus areas: in the first were activities to drive efficiencies and savings, together with the engagement with the public funding debate; in the second were projects that were not in themselves new, but to which the University would pay increasing attention over the following year, that was employer engagement, teaching in Europe and yield enhancement; and in the final phase was new international business.
- 14.3 The University mission had grown in the last iteration of OU Futures but had now gone back to its basic form. The four "open"s of The Open University would remain as the core ambition. The remainder of the current mission statement still applied, but had been distributed in the form of core values. The strategic intent was summarised in the sentence to "adapt and strengthen the University in order to sustain the OU mission". Performance indicators and a risk register would be developed and attached to the final document.
- 14.4 The Vice-Chancellor read a quote from an article in the Harvard Business Review which had influenced his thinking when he began his role at the OU:
- "The first task of an organization's leadership.... is to choose the appropriate strategic approach in light of the challenges the organization faces. Choosing the right approach, however, is not enough. Executives then need to make sure that their organizations are aligned behind it to produce sustainable performance." W. Chan Kim & Renée Mauborgne Harvard Business Review September 2009*
- He then briefed the Senate on some structural changes to be implemented over the following months, which would align the organisation behind the strategy in order to ensure its successful execution.
- 14.5 A critical first step in creating the optimal organisational structure to lead the University through the turbulent times ahead was the formation of an Extended Leadership Team, comprised of VCE and the Deans, which would meet on a monthly basis to monitor progress against strategy, identify opportunities and roadblocks and take necessary action.
- 14.6 In response to the new priorities for the University, VCE would be reorganised. Professor David Vincent's term of office as the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Strategy and External Affairs) would finish at the end of July and his portfolio was being redistributed. The Vice-Chancellor thanked Professor Vincent for everything he had done for the University over the last six years. Professor Vincent's insight, deep commitment to social justice, strategic vision, and representation of the University in public, private and academic circles had contributed greatly to the current success and state of the OU.

- 14.7 There would be a new post of Director of Business Development on VCE, who would take responsibility for parts of Phases Two and Three of the strategy, and who would report directly to the Vice-Chancellor. This involved responsibility for the focus areas of employer engagement, teaching in Europe and leading international growth.
- 14.8 After the retirement of Mr Alan Yates, Director of Academic and Administrative Computing Services (AACS), at the end of March, a new Chief Information Officer would be appointed to develop the OU systems, processes and technology to fully align with and support the strategy so that the University could exploit new opportunities effectively. This position would also be on the VCE. The Vice-Chancellor thanked Mr Yates for his thirty five years of dedicated service to the University.
- 14.9 Following discussions with VCE in late November, a decision had been taken to change the membership of the Senior Team and the purpose of Senior Team Days to allow a more focussed discussion of the OU strategy and the opportunities and challenges faced by the University. These days would now be known as 'Senior Team Strategy Days' and there would be one meeting per quarter from September 2010 onwards.
- 14.10 Other changes in the senior management team would create shorter reporting lines so that accountabilities for delivering plans were clearer and resources could be more tightly focused on key priorities. The new structures and posts would be in place by the beginning of August 2010, and staff in areas where changes would take place had already been briefed by their managers.
- 14.11 Paper S/10/1/9 was broadly welcomed by members of the Senate, particularly in the difficult financial context. The three-phase approach was considered useful in making the OU's priorities clear and the details regarding roles, responsibilities and measures were very helpful.
- 14.12 On behalf of the Deans, a member welcomed the inclusive way of working with the Vice-Chancellor and his executive. It was crucial that those leading academic units were fully involved in academic planning at University level and the Deans were ready for the challenge.
- 14.13 A member commented that one implication of the Higher Ambitions document was that if funding for part-time education was to become more equitable, then the market would become more competitive as other institutions found more incentive to engage in this field. The document made explicit and transparent the link between the University's ability to achieve its mission and the financial means available. However, the document was not just for internal consumption, but was to be shared with funding bodies, governments, partners and employers across the four nations of the UK. Each government should be engaged with on its own terms and in its own context. Undergraduate publicly funded students from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland represented one sixth of the OU's core business and these students were not ineligible for funding with respect to the ELQ policy.
- 14.14 With reference to paragraph 3.4, a member asked whether there was any specific policy on knowledge sharing with organisations such as BPP Holdings. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards), Professor Alan Tait, confirmed that the University was now in a competitive relationship with this organisation in the field of law. The Vice-Chancellor said that as the competitive landscape changed then the extent to which information was shared with external organisations should be more explicitly stated. Any specific issue should be referred in the first instance to the Vice-Chancellor and the University Secretary.

**Action: Senate Members**

- 14.15 A member commented that conversations around cost reduction and action plans were now familiar in the academic units. Much thought had gone into ensuring that the curriculum that was left made sense and was coherent. There had been a shift in the University towards more integration, particularly with the strategies for Curriculum, Research and Scholarship, although the need to align portfolios with focus areas for implementation was understood. There were still challenges around cohesion and in organizing change in this way in order to ensure that it made sense for the students, but also for academics organizing their portfolios and careers.
- 14.16 Referring to Focus Area 1, curriculum coherence, a student member said that it was important that students be given clear information about changes to the curriculum and qualification pathways, and on the length of time for which a course would be available, in order to ensure that students only signed up for courses that they were able to complete. There should be some protocol, preferably in the regulations, which stated what the University was prepared to commit to.
- 14.17 A student member expressed concern about some of the measures in Focus Area 2 regarding learning and teaching efficiency. Further information was needed about the kind of supplementary material that would only be available online and the implications for students. The experience of some students regarding the use of eTMAs was that the system was not as fit for purpose as it should be in a modern technological environment. Moreover, increased cost efficiency did not necessarily mean pedagogically effective assessment. Personal feedback was an important part of the learning experience and generalised assessment was not a useful teaching tool.
- 14.18 The Chair of the Associate Lecturers Committee (ALC) commented that there was a danger in looking at efficiency solely from a University perspective, as was not necessarily the same as that of an AL. The University's student satisfaction ratings were largely built on the discretionary effort put in by the associate lecturers. Clarification was needed with regard to the statement in paragraph 5.3 about "understanding quality as 'fit for purpose' rather than 'gold-plated'". The notion of quality had to be student focused. If students wanted 'gold-plated', then the University might lose its competitive edge if it delivered something else. A student member was concerned that more efficient use of tutor group sizes would simply mean bigger groups and "fit-for-purpose" would mean a lowering of standards.
- 14.19 The Chair of the ALC was also concerned that where areas for efficiency gains were considered separately, then the links between these areas might be overlooked. For example, taking measures to boost retention on a single course might act against progression on award; because allowing things to persist that might have been corrected at a fundamental level might subsequently hold students back at a higher level. She also suggested that the third sentence of paragraph 4.2 would benefit from the addition of some commas.
- 14.20 With reference to Focus Area 4, a member suggested that students might not progress from short courses to Level 1 and 2 because the support model was different. An explicit activity to find out whether this was the case might be added to the list of main tasks.
- 14.21 A member said that Focus Area 5, developing research, referred to key areas of excellence that were sustainable within a broad framework, but that it was unclear what this meant within the totality of the OU operation. The idea of enterprise was missing from all areas. Phases 2 and 3 referred to teaching in Europe and new international business, but these were very specific. Enterprise was a route to additional income that was underexplored in the OU.

- 14.22 Another member had hoped that there would be something in the document to reflect that the OU would not be withdrawing from its non-UK markets. For example, reassurance that research would continue outside the UK and that funding would be sought from non-UK funding bodies, or that the University would continue to ask whether its curriculum was internationally relevant. Faculties were engaging employers outside of the UK and were in markets outside of Europe, but this was not taken account of in the focus areas highlighted by the paper. Focus area 6, for example, should ensure that the OU systems supported activity beyond Europe.
- 14.23 A member agreed that there should be an alignment of effort. The University should be bidding for research opportunities in the EU and it was astonishing that a university of the size of the OU did not have someone to co-ordinate this. It was important to align internal systems, and nations and regions should be challenged to find local and public funding in a systematic way. A cross University effort was required by faculties, student services and marketing, as a combination of skills was needed.
- 14.24 Another member said that the paper barely mentioned postgraduates in the paper, who brought in fresh money hardly touched by HEFCE funding. The service delivered to these students should not be affected by the cost-reductions, particularly as 70% of postgraduate students came via recommendations. They were used to small student groups and a high level of support from their tutors and the model should not be spoiled.
- 14.25 A member was concerned with the realities of implementing the strategy. Focus Area 6 indicated that the timetable for the business improvement programme had already begun. It did not show that £1.5 million savings were due to come out of the following year's budget as a result of modeling changes where improved business processes lead to efficiencies and savings without loss of quality and student experience. Staff in Student Services had been creative in their ideas for improvements and internal customers had been consulted to ensure that any changes did not make things worse or more expensive for other areas of the University. It was difficult to translate changes into savings and staff were being asked to be very flexible. It was important to ensure that sufficient support and staff development were being put into the transition and that the University employed good HR policies and practices in such a turbulent time.
- 14.26 Another member asked for some elaboration on the meaning of yield enhancement (Focus Area 10). The Professor Vincent, said that it was a technique for articulating the various devices available for maximizing income from student fees. It brought together the University's policies for pricing, student support, communications, marketing and curriculum. By exploring the relationships between these activities, it might be possible for the OU to make a substantial difference to the take from student fees whilst still operating within the framework of its mission and policies. The Vice-Chancellor added that it was critical to include this as part of the strategy as the funding review was likely to have a dramatic impact on the student fee landscape and it was important to be prepared. A member suggested that the University should reflect on the way in which it communicated the intention of yield enhancement, to ensure that there was no risk of it being interpreted to mean that the University might move from a position where the students' needs were paramount to one where the OU interests came first.
- 14.27 A member thought that the document was missing a means of communicating the strategy across all parts of the University, and that this would play a part in creating the corporate institution implicitly embodied in *OU Futures*. The Vice-Chancellor said that some colleagues would be leaving the meeting early in order to brief the senior team, and that he would be broadcasting a video message to the whole University later in the week. Subsequently, the strategy needed to be made transparent and internalized.

- 14.28 A member recognised that the OU had to consider reducing activity in a range of areas and that the aims of the strategy needed to be broad and far-reaching. However, referring to the existing markets highlighted in Phase Two, there were viable opportunities other than employer engagement and teaching in Europe where the University could capitalize on its unique position as a national institution and fulfill government agendas. These included the Further Education (FE) sector and schools, where there were huge opportunities that did not require additional work, but greater efficiency. The Vice-Chancellor assured the Senate that these areas were part of a sector that came under employer engagement and were core to the University's activity.
- 14.29 A member thought that Focus Areas 9 and 11 tried to ensure that what was left after the cost reductions was coherent in terms of European teaching and International business. However, it also had to be the starting point for where the University went next and the hooks around these areas did not appear to go back into the academic community or aim to maintain its experience. A greater understanding of how this would be taken forward, given the changes that had been announced, would be appreciated. The Vice-Chancellor said that the review of *OU Futures* was in its early days in and the executive would return to the Senate with responses to these issues.
- 14.30 A member was concerned that some of the peripheral things were being forgotten, for example the broader issue of environmental sustainability. The Vice-Chancellor responded that sustainability was an issue that was threaded throughout the University's activities and a document would be forthcoming on this matter at a later stage. The University Secretary added that a decision had been taken not to include a sustainability strategy at this time. Key elements of a sustainability policy were already in place and it would be an expectation of the funding councils that the University should have an explicit strategy.
- 14.31 The Vice-Chancellor thanked Senate for its comments. Amendments would be made to the document before it progressed to SPRC and Council. Focus area owners would be asked to respond to specific points. The University was committed to tracking, measuring and executing the strategy, and feedback on progress would be communicated to the Senate at future meetings.

## 15 CURRICULUM STRATEGY

S/10/1/10

- 15.1 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards), Professor Alan Tait, said that the core proposition of this paper was that the University needed to rethink the size and shape of the curriculum. The paper represented the final stage in a transition from a course to an award based curriculum, initiated 10 years ago and now framed by the financial challenges to come.
- 15.2 Core to proposition was the view that 'Curriculum Strategy overall is more than the aggregation of individual academic units strategies'. If supported by the Senate, the recommendations would provide the parameters within which the Faculties and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards) would develop the size and shape of the curriculum over the next 5 years, supported by a range of focussed projects. They made explicit the principles on which the curriculum was based at an institutional level. The way in which these principles were executed was the responsibility of the central academic units (CAUs), but would they would fall within an overall framework which aligned the OU's mission and market, and were financially sustainable. In this context the strategy aimed to protect the curriculum that primarily served personal development, and grow the vocational and professional curriculum.
- 15.3 Professor Tait clarified that all curriculum should be career enabling, including that which could be termed curriculum for personal development. Employability should be explicitly

clear to students and employers across the entire curriculum. Some curriculum clearly served an occupational purpose and was designed to do so, for example the Masters in Business Administration (MBA), courses in nursing and social work; Foundation Degrees in Early Years, Analytic Science, Counselling and Financial Services; areas of IT and computing; the Post Graduate Certificate in Education and so on. These courses also provided personal development, but the motivation to study was current or future employment and the curriculum was derived from these fields of occupational endeavour.

- 15.4 A set of principles had been developed to help rethink the size and shape of the curriculum and these were set out in Part B of the paper. The curriculum should offer a public statement about the major themes that the OU seeks to address through its teaching. This would enable the University to better define OU graduateness, which would help employability and the identification of the values and capabilities embodied in the OU's teaching.
- 15.5 An analysis of the present curriculum demonstrated that the University had become less efficient over recent years, in terms of average course population, and number of students taught per number of staff. This would not be sustainable in the future.
- 15.6 Analysis from Marketing demonstrated that the OU substantially dominated at undergraduate level the part-time HE curriculum most supported by students whose primary motivation was personal development and which was derived from academic subjects, for example Mathematics where the OU had 80% of the market share. This market was more impacted by ELQ than the vocational or professional market, and was an area in which the OU should concentrate its efforts on maintaining and optimising the offer.
- 15.7 The OU did not dominate markets in professional and vocational areas, so it was proposed that the University invested to grow or invested to enter these areas, which attracted a disproportionately higher number of widening participation students and had fewer ELQ students. These areas also tended to attract younger students. This line of development corresponded with that set out in the government's Higher Ambitions document.
- 15.8 The marketing proposition was a starting point for detailed decisions about where the OU should invest and disinvest.
- 15.9 The University also had to address the loss of market share in postgraduate teaching. The group addressing this matter had not been able to report its proposals in the required timeframe for the Senate, but it was apparent that the field of distance and part-time postgraduate teaching was far more competitive than that of the undergraduate market. The University would have to identify the OU's strong points and embody them in a new approach that would bring students to study at the OU rather than at other universities. This work would be taken through one of the curriculum focussed projects.
- 15.10 Several members welcomed the paper and gave broad support for the recommendations. It was considered to be an influential and timely document, with a balanced discussion of the issues, and members were grateful for the consultation process. The four nation approach to the construction of the strategy was acknowledged.
- 15.11 Commenting on Recommendation 1, which proposed aligning the curriculum more closely with University strategies, a member said that as faculties started to plan their future curriculum and plan for their key research strengths, it was important that the two worked in parallel rather than one being aligned with the other. It would be helpful to make the close synergies between the curriculum and research planning more explicit.



- 15.12 Referring to Recommendation 2, a member noted that whilst the growth in courses had not led to a proportionate growth in students, it was not known whether reducing the number of courses would improve the situation. It was important to proceed cautiously. Reducing the number of credit points was not the only way of reducing the curriculum. The Arts Faculty had made a decision to take out three 10 point courses, but had subsequently replaced them with one 30 point course. Although an equivalent number of credit points had been maintained, 7 presentations and 3 course codes had been withdrawn
- 15.13 Another member commented that there was little mention of the effect of changing the curriculum on the number of qualifications available. Changes to curriculum, courses and presentations often caused difficulties for students when planning ahead and reduced the choices available to them. The Open Degree would act as a safety net, but it might still lead to dissatisfaction. It was important to communicate decisions about curriculum with plenty of lead time, so that students did not plan to include courses that would no longer be available.
- 15.14 A number of members were unhappy with the language used, and perceived words such as “optimise” and “streamlining” as euphemisms for “cut” or “reduce”, rather than “make better”. The Professor Tait, stated that this was not the case. It was important that the University kept the curriculum areas that appeared in the category of “Optimise Offer”, but that it tried to do so more efficiently by offering a smaller curriculum and still maintaining the same student numbers. A member said that this offered some reassurance, but anticipated that many of those reading the paper would interpret it differently. Another member thought that the equivalence being made between optimising and cutting was harsh. It was possible to be more effective and more efficient, as was evidenced by the current redesign of the MBA which would be more attractive to individuals and more flexible for employers, but would end up with less credit points as against presentation.
- 15.15 A member was concerned at the number of subjects in the “Optimize Offer” category. There was no indication of the scale of the shift in the curriculum or where end point would be. Professor Tait said there were too many variables to say what the shift would be over 5 years. The strategy set a broad direction, which suggested that where the OU could “Invest to Grow”, it was more likely to be in the vocational and profession curriculum, but it was impossible to give percentages with any accuracy that would be helpful. A member commented that the OU was a large institution that often moved slowly. Consequently, there was a need for the University to be flexible and responsive to new events and opportunities.
- 15.16 A member was concerned that the product strategy recommendations outlined in the table in paragraph 45 did not meet national needs and others commented that the principles of curriculum did not appear to include any reference to the University responding to government initiatives such as STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics), despite Lord Mandelson’s emphasis on the crucial and global importance of these subjects. Professor Tait, said that it was not a removal of Science and Technology from the curriculum, but a refocusing of them, in particular towards more vocational and professional purposes. The Science Faculty had been very innovative about recreating its curriculum in ways that were attractive to students.
- 15.17 Referring to the outcomes from the product analysis, a member commented that at present the number of Mathematics students was going up, and was overtaking the number of Computing students, which was going down. However, Computing was in the area of “Invest to Grow”, whilst Mathematics was in the “Optimise Offer” category. Almost all Science and Technology subjects had been categorised as “Optimise Offer”, whilst the Arts and Social Sciences were in the areas of “Maintain Offer” or “Invest to Grow”. This did not reflect current market information. Another member said that further information about the

limitations of the market research that had led to the preliminary findings would be helpful. The work contained some useful messages, but was historic in basis, depending on HESA statistics that looked at past activity for part-time study. If the Senate was being asked to approve the detail of the product and market analysis, it would be in danger of fossilising the curriculum by categorising opportunities in these terms. If the table was being offered as guidance for the development of the curriculum rather than specifying a direction, there were fewer concerns.

- 15.18 A member said that if the product strategy recommendations were not intended to direct the University, then it was unhelpful to include it in the paper. Paragraph 45 stated that it was a starting point for detailed decisions, but paragraph 46 said that five areas had been identified for further research before decisions on actions could be taken. If the Senate voted to accept the recommendations, then it might be voting for something that will be underpinned by marketing information that was not directing what we do. Professor Tait, responded that Marketing had worked with Faculties to deliver product strategy reviews and these had been found helpful. Paragraph 46 identified areas where further reviews were to take place. This was work in progress that had already contributed to the way in which faculties considered its future curriculum.
- 15.19 Professor Tait remarked that were a range of professionalisms within the OU that contributed to the delivery of the University mission. The preliminary findings from the product and market analysis were not provided as a direction, but in order to stimulate thought. It provided a useful vocabulary and framework and the University should have the courage to start using them to think about how the curriculum could be restructured. The current curriculum could not be sustained from a financial perspective, and it was confusing from the students' viewpoint. The paper provided explicit principles and visible and transparent tools to discuss curriculum futures.
- 15.20 A member commented that the detail of the table did not make sense in terms of the information provided in paragraph 59 on the number of career students studying particular subjects. Some of the subjects which appeared in the "Maintain Offer" category had higher percentage of career students than others that were in the "Invest to Grow" area. The idea of the four categories was useful, but the data currently being used was unconvincing.
- 15.21 Another member said that the mathematical aspects of the tables in paragraph 59 required interrogation. The paper suggested that undergraduate Widening Participation (WP) students were often motivated by career and employability, and that it was possible to infer that by focussing more on curriculum with vocational relevance and employability skills it would also be possible to increase overall the proportion of WP students. In a recession, people would choose to study a subject that would help them to get a job. This would be much more likely with the STEM subjects, than with some other topics. However, Mathematics appeared in the "Optimise Offer" category. This would not help the University to increase its student numbers.
- 15.22 A member observed that there were inconsistencies between the product strategy recommendations at undergraduate and at postgraduate level. For example, Accounting and Finance were "Invest to Grow" at undergraduate level, but "Optimise Offer2 at postgraduate level. Nursing was "Invest to Grow" at postgraduate level, but "Optimise Offer" at undergraduate. Professor Tait, responded that it was quite plausible that there would be different priorities in different markets.
- 15.23 Referring to Recommendation 4, a member said that he had had some initial concerns with early drafts of the paper where the curriculum that was characterised as for personal interest had been pitched against vocational curriculum. The idea of the curriculum being career enabling was more satisfactory.

- 15.24 A student member asked whether the University was looking to oust ELQ students in those areas in which it was seeking to “Invest to Grow” and to recruit younger students without the ELQ problem. The PVC said that this group represented 20% of student body and the University was committed to them. However, they were unfunded in England and the transitional funding would be gone by 2013/14. The University had to find a way of getting more funded students and had to be mindful of financial sustainability of the curriculum.
- 15.25 Another member commented on the tension between the aspirations in Recommendations 4 and 5, particularly in the context of Recommendation 2. The balance between the vocational courses aimed at a young market and the personal interest courses aimed at an older constituency needed to be maintained efficiently. The latter group had been served well by the OU and was expanding demographically. There might be reduced competition in this market in future, as external studies departments were being cut in many universities. The younger market, however, was reducing demographically, which would result in much more competition. The OU had the opportunity to use the new IT approaches developed in the University, such as i-Spot, to satisfy the personal development markets. New IT could support personal development without the need for elaborate assessment apparatus. Such an approach could also make a cost-effective contribution to the OU’s international aspirations, helping to raise global awareness of climate change, environmental degradation and so on. These were important issues for people to understand, but did not necessarily require formal qualifications.
- 15.26 A member suggested that the real value of the curriculum to students was not emphasised in the paper, although it was hinted at in Recommendation 4 in the “career enabling character of existing curricula”. The National Student Survey, in which The Open University appeared in the top 3, measured different aspects of student experience. The area that focused on student value of curriculum related to personal development and was closely related to the idea of graduateness. The three items that the students were asked to address were around being able to present themselves with confidence, having improved communication skills and having confidence in tackling unfamiliar situations. Students who could respond positively were those who had acquired graduateness, and these three items featured prominently in what employers wanted from students from HEIs. Whilst the OU was top of the survey in many dimensions, it was 198<sup>th</sup>, 229<sup>th</sup> and 177<sup>th</sup> respectively in these areas. The University might persuade itself that it delivered graduateness, but these factors deserved more scrutiny and should be more prominent in terms of the curriculum strategy and delivering actual value to students.
- 15.27 A member said there was something of a virtuous circle with regard to the OU’s credibility as an academic institution and a place where students chose to study. Students might choose the OU because of the clear curriculum and pathways, but they might also be influenced by the University’s research strengths, which became evident in the curriculum the University developed. She enquired about the relationship between these two aspects of the OU’s work. A member involved in the postgraduate project said he was reluctant to discuss this issue in detail until the project report had gone to the relevant University committees. However, it appeared that the postgraduate offering was in a very different place to that of the undergraduate and needed representation to make it more attractive and more readily identifiable as belonging to the OU. Stronger coordination was required across areas of postgraduate study, particularly teaching and the University needed to be more aware of links between postgraduate teaching and postgraduate research. The project team was currently looking at structures and models for further consideration by CAVC.
- 15.28 In response to recommendation 7, a member said that he was concerned about the continuity between undergraduate and postgraduate study. In a recent edition of The

Independent, it was reported that the government had recently wasted £26 billion on information systems. The need for a programme in this area had been predicted, but the MSc in Information Systems had failed to attract big numbers. However, the curriculum area appeared in the “Invest to Grow” area. It was an important topic, but the University had to convert the need to demand, which it had not managed to do at postgraduate level. There was an inconsistency between undergraduate and postgraduate demand and it was necessary to be careful about how the two were conflated.

- 15.29 An associate lecturer member welcomed Recommendation 7, but thought that there were missed opportunities, if not discontinuity and incoherence, between what is offered at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. More could be done to maximise the feed through from undergraduate to postgraduate, particularly with respect to the rationalisation and coherence of awards and marrying these up with principle of graduatness. In some faculties, it was possible for students to go through a programme without any collaborative working and with no emphasis on systematic investigation and research.
- 15.30 Several members asked for confirmation what the Senate was being asked to approve. The box referred to a proposed curriculum strategy, but only sought the Senate’s approval for the 9 recommendations. It was unclear whether the principles, the curriculum themes and the product strategy recommendations, many of which appeared to be work in progress, should be endorsed. The Chair welcomed comments on the whole paper, but confirmed that the Senate was only being asked to approve the 9 recommendations.
- 15.31 Some members were unclear on the status of the proposed curriculum themes, particularly in relation to the 14 subjects that the University had adopted, and how these would map out in practice to operational decisions. Professor Tait, said that the themes were not part of the recommendations. They attempted to demonstrate that the curriculum did not exist for itself, but responded to major issues in the world. This might be attractive to the external world and would say something about the University’s values. The themes would have some kind of relationship with the emerging themes within research area, but would not necessarily be the same. It would be helpful to understand whether the Senate as to whether such themes would be useful.
- 15.32 The Chair summarised by saying that the debate had left many open questions and some real concerns about the way in which the data being used to present examples in the paper. This would be taken into account and work would continue to take inputs from a variety of sources, including Marketing. However, did not appear to be anyone against the 9 recommendations set out in section 73, which the Senate was asked to approve.
- 15.33 The Senate **approved** the 9 recommendations set out in section 73 of the paper.

## 16 ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEWS

S/10/1/11

- 16.1 A member commented on the poor attendance at Faculty Committee meetings and asked how this might be improved. The co-ordinator of the Dean’s Group was asked to bring a response back to a future meeting.

**Action: SD**

- 16.2 The Senate **noted** the annual effectiveness reviews for the period September 2008 until July 2009 of the Research Committee, the Academic Staff Promotions Committee, the Honorary Degrees Committee, the committees for the Faculty of Education and Language Studies, the Open University Business School, and the Faculty of Social Sciences, as published on the Central Secretariat website.

**17 RECOMMENDATION FOR THE AWARD OF FELLOWSHIP**

S/10/1/12

The Senate **approved** the Award of Fellowship of the University to Professor Brenda Gourley.

**18 EMERITUS PROFESSORS**

S/10/1/13

The Senate:

- a) **approved** recommendations from the Chair and Readership Subcommittee that the title Emeritus Professor be awarded to:
- i) Professor Terry Griggs
  - ii) Professor John Gower
  - iii) Professor Doreen Massey
  - iv) Professor Vivienne Brown
  - v) Professor Shirley Reveley
  - vi) Professor Andy Northedge
- b) **noted** that Chair's Action had been taken in respect of the award of the title Emeritus Professor to Professor Ian Donnachie, Faculty of Arts.

**19 SENIOR LECTURER PROMOTION PROCEDURES**

S/10/1/14

- 19.1 A member said that the examples of evidence that could be submitted in promotions cases were helpful, but asked where enterprise sat within these and whether it could be included under scholarship in the criteria. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise), Professor Brigid Heywood, said that although the word enterprise was not specifically used, "the transfer and dissemination of knowledge, and the application of knowledge in a wide range of practical, professional and societally relevant contexts" encapsulated it. The word enterprise had not been used as it had other interpretations.
- 19.2 The member observed that the criterion of "other appropriate forms of scholarship could be taken into account, alongside evidence of leadership and innovation in respect of outcomes which advance employer engagement and civic and public engagement" appeared in the section regarding staff tutors and OUBS regional managers, but not the one for central academics, which implied it was not open to them. Professor Heywood clarified that the example should apply to all groups, the minutes should show this correction and the criteria would be amended to make this clear.
- Action: BH**
- 19.3 The member also commented that the way in which many University CVs were presented did not allow academics to put forward their strengths. This disadvantaged OU staff and how they were perceived externally. Professor Heywood said that the presentation of CVs had been referenced externally in 2003/04. The view had been that the presentation of a CV was part of an individual's career development and that it should be a document that could be used for many purposes. The University had used criteria that were relevant at the time and external referees had often been very positive in their comments. She proposed that the matter be referred to ASPC for further reflection.
- Action: ST**
- 19.4 Another member supported the proposed changes, but commented that references to web 2.0 technologies might be too precise and would date.

19.5 Referring to paragraph 2 (a) (i), a member drew attention to the reference to Central Academics furthering employer engagement. This was particularly relevant to the work of regional academics and staff tutors and should also be incorporated into the paragraph regarding staff tutors and OUBS regional managers. Professor Heywood said that it was not intended that any particular group of staff by should be excluded from the opportunity to present a case under any heading. The committee had endeavoured to recognise that staff had multi-professional roles within the institution. The inconsistencies were due to the complexity of the document and would be corrected.

**Action: BH**

19.6 Another member commented that the HERA role profiles had not been addressed in the document and did not correspond with the criteria for particular posts. Professor Heywood said that the HERA role profiles for academic staff had been used comprehensively across all the OU roles when the University had adopted the single point pay scale. The issue was about the evidence that an individual was performing at a level where they could be regraded in an academic context, but did not necessarily change the substantive role in which they were employed. The HERA role profiles had been accommodated when the original promotion criteria were established and very thoroughly reviewed. The member requested further evidence and more reassurance as many of the words used for promotion were not consistent with the HERA profiles.

**Action: BH**

19.7 The Senate **approved** the amendments to the Academic Staff Promotions Committee's procedures for promotion to senior lecturer (Appendix 1 to these minutes), subject to the editorial changes highlighted by the Senate.

## **20 CHAIR AND READERS PROMOTION PROCEDURES**

**S/10/1/15**

20.1 A former member of ASPC welcomed the inclusive heading of scholarly activities in both papers, but noted that an editorial change was necessary in paragraph 7.5 (a) where it referred to the subsidiary criterion relating to criterion (a) research and/or scholarship.

**Action: BH**

20.2 The Senate **approved** the amendments to the Academic Staff Promotions Committee's procedures for promotion to chair and readership (Appendix 2 to these minutes), subject to the editorial changes highlighted by the Senate.

## **21 CHANGING OU TERMINOLOGY**

**S/10/1/16**

21.1 A member asked for clarification as to whether the word course was to disappear from OU terminology, or whether there would be any exceptions apart from the one made for Marketing as indicated in paragraph 2.1.3. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards), Professor Alan Tait, confirmed that this was the case.

21.2 Another member said that the associate lecturers were in general happy with the change from course to module, but they were aware that in other universities that modules were much smaller than some of the OU 60 credit point courses. An additional action was needed in terms of communicating the fact that an OU module was a much more substantial commitment than elsewhere.

21.3 The Senate **approved**:

- a) the change from course to module
- b) the recommendations about the use of Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) levels
- c) the recommendations made about the timetable for implementation
- d) the recommendations for changes to credit transfer terminology

**22 LEVEL 1 COHERENCE PROJECT OUTCOMES**

S/10/1/17

- 22.1 A student member said that OUSA was grateful to have been involved in the consultation and broadly welcomed the paper. It was appreciated that the core introductory courses needed to teach introductory study skills, but some students would find themselves taking courses in subjects in which they had no interest in order to gain these skills. A conversion course was suggested that taught students how to study with the OU without having to do a subject specific course. OUSA wished to be involved with the implementation of this project.
- 22.2 Referring to the earlier positive remarks about the ways in which the OU was developing different approaches in new markets, a member expressed concern that some of the strategies in this paper were restrictive and that more flexible ways might be found in the future for students to meet the Level 1 requirements.
- 22.3 A member was concerned that the Open Degree now required 60 points at Level 1. The Open Degree was unique and its flexibility important. The number of students that went on to graduate was small in percentage terms, but was greater than the number graduating in several named degrees. The introduction of this requirement would disadvantage some students and there was no evidence that it would change student behaviour. A member responded that the issue of the Open Degree was an important one and the case for introducing the 60 point Level 1 requirement was made in paragraph 5.11 and was primarily concerned with consistency for students. It was essential to set students up to succeed and in order to do so they needed to have the necessary underpinning skills, whether on the Open or on a named degree.
- 22.4 Another member encouraged the Senate to think about adopting a supported managed entry for OU students. These proposals encompassed that approach. The statistics in paragraph 5.12 indicated that many students had Level 1 in their degree profile or an alternate credit transfer. There were not statistics about unsuccessful students who did not graduate because they had chosen the wrong point to come in.
- 22.5 A member was concerned that the characterisation of modules was overly simplistic and that it would interfere with what the University was trying to do with regard to pathways and qualifications. Another member enquired about the difference between the four categories of courses: could a course belong to more than one category; and whether the categorisation was a property of a particular course or a property of a course in relation to a particular qualification: could a course be in one category in the context of one qualification and another in respect of a different qualification.
- 22.6 Professor Tait said that the models were intended to simplify a complex and confusing area for students, ie Level 1. The courses that were being put into the categories outlined in the paper, had not been written for them, but they could be in the future. In theory, a course could belong to more than one category, although this was unlikely because the categorisation would relate to the way in which students were introduced to and supported for study. The University now tried to look at all modules in terms of qualification pathways rather than entities in themselves. The member replied that there were some good

additional courses that were not at Level 1. They attracted large numbers of students and had very good retention rates.

- 22.7 A member was concerned at recommendation B. The University had formerly had this requirement, and some students finished with a Foundation course having achieved 300 points elsewhere, which was absurd. This scheme would cause the same problems unless it allowed for a system of counting back or credit transfer.
- 22.8 The Chair welcomed the debate, but felt it would be appropriate to move the recommendations to a vote. A member suggested a specific amendment to the recommendations, which might help clarify the matter. He proposed that the Senate did not approve Recommendation B. Alternatively, for advocates of 60 points at Level 1, the second part of the statement could be removed, ie that "This should come from Core Introductory courses". Several members seconded this proposed amendment. The Chair invited comments on the amendment.
- 22.9 A member said that removing this sentence would be problematic. The intention was to set students up to succeed and one way of doing so was to ensure that they had the appropriate support, as listed in Appendix 1 under core introductory courses. If students were to do any 60 points at Level 1, they might do some courses that did not have the appropriate skills embedded within them to enable students to move on to Level 2 with a reasonable chance of success. This was particularly important when considering the type of students that the University currently tended to attract and was likely to attract in greater percentages in the future.
- 22.10 A student member did not agree with the amendment. It was possible to do several short courses at Level 1 that would provide 60 points, but no study skills that would support further study with the University.
- 22.11 A member said that she did not wish to remove the whole of the second sentence, but would be content for at least 30 points to come for Core Introductory courses. This might offer a middle way if the amendment failed.
- 22.12 Another member spoke in favour of the amendment. The qualification description, the compulsory courses associated with qualifications and the rules of assessment should ensure that students studied the right courses at Level 1. It would also solve some of the issues around the classification of courses and the way in which this would interfere with some successful current degree schemes.
- 22.13 A member wanted Recommendation B to stand without amendment, as if the second sentence was removed it would create problems for the core additional courses. If the students were just able to study these, they would miss the preparation contained in the core introductory course.
- 22.14 Professor Tait spoke against the amendment. The core introductory courses "develop and support essential skills for undergraduate study, as well as introducing the subject area". They were core building blocks in undergraduate degrees and it would be irresponsible if the University removed this support to progression.
- 22.15 The Senate **agreed** by an overwhelming majority not to accept the amendment.
- 22.16 A member asked for clarification as to whether someone who returned to undertake a second degree would also be subject to the rule as set out in Recommendation B. Professor Tait said this would not be the case, as the student could make use of credit transfer.



- 22.17 After a vote, the Senate **approved** overwhelmingly the Final Recommendations A-D.
- 22.18 The Vice-Chancellor said that all views would be taken into consideration as the recommendations were implemented.

## 23 COMMITTEE MATTERS

S/10/1/18

The Senate:

- a) **approved** the proposal to give Awards Committee delegated powers to approve all withdrawals of awards and their associated regulations, and straightforward proposals for new awards, and their regulations
- b) **noted** that it was proposed that the approval of specified types of awards, along with their associated regulations should remain with CAVC
- c) **noted** that Awards Committee would still retain the power to refer any proposal to CAVC for a final decision, if it wished to do so
- d) **approved** the consequent proposed changes to the terms of reference for Awards Committee and Curriculum Awards and Validation Committee (Appendices 3 and 4 to these minutes).

## 24 THE COUNCIL

S/10/1/19

The Senate **noted** the report on the Council's discussions at the meeting held on 17 November 2009.

## 25 SOCIAL LEARN UPDATE

S/10/1/20

- 25.1 A member commented that there appeared to have been a decision to progress the implementation of SocialLearn and to integrate it with other technologies under development in the OU. The delivery of this would have far reaching consequences for students and modes of teaching, yet the University was currently achieving good results by supporting students with technologies that were already familiar to them. It also appeared that the University was embarking on this project without a business model, yet it had to be mindful of the costs.
- 25.2 The Vice-Chancellor said that the University would pause, look at the possible business models for SocialLearn, its broad value to the OU, and how it could support and enhance the existing teaching, learning and research strategies. It would not look to SocialLearn to be a stand alone, income generating enterprise. The intent was to open up SocialLearn and invite the broader community of funders and developers to share in SocialLearn's evolution. The meeting of social networking with education could unlock many opportunities and provide clarity on SocialLearn's future direction.
- 25.3 The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning, Teaching and Quality), Professor Denise Kirkpatrick said that the new Social Learn team was small and had been rethinking what was possible without the investment that had been made to date. It wanted to make SocialLearn more open, using open source and open architecture. It was looking at other ways of funding the project, but was not thinking of a joint venture. The team had been uncomfortable with the term platform, as at one point SocialLearn had looked like developing into another learning management system, such as the VLE (Virtual Learning Environment). The concept was for something light and responsive, which would bring together all the existing social networking tools and help forge the links between formal and informal learning.

25.4 A member asked if the title – OU Freemium and Social Learn – could be reconsidered. Professor Kirkpatrick said that the University had moved away from the term Freemium in connection with SocialLearn. However, the SocialLearn title had resonance and international acceptance. It was recognised within the University, which would be important as the team tried to engage the community with something familiar rather than presenting it as yet another new development.

25.5 The Senate **noted** the new priorities set by VCE for 2010, following business modelling and system prototyping during 2009.

**26 FUTURE ITEMS OF BUSINESS**

**S/10/1/21**

The Senate **noted** the list of potential items for discussion at the meeting of the Senate in April 2010.

**27 DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS**

**S/10/1/22**

Meetings will be held on the following dates:

Wednesday 14 April 2010  
Wednesday 16 June 2010

Julie Tayler  
Assistant Secretary  
Central Secretariat  
[j.d.tayler@open.ac.uk](mailto:j.d.tayler@open.ac.uk)  
February 2010

Attachments:

- Appendix 1: Promotion to Senior Lecturer: Guidance and Procedures
- Appendix 2: Promotion to Chair or Reader: Guidance and Procedures
- Appendix 3: Awards Committee constitution
- Appendix 4: Curriculum, Awards and Validation Committee constitution

Key:

BH Brigid Heywood  
CS Central Secretariat  
DK Professor Denise Kirkpatrick  
DV Professor David Vincent  
MH Mr Miles Hedges  
SD Dr Sharon Ding  
ST Mrs Sue Thomas  
WS Mr Will Swann



## Promotion to senior lecturer: guidance and procedures

### 1. General points

This section contains information and guidance on promotions to senior lecturer (and equivalent) and senior research fellow.

#### (a) Criteria for promotion

The three sets of promotion criteria for central academic staff, staff tutors and OUBS regional managers and research fellows can be found in sections 4.3 and 4.4. The criteria approved by the Senate to operate from 1 October 1975 have been modified in 1986, 1991, 1995, 2000 and 2003.

#### (b) Consideration of promotion recommendations by the Academic Staff Promotions Committee

Recommendations for promotion to senior lecturer are considered by the Academic Staff Promotions Committee at its meeting in October. Deans/Directors and individuals are informed annually of the deadline by which cases should be submitted to the Committee Secretariat. This is usually the end of May.

The Academic Staff Promotions Committee establishes a sub-group each year to give initial consideration to promotion recommendations. This group meets twice before the meeting of the Committee in October. At its first meeting in June the group checks that submissions have all the necessary information which the Committee requires to make a decision on the case. After this meeting the Committee secretariat may request revisions/amendments to the submission from the Unit. At its second meeting in September the sub-group considers each submission and makes a recommendation to the main Committee on whether to approve promotion or not.

At its October meeting, the Academic Staff Promotions Committee makes final decisions on individual cases. At this meeting the Committee agrees appropriate feedback to be provided to unsuccessful candidates through the Dean/Director or directly to the individual in the case of personal submissions. For Unit submissions the Dean/Director is responsible for putting the decision into context in a meeting with the individual.

The Academic Staff Promotions Committee acknowledges that the environment in which the system for academic promotions operates is constantly evolving, and that systems in

ASPC – Procedures 2010 – Section 6 – Senior Lecturer

place must be flexible to reflect the new challenges and opportunities for academic and research staff. In assessing cases for promotion, the Committee is therefore sympathetic to the different career paths and patterns pursued by individuals, for example, non traditional career portfolios, professional backgrounds and experience, and career breaks. It aspires to be flexible in its approach to the interpretation of the criteria for promotion to senior lecturer (or equivalent) to recognise such diversity amongst staff.

In considering recommendations for promotion to senior lecturer (or equivalent) the Committee has given careful thought to the role of the individual on promotion. The Committee believes that the role of a senior lecturer, whether appointed or promoted, incorporates an implication that the post holder should be able to demonstrate leadership qualities at either Unit or University level. Submissions for promotion are therefore expected to include evidence that a candidate for promotion possesses the ability and skills to adopt such a role.

It must also be noted that, as with other institutional forms of professional recognition, attention will be given to the manner and contribution of an individual's activities to the strategic objectives of the university.

Further detailed guidance is given in paragraph 4 on the preparation of promotion submissions. Submissions must comprise a statement from the candidate and a statement from the candidate's line manager. In the majority of cases this will be the candidate's head of department, but the Committee acknowledges that in some faculties different arrangements may exist.

The Dean/Director, however, advised by the advisory promotions committee within the Faculty retains overall responsibility for the annual review of academic and research staff.

## 2 Guidance on the criteria for promotion to senior lecturer

For each criterion specific guidance is given for central academics and staff tutors and OUBS regional managers, followed by general guidance ~~which that~~ can be applicable to all groups of staff.

The ASPC considers promotion to be recognition of significant professional and intellectual development and the acknowledgement of the value of the contributions an individual has made to the institution. It does not see promotion simply as a reward for an individual doing a good job, which it considers should be the norm.

In considering cases for promotion the ASPC therefore needs to see clear evidence of this professional career development. In particular, evidence is required to ~~give provide~~ an indication of independence and leadership in relation to the criteria, ~~and e~~Examples and suggestions ~~are given below~~ in the following sections. These must not be regarded as definitive or restrictive to the ASPC in determining an individual's evidence for 'independence' or 'leadership'.

Note: Candidates are reminded that promotion is linked to the demonstration of excellence in at least two of the four criteria, and for central academics evidence of a good record in a third.

### (a) Teaching and contributions to the teaching system

#### (i) Central academics

ASPC – Procedures 2010 – Section 6 – Senior Lecturer

Evidence should be provided in both the candidate's statement and the line manager's statements to emphasise excellent contributions and innovation in any or all of the University's programmes. This could include individual performance as a member of a course team in the conception, development, presentation and maintenance of a course or programme. It may however be appropriate to include evidence of course team chairing under the administration and management criterion. The Committee believes this is a judgement for the individual candidate to make based on the nature and balance of the duties and outcomes (see also (2 (c) (i))).

Examples of activities where excellence might be demonstrated include work in connection with the curriculum, student assessment, new media and technology, broadcasts, day schools, residential schools, the design of home experiment kits and special projects, intellectual leadership, critical reading and academic editing in the development of a course or programme, furthering the engagement of employers and/or the professions with the University's teaching activities, staff development of associate lecturers and the tuition of taught and postgraduate students and/or students registered for higher research degrees.

Attention should be given to the manner and contribution of an individual's activities to the strategic objectives of the University.

**(ii) Staff tutors and OUBS regional managers**

Evidence should be provided in both the candidate's statement and that from the line manager to emphasise excellent contributions and innovation in any or all of the University's programmes.

The main emphasis should be on work and innovation in teaching and learning approaches, contributions to day schools and towards the establishment of links between Faculty, course tutors and students. Evidence of excellence in activities connected with the staff development of associate lecturers may also be included. Recognition should also be given to participation in course team work if undertaken. Other evidence could include furthering the engagement of employers and/or the professions with the University's teaching activities, staff development of associate lecturers and the tuition of taught postgraduate students and/or students registered for higher research degrees.

Attention should be given to the manner and contribution of an individual's activities to the strategic objectives of the University.

**(iii) Further guidance**

This is not a definitive list because it is recognised that work of academic and research staff reflects a diverse academic culture at the Open University, and the nature of excellent achievements claimed is likely to depend on the candidate's post and Unit.

In all cases the Committee will be seeking specific evidence of academic leadership from the candidate's case and accompanying CV.

The following areas may be helpful when considering evidence for inclusion in promotion statements:

- evidence that the candidate's contributions to teaching and the teaching system have set an example which others follow;

ASPC – Procedures 2010 – Section 6 – Senior Lecturer

- evidence of contributions to the design of innovative approaches to teaching, learning or student support;
- evidence of curriculum developments and innovative use of technology;
- achievement of excellent academic standing as a result of his/her teaching;
- achievement of recognition via teaching awards;
- evidence from IET surveys relating to specific course units etc.;
- evidence of development of teaching, building on experience from a previous institution;
- evidence of excellent and innovative contributions to the development of course/packs, for example, through the use of different media and technology although individual contributions must be made clear;
- evidence of the candidate's ability to work with others, for instance as a leader or member of a course team or project team;
- initiatives made in relation to activities such as the development of the student learning experience, course presentation, tuition, staff development and residential schools;
- evidence of success in helping post-graduate research students towards completing their higher degrees;
- evidence of excellent contributions to initiatives and developments in the area of access and equal opportunities;
- evidence of successful developmental or support work which have influenced learning processes, residential schools, assessment and examinations etc.;
- evidence of success in recruitment or retention of students and nature of the candidate's particular skills.

**(b) Research and/or scholarship Scholarly Activities****(i) Central academics**

The Committee welcomes cases that present a range of scholarship activities with appropriate evidence of excellence through leadership and innovation.

Scholarly activity will be recognised as deeply interconnected with the full range of the University's core purposes in respect of leading edge discipline-based research, the development and delivery of teaching and learning, the transfer and dissemination of knowledge, and the application of knowledge in a wide range of practical, professional and societally relevant contexts<sup>1</sup>.

Evidence should include the normal outcomes of scholarly activities for example, This is normally defined as original work arising from research which is published in book form or

<sup>1</sup> Senate paper S-09-4-10 Scholarship in the Open University

ASPC – Procedures 2010 – Section 6 – Senior Lecturer

in reputable academic journals. ~~., however, e~~ Other appropriate ~~forms of outputs from~~ scholarship can be taken into account including a demonstrable influence upon academic communication mediated through online and web 2.0 related web mediated technologies that which influences the discipline.

It is helpful for the Academic Staff Promotions Committee to have evidence in the submission ~~about as to~~ whether the candidate is recognised as an authority in a specific field or whether the strength ~~lies lay~~ in the range of scholarly activities including but not limited to – research to research, knowledge transfer, appropriate service to the professions, and public and civic engagement, including innovative contributions mediated through teaching, curriculum development or Widening Participation activities. – research.

Evidence of the effective supervision of full and part time post graduate research students should be included under this criterion as well as innovative contributions to the development of early career academic staff engaging with research or other modes of scholarship of scholarship. Other and other examples of external peer review may include interactions with communities of scholarly practice, as evidenced through external grant income and related activities (e.g. PGR funding, invited key note lectures, and including a demonstrable influence upon academic debates mediated online).

Other appropriate forms of scholarship can be taken into account, alongside evidence of leadership and innovation in respect of outcomes which advance employer engagement and civic and public engagement.

Attention should be given to the manner and contribution of an individual's activities to the strategic objectives of the University.

**(ii) Staff tutors and OUBS regional managers**

This would include scholarly research activities, as stated above. However, other appropriate forms of scholarship can be taken into account, alongside evidence of leadership and innovation in respect of outcomes which advance employer engagement and civic and public engagement.

**(iii) Further guidance**

Examples of evidence for excellence ~~may in research could~~ include the following:

- in the case of published papers, evidence of external review ~~and~~ the standing of the journals in which they appear and whether they are refereed;
- in the case of books and book chapters, evidence from published reviews and/or publisher's reader reports;
- evidence of success in obtaining external peer reviewed research funding;

ASPC – Procedures 2010 – Section 6 – Senior Lecturer

- in the case of institutional scholarship including research and evaluation (published within the University only), evidence of excellence equivalent to that to be seen in refereed external publications;
- evidence of internal publications helping to inform and influence the Open University's policies and practices;
- evidence of the candidate's work opening up new and fruitful areas or leading to practical developments;
- evidence of impact on policy or practice;
- evidence of external peer reviewed, fellowships and/or related awards;

**(c) Administration and Management****(i) Central academics**

Evidence should be provided in both the candidate's statement and the line manager's to emphasise excellent contributions and innovative work. This may include excellent contributions to Faculty and University Committees, the managerial and organisational aspects of the roles of programme director, course team Chair during production, head of department (or equivalent), the establishment and leadership of a research group, the administration of residential schools, liaison with outside bodies and entrepreneurial and promotional activities in support of the Unit and University. Candidates may wish to include under this criterion, evidence of administration and management linked to, but independent and separate from, evidence provided in other areas. For example. Course Team chairing (section 2a), leadership of a research group (section b1).relating to course team chairing. (see 2 (a) (i)).

Attention should be given to the manner and contribution of an individual's activities to the strategic objectives of the University.

**(ii) Staff Tutors and OUBS Regional Managers**

It is recognised that a large part of the staff tutor's work is administrative and assessment for promotion will depend to a considerable extent on performance in the range of duties specified in the terms and conditions of service and further particulars for the post. However, emphasis can be given to important conceptual impact in innovative activities (such as new ideas for student recruitment) and the success of these. Contributions to the development of policy and procedures, either individually or as a member or leader of a group may also be included as well as examples of imaginative management. Examples of evidence of substantial contributions to staff development and/or successful outcomes are also valid.

**(iii) Further guidance**

Examples of excellence in managerial or organisational aspects of a candidate's work, whether centrally, regionally or both may include:

- evidence of excellence in the management or leadership of staff and/or associate lecturers (e.g. as a course team chair, or leader of a special project);
- evidence of excellent performance in administration and/or management outside the Unit (e.g. on Committees);



ASPC – Procedures 2010 – Section 6 – Senior Lecturer

- evidence of initiation of innovations, promotional or entrepreneurial activities that have significantly benefited the University.

(see also 2 (a) (i) )

**(d) Other Work**

**(i) Central academics**

Evidence in the statements should emphasise excellent contributions, for example, representing the University on national bodies, holding office in professional or learned societies, receipt of national academic awards or outstanding contributions to the attainment of the strategic objectives of the University.

**(ii) Staff Tutors and OUBS Regional Managers**

Evidence of examples as in d (i) above. However, for staff tutors, evidence of research activity, can be included under this criterion.

**(iii) Further guidance**

Other examples of work under this criterion could include:

- Recognition of contributions to e-scholarship, e-knowledge, development of professional practice, aspects of employer engagement, knowledge transfer and citizenship,
- demonstration of success in taking initiatives such as the development of collaborative activities, the development of local networks and community programmes for improving student access to the University;
- other professional activities. The Academic Staff Promotion Committee recognises that many individuals join the University from careers in professions such as nursing and other healthcare fields, teaching and engineering. It endeavours to consider the application of such experience to an academic career at the Open University, through for example, a contribution to the delivery of the institutional strategic objectives

**3 Research Fellows**

The essential criterion for promotion to senior research fellow is a distinguished research record as revealed by personal research, and/or scholarly publications, external peer review (e.g. research funding, conferences), post graduate research supervision and research leadership. Other service to the University, such as academic or organisational contributions, may be taken into account.

**4 Preparation of promotion recommendations**

Promotion documentation required by the Committee and guidance on the preparation of this documentation is set out in this section. All documentation should be submitted on single-sided sheets of A4 paper.

**(a) Promotion submissions consist of the following documentation:**

ASPC – Procedures 2010 – Section 6 – Senior Lecturer

(i) **Two page cover sheet**

There are different cover sheets for central academic staff, staff tutors and OUBS regional managers, and research fellows. (See section 12)

(ii) **A statement from the candidate**

The statement may not exceed **1500 words**.

(iii) **A statement from the candidate's line manager**

For central academics, the statement may not exceed **1000 words**. For academic staff, based in the regions, a report from the line manager of 750 words and a report (also 750 words) from the regional director are required.

(iv) **Curriculum vitae**

The CV should be up to date and **must** be submitted in the format set out in section 10. Any not submitted in the correct format will be returned to the candidate for amendment.

(v) **References**

Three signed and dated references should be attached to the submission.

(b) **Detailed guidance on the completion of documentation**

(i) **Two page cover sheet including appraisal statement**

The two page cover sheet must be completed and signed by both the Dean/Director and the candidate. If there has been no opportunity for involvement in an area of the criteria an explanation should be given on the form. The appraisal statement on page 2 should be completed and signed by the Dean/Director and the candidate. In signing the form the candidate confirms that s/he has seen and checked the submission.

(ii) **Candidate's statement**

The statement may not exceed **1500 words**. The Committee recommends font 10 or 11 and the statement must have the candidate's name at the top and a word count at the end. It should begin with an introductory sentence clearly stating the criteria under which the case for promotion is being made.

In the remainder of the statement, the candidate should draw attention to key, innovative contributions they have made against the criteria for promotion and give examples of where they consider they are performing at a level above that expected of a lecturer.

The statement should focus on how they consider excellence has been demonstrated against the relevant criteria for promotion. Its aim is to present a succinct summary of a candidate's achievements, which is supplemented by a comprehensive CV. The statement should not normally include quotations or testimony as forms of evidence.

Where a candidate is working in a role different from their substantive post, then information should be provided on the nature of that role ensuring the role is clearly described, to assist the Committee in its evaluation against the promotion criteria.

ASPC – Procedures 2010 – Section 6 – Senior Lecturer

Evidence from work in a previous role is acknowledged by the Committee but there needs to be evidence of the candidate's development in their current role.

**(iii) Curriculum Vitae**

With the introduction of a shorter statement setting out the case for promotion, the CV becomes an even more important source of information for the ASPC.

It is **essential** that CVs are submitted in the recommended format and the guidelines set out in section 10 are followed. This is available on the Central Secretariat website. The Committee secretariat is able to give advice on CVs and to look at individual draft ~~CVs~~ CVs upon request.

Any CVs **not** submitted in the correct format will be returned to candidates for amendment.

**(iv) Statement from the candidate's line manager**

For central academic staff, including research fellows, a statement **of not more than 1000 words** is required from the candidate's line manager. This would normally be a role for the head of department though the ASPC recognises that other arrangements may exist in some Faculties/Units.

The statement should give an assessment of the candidate's contributions and evidence of his/her sustained commitment at a high level, role within the department and it should provide the Committee with a reflective, evaluative assessment of the candidate's contributions and include evidence to support the claims made in the candidate's statement. For example if the candidate states that a particular activity or contribution demonstrates excellence against a criterion for promotion, then the line manager's report should give an opinion on that activity supported by evidence of its delivery. It would not normally include quotations or testimony but the ASPC acknowledges that it may be appropriate in some circumstances to include a quotation as evidence of a particular contribution.

For academic staff based in the regions (staff tutors and OUBS regional managers) their case should be supported by a report from their line manager of not more than **750 words** ~~and words and~~ a report from the Regional Director (also of not more than **750 words**). In each case the report should provide an assessment of the candidate's contributions and role within the region and evidence of his/her sustained commitment at a high level.

**(v) References**

Three signed and dated references should be included with the submission. One should be from a source external to the Open University. It is the responsibility of the Dean/Director to approach referees and not a role for Heads of Departments or other colleagues. The referees should be listed on the cover sheet. Where the circumstances of the post are such that it is difficult to find a suitable external referee (for example in cases for staff tutors, OUBS regional managers) the Dean/Director may include a third internal reference and must provide a note of explanation on the cover sheet to this effect. Where a case is resubmitted to the Committee, references should not be provided which are dated from the previous submission.

ASPC – Procedures 2010 – Section 6 – Senior Lecturer

In selecting referees care should be taken to choose referees of sufficient status and independence and standing in their field and who would have no conflict of interest. It may be appropriate in exceptional cases for one of the referees to be from outside the academic community. Referees should be chosen who are able to address one or more of the criteria. They should be asked to declare any professional relationship with the candidate. Referees should be sent the promotion criteria, the statement from the candidate and their CV to assist them in preparing a reference. It is not appropriate to send the line manager's statement to referees.

Where a candidate is a recent employee of the University, the Dean/Director might select one of the referees from his/her former institution to comment on the individual's contribution in their previous role.

The Academic Staff Promotions Committee has discretion to approach additional referees if it decides that additional information is required, but will contact the Dean/Director in the first instance where it decides to do so. The Committee may also request that the Dean/Director provides additional references to replace existing references.

**(c) Role of Dean/Director**

Although detailed guidance on the responsibilities of units in respect of the review of academic and research staff is set out in section 3 of its guidance, the ASPC reiterates at this point that the Dean/Director of the Faculty still retains overall responsibility for the review. In his/her report to the ASPC (see section 3 .2) Deans are still required to include a short paragraph on each candidate being recommended for promotion summarising the reasons for submission and confirming the Faculty's support for the recommendation.

Provision for personal submissions is set out in section 8.4 of the ASPC's guidance.



The Open  
University

## ~~7~~ SENIOR LECTURER TO READER OR CHAIR SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW TO CHAIR LECTURER TO READER OR CHAIR

### 7.1 General points

Submissions for promotion to a readership or a chair are considered by a sub-committee of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee, the Chair and Readership Sub-Committee. This Sub-Committee normally meets three times a year and further information about it can be found in the Government Structure Handbook. Submissions ~~may~~ be made to any of the meetings of this Sub-Committee. Deans/Directors are notified of the submission and meeting dates, which are also available from the Committee secretariat. Meeting dates are published in the Committee Timetable.

This section contains guidance on making a submission and procedures relating to promotion to a readership or a chair. The criteria are set out in sections 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7.

There are a number of stages in the process and for this reason it can take some time, especially if revision or amendment of the submission is ~~required~~ requested at any stage. The Sub-Committee does, however, endeavour to progress cases between meetings as much as possible. Deans/Directors are reminded to comply with the procedures for making submission, as failure to do so might ~~cause a case to fail~~ give rise to an unsuccessful candidate, or could result in delays in the process.

Promotion from lecturer to a readership or chair is considered to be exceptional and guidance is given in section 7.6.

### 7.2 Criteria for promotion to a readership

There are three criteria for promotion to a readership. These are set out in section 4.5. Clearly state in the submission under which criteria a case for promotion to a readership is being made.

### 7.3 Criteria for promotion to a chair

There are three criteria for promotion to a chair. These are set out in section 4.7. Clearly state in the submission under which two criteria it is claimed that the record is outstanding, noting that criterion (b) teaching and/or student support should normally be included as one of the two criteria. In addition, there will normally be an expectation of competence in the third criterion. It is permissible to submit an all round case based on strong evidence of outstanding performance against all 3 criteria.

### 7.4 Guidance on the criteria

ASPC – Procedures 2009 – Section 7 – Chair and Readership

S/10/1/15

Appendix

**(a) Research and/or Scholarship Scholarly Activities**

Scholarly activity will be recognised as deeply interconnected with the full range of the University's core purposes in respect of leading edge discipline-based research, the development and delivery of teaching and learning, the transfer and dissemination of knowledge, and the application of knowledge in a wide range of practical, professional and societally relevant contexts.

The record has to stand up to rigorous examination by leaders in the field. There must be evidence of conceptual innovation, of a major advancement of knowledge, and significant communication to peers in the field and/or those engaged with the subject matter in a wider context. ~~Other relevant skills would include experimental ones~~ Outstanding contributions might be made, for example, in the areas of experimentation, methodological developments, problem solving, critical evaluation, synthesis and communication to the profession. The case will be assessed in relation to externally verified standards appropriate to the subject.

The record needs to substantiate contributions such as:

- (i) academic publications refereed and reviewed nationally and internationally in journals of quality or equivalent peer-reviewed works; and/or substantive monographs. Influential signature academic contributions through online debates and other modes of web 2.0 communication (e.g. blogs) and dialogue will also be considered as evidence where appropriate modes of peer/expert user review and impact can be evidenced;
- (ii) principal and/or major contributions to the intellectual framing of externally receipt of funded projects grants and other external research funding which have been secured through recognised expert and peer assessment and review of a proposal;
- ~~(iii)~~ (iii) effective and innovative supervision of research students;
- ~~(iii)~~ (iv) effective mentoring and development of career young and early career staff;
- (iv) receipt of national and international academic awards;
- ~~(v)~~ (v) invitations to present plenary lectures or keynote speeches at national and international conferences and including
- ~~(vi)~~ demonstrable leadership of academic debates mediated online;
- ~~(vi)~~ effective knowledge exchange through entrepreneurial activities.

**(b) Teaching and/or Student Support**

The record must show leadership and influence as demonstrated, for instance, by evidence of:

- (i) ~~(i)~~ sustained intellectual leadership in the furtherance of the University's teaching activities;
- ~~(ii)~~ (ii) wide publication and dissemination of a significant body of knowledge in relation to the University's teaching activities;
- ~~(iii)~~ (iii) effective innovation to enhance student's' learning experiences, e.g. introduction of new teaching methods, or student support systems, creative use of new technology and new media, development of distance learning materials in new forms and for new audiences;
- ~~(iv)~~ (iv) interdisciplinary activities eg. carrying insights and developments from one discipline's way of thinking into different areas;

ASPC – Procedures 2009 – Section 7 – Chair and Readership

S/10/1/15

Appendix

- (v) ~~(v)~~ pioneering the teaching or presentation of a subject or programme, in the University, and/or beyond, or popularising a subject successfully;
- (vi) Innovative contributions to civic and/or public engagement mediated through teaching curriculum development or widening participation activities.
- (vii) ~~(vi)~~ major contributions to the production design and development of quality distance teaching material learning experiences which combines scholarship and conceptual underpinning with flexibility and understanding of OU students' contexts and difficulties;
- (viii) ~~(vii)~~ effective supervision tuition of research taught post graduate students and/or higher research degree students candidates;
- (ix) ~~(viii)~~ innovative achievements in furthering equal opportunities and access:-
- (x) innovative achievements in furthering the engagement of employers and the professions with the University's teaching activities.

**(c) Academic Service**

The record must show leadership and influence as demonstrated, for instance, by evidence of:

- (i) representing the University on national and international bodies;
- (ii) office bearing in professional and learned societies;
- (iii) significant impact on important national or international policy areas including a demonstrable influence upon academic debates mediated online;
- (iv) editorship of prestigious journals or academic publications;
- (v) influential role in major collaborative projects with other institutions or partnership developments;
- (vi) senior excellent performance in a role in the academic management of the University, and recognition of standing and leadership;
- (vii) successful administration of courses/projects including leadership of colleagues, e.g. complex course, project team or discipline, associate lecturer teams, research group;
- (viii) ~~(viii)~~ significant input to University p-olicy developments and their implementation, e.g. development of research policy, curriculum design, learning and teaching strategies.
- (ix) significant input to national/international policy developments and their implementation. For example, contributions to public reviews, inquires, Government working papers.

**7.5 Guidance on the subsidiary criterion**

Candidates must normally be outstanding under two of the criteria, one of which will normally be criterion (b), teaching and/or student support. As to the record of achievement under the subsidiary or third criterion, although no threshold is set it will normally be expected that a candidate will have made a good contribution in the area.

- (a) Where the subsidiary criterion relates to criterion (a) research and/or scholarship: scholarly activities:



ASPC – Procedures 2009 – Section 7 – Chair and Readership

S/10/1/15

Appendix

1. The candidate will have made a contribution to the relevant subject area such that their peers see them as having standing in the profession;
  2. The candidate will normally have published in publications of recognised standing, this may include a range of online academic communications where appropriate academic authority and influence can be evidenced;
  3. In their publications the candidate will have demonstrated a capacity for original thought whether through a major advancement of knowledge in their own subject or through an original scholarly presentation of the subject, for example in University courses or developmental materials, or through critical literature review.
- (b) Where the subsidiary criterion relates to criterion (b) teaching and/or student support, account will be taken of the effectiveness of demonstrable contributions to teaching and/or student support and may include appropriate evidence drawn from innovative career development contributions to research postgraduate training and early career staff .-
- (c) Where the subsidiary criterion relates to criterion (c) academic service, account will be taken of the ~~effectiveness~~effectiveness of performance in areas such as:
1. Input in to policy developments within the University;
  2. Occasional senior role in Unit or University;
  3. Management responsibilities and leadership roles;
  4. External stature and influence.

**7.6 Process for making a submission**

Submissions are made to the Chair and Readership Sub-Committee. This ~~is a~~ Sub-Committee of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee consists of comprises the professorial or equivalent members of the parent Committee and is chaired by the Vice-Chancellor or the Deputy Chair of the Academic Staff Promotions Committee. The process for considering cases has several stages which are set out below. ~~Further information on this process can be obtained from the Committee secretariat.~~ Information on the documentation required by the Sub-Committee is set out in ~~the next~~ section 7.7. Decisions of the Chair and Readership Sub-Committee are reported to the Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

~~The process is the same for promotions to both chairs and readerships.~~ The processes for the award of readerships and chairs are have is the same. and has been simplified recently. ~~If the Subcommittee agrees that there is a prima facie case then this will be investigated rigorously with the help of external assessors. If the prima facie case is accepted by and after rigorous investigation and acceptance of the prima facie case for promotion,~~ the Chair and Readership Sub-Committee, ~~will promote the~~ candidate will normally be promoted to a chair or readership ~~now~~ without referral to a panel.

**Stage 1 Submission of the recommendation to the Sub-Committee**

A submission, consisting of ~~a case~~ the candidate's statement, a statement from the Dean and curriculum vitae, is considered by the Chair and Readership Sub-Committee. There are four options for the Sub-Committee:

- (a) to proceed to a formal investigation of the *prima facie* case;



ASPC – Procedures 2009 – Section 7 – Chair and Readership

S/10/1/15

Appendix

- (b) to take informal external soundings in order to decide whether to investigate the *prima facie* case;
- (c) to suggest revisions and developments to the case or to seek further information from the Dean/Director (or candidate in the case of personal submissions);
- (d) to decide that there is insufficient evidence against the criteria to proceed further at this stage.

The Dean/Director or individual (in the case of a personal submission) is informed of the Sub-Committee's decision and provided with feedback, where appropriate, shortly after the Sub-Committee's meeting.

**Stage 2 Investigation of a *prima facie* case**

Where a decision is made to investigate a *prima facie* case for promotion to either a readership or chair, the Committee secretariat on behalf of the Sub-Committee, will seek references from external assessors. ~~The candidate may nominate two referees and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and Staff) will nominate three referees from four provided by the Dean/Director. (see section 7.7 (d) for guidance on selection of referees).~~

At the next opportunity the Sub-Committee will consider the submission (~~case and CV~~) and the references. At this point the Sub-Committee may make one of the following decisions:

- (a) to accept that a *prima facie* case exists for promotion and to proceed to the next stage promote the candidate;
- (b) to seek further information before making a decision;
- (c) to decide not to proceed further at this time.

The Dean/Director or individual, in the case of personal submissions, is informed of the Sub-Committee's decision shortly after the meeting. Where the Sub-Committee decides not to proceed further, or to seek further advice, feedback on this decision will be provided.

**Stage 3 Award of chair or readership**

Once the Sub-Committee has thoroughly assessed and substantiated the evidence against the criteria and accepted the *prima facie* case for promotion to a chair or readership, it will promote the candidate without redress to a chair or readership panel. In very exceptional circumstances, it may however be necessary to convene a panel. Further information on the constitution of these panels can be found in the Government Structure Handbook.

The decision is notified to the candidate shortly after the meeting of the Sub-Committee. If promotion is approved, the candidate is consulted on the title to be conferred. ~~Promotions are reported to the Academic Board.~~

**7.7 Promotion submission documentation**

~~The promotion submission consists of a case and curriculum vitae. At a later stage in the process, the Committee secretariat seeks references which form part of the documentation.~~

**(a) Promotion documentation**

The documentation to be provided to the Sub-Committee consists of:

- Case Cover sheet (individuals making a personal submission should not complete this sheet)
- Statement from the candidate of not more than 2000 words

ASPC – Procedures 2009 – Section 7 – Chair and Readership

S/10/1/15

Appendix

- Statement from the relevant Dean/Director of not more than 1500 words. For academic staff based in the regions a report from the regional director of not more than 1000 words is also required.

- Curriculum vitae

• ~~Form (individuals making a personal submission should not complete this form).~~

~~The case and the CV should have the name of the individual at the top of the first page and each document should be separately paginated and dated. If either document is revised at a later stage in the process, the date should be amended to identify the correct version. The case and CV should be submitted as single-sided A4 sheets. Further information about the case and CV can be found in (b) and (c) below.~~

Deans/Directors are requested to provide a completed form cover sheet when the recommendation is first submitted to the Sub-Committee. The provision of this information at the beginning of the process enables the Committee secretariat to progress the case quickly without requests to the Dean/Director for information at each stage. Individuals making a personal submission should not complete a proforma cover sheet as this document requests nominations for referees, which is the responsibility of the Dean or Director. For such cases if - Should, the Sub-Committee decide to investigate a *prima facie* case after Stage 1 the candidate will be asked to nominate two referees and the Dean/Director will be asked to complete the proformasheet. The form cover sheet is available on the Central Secretariat and Human Resources Intranet sites.

**(b) Presentation of the case for pPromotion**

The case should convey the nature and evidence for promotion to the senior academics that serve on the Sub-Committee, ~~the nature and evidence for promotion. These professorial level staff~~ The members of the Ssubcommittee are accustomed to judging academic achievement in their own fields, and build up considerable experience across disciplines in their work on the Academic Staff Promotions Committee. They need to be satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of an outstanding record before seeking external assessment, whether formally or informally.

**(c) Statement from the Candidate**

~~The case should contain:~~

- ~~1. an introductory paragraph containing the candidate's name, Unit and current title (senior lecturer, reader) and to which level promotion is sought (reader or chair). A clear and concise statement should be included setting out under which of the criteria it is claimed that the candidate's record is distinguished/outstanding and which is subsidiary;~~
- ~~2. sub-section headings. It is advised that the criteria headings be used for this purpose;~~
- ~~3. information on the Unit/discipline context and the acceptability of the proposed promotion at least among senior staff (Units have been encouraged to review all senior staff through a collective mechanism);~~
- ~~4. input from the Head of Discipline/Centre, or a relevant Professor if more appropriate;~~
- ~~5. reference to any external advice obtained;~~
- ~~6. quotations from senior people in the field of sufficient standing may be included. All quotations should be attributed and used selectively to substantiate claims made in the case.~~

~~There is no page or word limit for the case although it should be noted that a closely argued case of not more than six sides is more compelling than a longer one. Cases which are, in the~~

ASPC – Procedures 2009 – Section 7 – Chair and Readership

S/10/1/15

Appendix

~~opinion of the Sub-Committee, excessively long will be referred back to the Unit for editing. There is a provision for supplementary information to be included, but a judgement should be made on whether it enhances the evidence provided in the case and the CV.~~

~~In the case there should be a clear explanation of the nature of the work claimed to be outstanding, and why it is considered that the candidate's achievements meet the criteria. Where there is involvement in collaborative work/projects the candidate's role should be clearly defined. There needs to be substantial evidence of the quality of the candidate's work and its influence on other academics, perhaps through quotations from eminent authorities, for instance from book reviews, invitations to make keynote speeches. Authorities quoted in the case should not subsequently be nominated as referees.~~

~~The criteria for promotion to a chair set out areas in which the outstanding record might be demonstrated (under two selected criteria) and the exposition under research is also relevant for submissions for promotion to reader, where the Sub-Committee will look for evidence of advancement of knowledge, and possibly of national or international recognition.~~

~~The statement should not exceed 2000 words. The Committee recommends font size 10 or 11 pt and the candidate's name should be clearly stated at the top and a word count given at the end.~~

~~It should begin with an introductory sentence clearly stating the criteria under which the case for promotion is being made.~~

~~The remainder of the statement should draw attention to key innovative contributions made against the criteria for promotion to a chair or reader.~~

~~The statement should focus on demonstrating a record of outstanding evidence against the relevant promotion criteria. Its aim is to present, and evidence as appropriate, a summary of the candidate's achievements, in particular, evidence of the advancement of knowledge and international recognition which is supplemented by a comprehensive CV. The statement should not normally include quotations or testimony as forms of evidence.~~

**(d) Statement from the Dean/Director**

~~A statement of 1500 words is requested from the Dean or Director of the Faculty.~~

~~The statement should give an assessment of the candidate's contributions and evidence of sustained commitment at a high level.~~

~~The statement should be a reflective assessment of the candidate's contributions and should include appropriate factual evidence to support claims made in the candidate's statement. It would not normally include testimony or quotations but the Subcommittee recognises that it may be appropriate in some circumstances to include a quotation as confirmation of evidence of a particular contribution.~~

~~For academic staff based in the regions (staff tutors and OUBS regional managers) their case should also be supported by a report from the regional director of not more than 1000 words. This report should provide an assessment of the candidate's contributions and role within the region and evidence of sustained commitment at a high level.~~

**(ee) Curriculum vitae**

~~The curriculum vitae should be clearly set out in the Committee's preferred format. It is essential that the CV is submitted in the recommended format as set out in section 10. It must be paginated and dated. The Committee secretariat is able to answer general queries on CVs and to look at CVs in draft upon request.~~

**(fd) Referees**

ASPC – Procedures 2009 – Section 7 – Chair and Readership

S/10/1/15

Appendix

~~Should~~ If the ~~recommendation submission~~ progresses to Stage 2 references will be sought. The candidate will be asked to nominate two referees. For promotion to a chair the Dean/Director will be asked to propose the names of ~~five~~four potential external referees for the consideration of the ~~Vice-Chancellor or~~ Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research and ~~Enterprise Staff~~) in order for ~~four~~three to be selected, ~~in respect of promotions to a Chair~~. For promotions to readership, the Dean will be asked to propose the names of ~~four~~three potential external referees, ~~from which three~~all of whom will be contacted.

In selecting referees, care should be taken to choose referees of appropriate status and independence and who have no conflict of interest. It may be appropriate in exceptional circumstances for one of the referees to be from outside the academic community.

Deans/Directors should note that consultation with the candidate for the names of potential referees is inappropriate and this should be confined to senior staff. ~~External assessors who can provide an independent reference or opinion on the candidate should be sought. Sources of advice for potential external referees might be, for example, journal editors, grant giving bodies and relevant professional bodies. Those quoted in the submission should not be proposed as a referee.~~ All external assessors are asked to declare any personal, professional or contractual relationship with the candidate. The Secretariat may seek further consultation about the identity and selection of referees under the instruction of the Chair and/or Deputy Chair, where the professional expertise of those nominated does not meet the required breadth and depth of academic review.

External assessors should normally be at least of the status of the promotion involved and need to have appropriate expertise in areas relevant to the candidate's case, and relevant ~~some~~ recent knowledge of the candidate's work CV to be able to ~~substantiate claims made~~ assess the evidence against the promotion criteria.

## 7.8 Promotion of lecturer (or equivalent) to a readership or chair

The criteria for promotion to readership (or chair) directly from lecturer (or equivalent) are as set out in sections 4.5 and 4.7.

For all academic promotions to ~~the~~ senior level (senior lecturer, reader or chair) an adequate and competent contribution to course production and maintenance must be demonstrated. Where a distinguished research record suggests that promotion direct to readership (or chair) is more appropriate, the Dean/Director is asked to take account of the following in making such a recommendation:

- (a) ~~such the proposed~~ promotion is exceptional;
- (b) adequate and competent contribution to course production and maintenance can be demonstrated;

~~For a trial period of two years, with effect from 1 April 2005, c~~Cases for promotion from lecturer to reader (or chair) can be made at any time during the year to the Chair and Readership Sub-Committee via the Committee Secretary. ~~This is a change to previous guidance which permitted submissions once a year as part of the senior lecturer review.~~

Submissions should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in section 7.7 for the preparation of a readership or chair case. References should not be sent with the submission, and the appropriate cover sheet must be completed and attached to the submission.

On receipt, as is the practice with promotions from senior lecturer to reader or chair, cases will be scrutinised by the Chair and Readership Sub-Committee in accordance with the procedure set out in section 7.6, stage one.

ASPC – Procedures 2009 – Section 7 – Chair and Readership

S/10/1/15

Appendix

If the Sub-committee decides that there is sufficient evidence against the criteria then the case will proceed to the second stage of the process, (section 7.7) investigation of the *prima facie* case.

If the Sub-committee decides that there is insufficient evidence ~~of a distinguished research record~~ against the criteria, then the case will be referred back to the Unit, with feedback, and it will not proceed any further at this stage. The case will not automatically be considered against the criteria for promotion to senior lecturer.

Deans and directors must therefore give very careful consideration to the route they decide to pursue ~~for certain cases~~. The Academic Staff Promotions Committee also considers that although not specifically precluded, it would be very unusual for cases to be submitted via both the senior lecturer and readership or chair routes. Deans and directors who think they might wish to pursue such a course of action with any cases are requested to contact the ~~deputy chairman or~~ secretary of the Committee for guidance, at a very early stage in the preparation of cases.

Deans and directors are reminded that the consultation on a submission for the promotion of a lecturer to a readership or chair should be as wide as for submissions for promotion to senior lecturer, so that the support within the Unit and elsewhere is evident to the Academic Staff Promotions Committee.



## AWARDS COMMITTEE

DRAFT CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~14.10.2009~~ 27.01.2010

---

### Purpose

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

### 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 awards, 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 account of the University's validated programmes and awards; where appropriate, to refer proposals for classification schemes to the Assessment Policy Committee
2. Following scrutiny, to approve new awards and their associated regulations where the proposals are standard.
3. To approve proposals for the withdrawal of individual taught awards, and amended regulations, ensuring that students are given reasonable notice of any changes.
- ~~4.~~ To approve amendments to existing awards and their regulations.
- ~~2-5~~ 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 awards, which do not require regulatory changes.

#### ***Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance***

- ~~36.~~ To monitor the demand for the University's taught awards and to receive an annual report on the number of awards made of each type.
- ~~4-7~~ To monitor the process for the annual review of awards.
- ~~58.~~ To have oversight (on behalf of the Senate) of the award of credit to applicants and students towards the University's taught awards based on study undertaken outside the University in accordance with established regulations.

- 6-9 To receive regular-annual 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**

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

### **Advising other governance bodies or management**

- ~~4013. To provide detailed scrutiny of proposals for the introduction of individual taught awards, taking into account the QAA requirements relating to programme specifications, learning outcomes and subject benchmarking, the balance in such awards between Open University originated credit and credit originated outside the University, and taking account of the University's validated programmes and awards; where appropriate, to refer proposals for classification schemes to the Assessment Policy Committee; and to make recommendations to the CAVC on the approval of new individual awards. To make recommendations to the CAVC on the approval of proposals for the introduction of individual taught awards, and their regulations, particularly where such awards involve a partnership dimension, where any aspect of the award is being funded from strategic/central funds; where the award is the first example of a new type of award; where the award has a non-standard element; or where the award is in a subject of dub-subject that is new to the University.~~
11. ~~To give initial consideration to proposals for the withdrawal of individual taught awards, ensuring that students are given reasonable notice of any changes, and to advise the CAVC on the withdrawal of awards.~~
4214. To identify and consider credit accumulation and transfer issues particularly those involving the status and recognition of the University's courses and awards 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 award or changes to existing curriculum policy to the CAVC.

### **Membership**

1. A Chair appointed by the Curriculum, Awards 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, OU Validation Services, or nominee.
4. The Director, Centre for Outcomes-based Education (COBE) or nominee, *ex officio*.
5. The Head of Assessment, Credit and Awards or nominee.



6. The Head of Product and Service Development, or nominee
7. Two members of Student Services support staff, nominated by the Director, Students.
8. One member of staff based in Scotland, nominated by the Director, Scotland.
9. Two registered students, one of whom should be a postgraduate student, appointed by the Open University Students Association.
10. One associate lecturer appointed by the Associate Lecturers Committee.
11. Two members of the Validation Committee, nominated by that Committee.
12. [The Chair of the Credit Rating Panel, ex-officio.](#)

Secretary

### **Mode of Operation**

1. The Committee shall meet as and when required, and shall report at least annually to the Curriculum, Awards 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.
-

## AWARDS COMMITTEE

MEMBERSHIP LIST – UPDATED 01.09.2009

---

### Membership

- A Chair appointed by the Curriculum, Awards and Validation Committee.  
Professor AW Tait                                The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards)
- 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).  
Dr R Brown                                        Arts  
Dr I Sinka    FELS  
Mr J B Roche                                        HSC  
Dr B Hodgson                                       IET  
Dr K McConway                                    MCT  
Mr M Lucas                                         OUBS  
Dr P Murphy                                        Science  
Dr SJ Bromley                                      Social Sciences
- The Director, OU Validation Services, or nominee.  
Dr G Thomas
- The Director, Centre for Outcomes-based Education (COBE) or nominee, *ex officio*.  
Mr C H Edwards
- The Head of Assessment, Credit and Awards or nominee.  
Mr B J Palmer
- The Head of Product and Service Development, or nominee.  
Ms E Nicholls
- Two members of Student Services support staff, nominated by The Director, Students.  
Mrs M Jones  
Dr P Cannell
- One member of staff based in Scotland, nominated by the Director, Scotland.  
Mr R Harding                                       Deputy Chair
- Two registered students, one of whom should be a postgraduate student, appointed by the Open University Students Association.  
Mr S Jamieson                                       to 31.08.2010  
Mrs J Jones    to 31.08.2010

10. One associate lecturer appointed by the Associate Lecturers Committee.

Mr T Parry

to 31.08.2011

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

Mr J Buswell  
Professor J Last

12. The Chair of the Credit Rating Panel, ex-officio

tba

Secretary: Ms D Rowe

---



## CURRICULUM AWARDS AND VALIDATION COMMITTEE

DRAFT CONSTITUTION – UPDATED ~~28.01.2009~~27.01.2010

---

### Purpose

The Curriculum Awards and Validation Committee is responsible to the Senate for strategy, policy and standards relating to curriculum and awards, including collaborative offerings, and associated and accredited institutions; in collaboration with the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, where appropriate, to recommend policy in respect of awards based on occupational standards; and to monitor the framework for the approval of awards of this type. It has delegated powers to approve assessment policy, ~~and may approve new instances of existing types of award.~~

### 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 awards which involve taught courses (with the exception of research degrees and higher doctorates) acting on advice from the Learning Teaching and Student Support Committee where necessary, and for the approval of new courses and packs, recommending the frameworks and guidelines to the Senate for approval.
3. To monitor and review of 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 approve the introduction of new courses and packs and on the advice of the Awards Committee, to approve the introduction, and withdrawal of awards 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.~~
54. To delegate to the Awards Committee ~~the approval~~the approval of the introduction of all standard awards and their regulations, the approval of the withdrawal of all awards and their associated amended regulations, and the approval of amendments to existing awards 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 approve the introduction of new courses and packs and on the advice of Awards Committee to approve the introduction of new awards and their regulations, where these are referred to it by Awards 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.

6. 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.
7. To approve, on the advice of the Validation Committee, accredited or associate status for institutions, the terms of their accredited or associate status, and where appropriate, the termination of their accredited or associate status and to make recommendations to the Senate in cases which fall outside these limits.
8. To approve, on the advice of the Vocational Awards Committee, proposals for any new types of awards based on occupational standards and any new curriculum areas in which vocational awards might be developed.
9. To interpret and approve exceptions to the policies and regulations relating to examinations and assessment and awards.

***Monitoring, and reviewing, actions and institutional performance***

10. 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.
11. To monitor the annual review of awards, and the annual review of curriculum partnerships and partnerships with accredited or associate status to identify areas of the University's curriculum and awards structure requiring attention or development, and to draw these to the notice of appropriate officers and committees for review or development activities as appropriate.
12. To contribute to the Senate's annual academic review of the University.

***Assuring Quality and Standards, including approving regulations***

13. To ensure that standards are set for the awards, courses 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.
14. To approve recommendations for the recognition and inclusion in the awards of the University of courses and periods of study undertaken under the auspices both of the University and of other institutions.
15. To maintain and monitor the University's procedures for the approval of proposals for University awards 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***

16. To advise relevant areas of the University of significant market opportunities which the market may present, in order to inform University strategy.
17. To advise the Senate on the introduction or withdrawal of specific categories of award.

18. To report to the Senate of new partnerships and new approved institutions (including refusal to approve) or any changes in the status of accreditation.

***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 (Curriculum and Awards), Chair, *ex officio*.
2. The deans of faculties and schools 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, OUVS, *ex officio*.
5. The Head of Assessment Credit and Awards or nominee, *ex officio*.
6. The Director of the Centre for Professional Learning and Development, *ex officio*.
7. The Director of the Centre for Widening Participation, or nominee, *ex officio*.
8. One nominee of the Director, Students.
9. One nominee of the Director of Marketing.
10. Four members of staff, elected by the Senate, of whom at least two shall be members of the central academic staff.
11. Two associate lecturers appointed by the Associate Lecturers Committee.
12. Two registered students appointed by the Open University Students Association.
13. Four external members. These may be drawn from the following bodies: the University's accredited 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 (Curriculum and Awards) on the recommendation of University officers.
14. 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.



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 courses and packs.
-

**CURRICULUM, AWARDS & VALIDATION COMMITTEE**

*MEMBERSHIP LIST - UPDATED 01.09.2009*

---

1. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Curriculum and Awards), Chair, *ex officio*.  
Professor AW Tait
2. The deans of faculties and schools or their nominees, and the Director of the Institute of Educational Technology or his/her nominee, *ex officio*.  

Professor D Rowland	Arts
Dr S Ding	FELS
Professor S Reveley	HSC
Professor J Taylor	IET
Professor C Earl	MCT
Professor J Fleck	OUBS
Professor P Potts	Science
Professor D Miell	Social Sciences
3. The chairs of any committees reporting to the Committee.  
Professor T Herbert                      The Chair of Curriculum Partnerships Committee
4. The Director, OU Validation Services, *ex officio*.  
Dr K Clarke
5. The Head of Assessment Credit and Awards or nominee, *ex officio*.  
Mr B Palmer
6. The Director of the Centre for Professional Learning and Development, *ex officio*.  
Mr C Elvin
7. The Director of the Centre for Widening Participation or nominee, *ex officio*.  
Dr EA Marr
8. One nominee of the Director, Students.  
Mrs L Brady, North West Regional Director
9. One nominee of the Director of Marketing.  
Dr T F Carlton
10. Four members of staff, elected by the Senate, of whom at least two shall be members of the central academic staff.

Dr C Williams	Central	to 31.08.2012
Mr U Baumann	Central	to 31.08.2012
Mr R Harding	Regional	to 31.08.2010
Ms C Morris	Regional	to 31.08.2012

11. Two associate lecturers appointed by the Associate Lecturers Committee.

Mr J Robson	to 31.08.2011
Dr R Oakes	to 31.08.2011

12. Two registered students appointed by the Open University Students Association.

Ms M Cantieri	to 31.08.2010
Mr D Reed	to 31.08.2010

13. Four external members. These may be drawn from the following bodies: the University's accredited 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 (Curriculum and Awards) on the recommendation of University officers.

Ms M Fletcher  
Mr B McGonigle  
Dr K Straughan  
One member to be appointed

14. 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.

Dr R Hamilton  
Mr R Humphreys  
Mr A Gribbon

Secretary: Ms S Rippon  
Working Secretary: Mrs J Wardale

---